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The period of progressive capitalist development is economically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater consolidations of economies, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. This is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence sec in the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

The Breathing Spell

The crisis, like much else in life, is a matter of custom; the longer one lives in it, the less detestable it is found. Even the things are bad, still one feels that they might be worse, -- much like a man who has been in an accident and considers himself lucky to have lost only his legs and not his head. Those who are fortunate enough to return home from a battle are often still more enthusiastic than they were on going in, and the dead are of course dumb. Complaints about the general misery finally get on the nerves of the most sober-minded and he seeks recreation in the more colorful moments of life, whether political assassinations or the first skirmishes of the coming world war. After the day's work, the baseball or football game of grownup children still offers to indifference the necessary stimulus and energy to read the boycotted Hearst press.

The newspaper economists appear to be right: the depression was a psychological phenomenon, people merely lacked the courage for prosperity. When the crisis ceased to be spoken of, it was also quite passed. The panic sky state of mind which once set people demonstrating in front of the banks because their money had already been taken up by others, the strike wave which it had been so hard to bring into legal channels, the suicides of bloated capitalists and emaciated workers, the unrest of the unemployed, -- all that is forgotten and consequently the dividends mount. General Dawes, the celebrated "voice from the Middle West", pounds his absent breast and prophesies an undreamed-of prosperity, supporting his prediction on the basis of the previous analyses, which set the turning point of the crisis at
1935. Forbes writes that "Instead of facing a long, grueling period of deflation, depression and stress, Americans now face a period of recovery which should last longer than any previous spell of prosperity," -- in which he merely gives expression to the general optimism, which is made responsible for the good business balances.

Jesse H. Jones, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, speaks for thousands of other "leaders" in industry and business when he says that "recovery has been attained and that there is no longer any fear or any reason for fearing that something is going to fall down upon us, that some great failure or disaster may occur that would disturb conditions". And in a letter to the newspaper King Roy "Howard, Roosevelt proclaims for the whole nation: "the depression was (sic) the culmination of unhealthy, however innocent arrangements in agriculture, in business and in finance". And he finds it "a source of great satisfaction that at this moment conditions are such as to offer further substantial and widespread recovery".

So the depression is now just a matter of history; it was, and the upward movement has set in which has allowed the Roosevelt Administration to give business a breathing spell. And, for that matter, the breathing is fit.

If the causes for the depression were sought as well as found by different people in accordance with their various interests, temperaments and intellects, hence in the most various places, so the explanation for the approaching new prosperity are extremely manifold and contradictory. Just as it was generally agreed, after three years of depression, that there really was a crisis in the U.S.A., so it is also now agreed that in about three years prosperity will be really noticeable. The dispute is merely regarding the maturity of this coming prosperity, and the violence of the dispute is not owing merely to the circumstance of the forthcoming elections which render necessary a sharper division of minds. It is true that the crown which Roosevelt set on his head is being spattered with mud by the liberty-thirsting anti-New Dealers. In reality, however, no one knows what the dispute is about, no one knows what he is saying; the most ignorant of the disputants knows the character of his audience. Since the blockhead constantly finds someone who is still more idiotic than himself, this debate can be successfully waged by any one.

Now what has actually happened? The Roosevelt Administration attempted to combat the depression with the following program (in the Chief's own words): "The establishment of a wise balance in American economic life, to restore our banking system to public confidence, to protect investors in the security market, to give labor freedom to organize and protection from exploitation, to safeguard and develop our national resources, to set up protection against the vicissitudes incident to old age and unemployment, to relieve destitution and suffering, and to relieve investors and consumers from the burden of unnecessary corporate machinery." And even the "healthy opposition" to the New Deal has to admit, Forbes writes, that "since the bottom of the depression, the progress made is impressive. Stock prices, a significant barometer, are the highest in four years. Re-employment is now more encouraging than at any time since the boom. The purchasing power of our agricultural population has increased quite substantially. Including producing capital, our durable goods have lately, for the first time, shown real revival. The steel industry has multiplied its output fivefold since it reached nadir, and steel masters predict further gains. Banks are doing 20 to 25 per cent more business than twelve months ago. The tidal wave of dividend reductions and omissions has spent its force; resumptions and increases are now becoming more and more common." etc., etc.

Now the fact is that none of these statements involves any responsibility; every one of them is completely without substance and expresses nothing more than Mr. Forbes's optimism -- an optimism for which he is also paid, since of course it is not until optimism sets in that business gets going. And in reality this whole optimism and this prosperity cry is based on the arbitrary generalization of individual cases; for the nation as a whole, there is no sign of a coming prosperity or of an upswing. The government business chart gives a clearer picture regarding the actual conditions, a picture which leads to other conclusions than those which are favorable to business.

Each index below represents the percentage of "normal" (100) as of the years 1929-35, with the exception of prices; these latter are based on the year 1926.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Industrial Factory Production</th>
<th>Pcy. Freight-Wholesale Production Employment</th>
<th>rolls loadings prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>109.1 106 95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>92 58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>75 72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>56 64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>60 70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>60 70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1935: Industrial Factory Pay- Freight- Wholesale-
Production Employment rolls loadings prices
Jan. 90 88 81.9 64.1 64 78.8
Feb. 89 88 69.1 65.5 65 79.3
March 88 82.4 70.7 65 61 80.1
April 86 82.3 70.7 61 60.1
May 85 81.2 68.5 61 80.2
June 86 79.9 66.4 63 79.8
July 84 80.4 65.3 58 79.4
Aug. 84 81.0 66.5 61 80.5

The most significant change of late has been in prices, which are higher than at any time in five years. Otherwise, however, since the beginning of 1935, since the beginning of the "new prosperity", no progress has been made in bringing industrial production back to "normal". The present depression is the longest in the entire history of capitalism.

Colonel Leonard P. Ayres, vice-president and economist of the Cleveland Trust Company, writes in his monthly review in October 1935: "During the last six months of this year the volume of industrial production has remained as nearly unchanged that there has been any variation. Production declined during the first quarter and has been almost stabilized since then. The level at which this has taken place has been almost exactly halfway between the low records made in 1932 and again in 1933 and the computed normal level. It is about the level reached in the autumn of 1929 and the spring of 1931." For four months, says Ayres, "no progress has been made in bringing industrial production back to normal", and he does not anticipate any change in the immediate future. The only thing of interest that he finds during the year 1935 is that it was the most stabilized period in American history. "It seems as if we are trapped by events in such a manner that we are slow to change our ways to meet new conditions." In the second quarter we had the suspension of NIRA, which might well have been expected to cause some serious labor disputes, only moderate price changes for commodities and no minor business booms or intermediate collapses."

Although in sharp contrast to the prevailing conception, Colonel Ayres' survey presents an objective picture of the actual situation, which permits of no optimism as regards the near future. This objectivity is, however, merely owing to the fact that Ayres is still holding to old ideas: ideas which relate to the prosperity of 1928-29. In the meanwhile, however, various discoveries have been made which have led to a transformation of economic concepts. It is not merely that the times when one danced around the golden calf are today generally recognized as sinful and the jazz age regarded as abnormal; science also sees today that the conditions of 1929 could not be regarded as typical prosperity, but rather that the "true prosperity" of capitalism is in the stagnant depression. Prosperity is denoted as the abnormal condition of the capitalist system. Thus, when Professor Douglas, in his book Controlling Depressions, asserts that the previous depressions were overcome only through pure chance, such a statement involves the view that the crisis is the condition of the present system and that only an accident, which cannot be counted upon, will help it evade. And Professor H. Parker Willis, of Columbia University, writes in his book The Economics of Inflation: "It had been evident, for some time before 1929, that at some comparatively early period a reckoning must be expected, owing to the abnormal conditions then existing."

If those profitable conditions were abnormal, then the conditions of today must be rated as normal, and the present prosperity can find its justification by way of such a simple means as a reversal of concepts. With this logic, which prizes starving as the best nourishment, one can almost solve all problems. Even the crisis did not make its appearance in 1929, but as early as 1928 - or, in other words, even if the rate of accumulation fell in 1926, that is, did not advance as much as would have been necessary in order to continue the general upswing - and business took refuge in increased speculation, which could only end in the collapse of the unfavorable speculations, all which is only a sign of the crisis which has been held up but not averted - nevertheless this speculation is one of the normal manifestations of the capitalist system. The whole of the prosperity down to 1929 is just as normal for capitalism as the whole of the depression since 1929.

There is no doubt that, as we read in a Report, "the rise in business activity in recent months has naturally benefitted corporate earnings materially. Despite higher operating costs and increased taxes, it is currently estimated that aggregate industrial earnings in the first
The figure for bank deposits for the week ended September 18, 1935, is $20,630,000,000, which means a rise of $3,320,000,000 in the last year and of $6,070,000,000 from the low of July 1932. This new existing surplus is expected to bring about a new general upswing. The most dramatic and important problem involved in the relatively static conditions of business," writes Colonel Ayres, "is the failure of the combination of great accumulated shortages of goods and accumulated surpluses of capital to stimulate new business activity. Idle funds have become so large that interest rates have fallen to the lowest level ever recorded, and corporations are busily calling their bonds and reassessing their earnings, but save in rare instances they are not creating genuinely new issues. Few new businesses are falling, and almost no new ones of importance are being started. It is a strange anomaly that huge shortages and accumulated idle capital are not being recognized as constituting opportunities available for investment and for new productive investments. Furthermore, some of the deposits have been created by government expenditures involving no return, so that these deposits are of no value to further capital accumulation. It becomes increasingly obvious that developed monopoly capitalism is a stagnant and hence at the same time a rotting capitalism. While on the one hand the NRA policy, as an instrument for temporarily bridging over the opposition of the less monopolized and less concentrated capitals and for assuring economic peace in the process of this endeavor, is now a thing of the past, the tendency which it involves for the strengthening of the monopolies and the promotion of capital concentration is, in the new legislation in the form of the new Banking bill, the taxing program, etc. The the NRA is dead in so far as it made the pretention of being in harmony with the interests of the workers, its monopolistic character lives on and compels the weaker capitals to ever recurrent protests, which can not, however, hold up the eventual ruin already announced in the economic literature. The big monopolies have to accumulate on an expanded scale, and that is the very thing which they find to be neither profitable nor possible. In order to hold what they have, their own stagnation has to be made a universal affair, and manifests itself in the strangling of the initiative of the smaller capitals, which - however paradoxical it may sound - precisely by reason of their weakness, still have possibilities of accumulation in conditions which preclude accumulation for the big monopolies. Still, the strangefold of the monopolies does not allow the smaller capitals to actualize their opportunities. Until the monopolies are able further to accumulate, some redistribution of capital, even tho at the same time it involves the slow destruction of the weaker capitals and must increasingly impoverish the workers. The breathing spell spoken of today can be appraised only within the capitalist blind alley. Whatever the urinal in the labor press about high profits, the fact is that they are not high enough to continue the accumulation of monopoly capital at the necessary tempo. The whole enormous reorganization of capital with a view to better profitability has resulted in nothing more than the maintenance of a certain crisis level. Factors which at an earlier date would have enabled overcoming the crisis merely suffice today to hold up the too rapid descent and offer nothing more than the possibility of temporary stafification at still lower level. The prospects offered monopoly capital by this breathing spell are those of seeking in new military encounters a redistribution of capital, conforming better to the profit needs. But under the present conditions each imperialist nation can assure and better its existence only at the cost of other nations, since a general world-wide upswing thru imperialism is not to be expected; and this is equivalent to saying that the military attempts at overcoming can only lead to the sharpening of the world crisis. This state of affairs has only one future: the sharpening of the crisis and eventually a new temporary stabilization at a still lower level.
investigation of the Brookings Institution on "Income and Social Progress", which sees as the only solution of the present difficulties a lowering of commodity prices without further restriction of mass purchasing power. This innocent position contains the whole capitalistic dilemma, and this in spite of the fact that it is a false statement of the problem. The really essential thing in capitalism is the capitalist purchasing power, which has to be increased, but which can only be increased thru the restriction of "mass purchasing power". In other words, the lowering of commodity prices means nothing more than the continuance of accumulation. So that Moultan says for the Brookings Institution practically only this: In order to attain prosperity, we have to prosper. To bring this wisdom to light, the institution has expended $150,000 for research purposes.

Capital knows only one way out of the crisis: more profit. And this more can only be driven out of the workers. Since the NRA went under, more than 20,000 firms have cut wages, lengthened the working day, increased the intensity of the labor process. Unemployment has not only increased. This years relief grants have been set at $1,237,973,573, as compared with $1,013,069,738 in the corresponding ten months of last year. Today relief is being cut everywhere, often more than 10 percent. The unemployed on relief jobs receive wages which are only little more than the relief rates. The more the workers are impoverished, however, the more talk is heard of social security: hope is to take the place of bread. But the capitalists know, better than all the social reformers, what is really going on, and one such social reformer recently received from Henry Ford the ironic but no less pertinent answer: "You can't make security one-sided; who is going to secure the securities?" and since the "securities" are still the lords of the world, there can hardly be any question that they will first make themselves secure.

Factory employment since March 1935 is estimated to have dropped 1.4 points and pay rolls to have declined 4.2 points. In view of this difference, capital breathes for the moment somewhat more freely. But the breathing spell is brief: soon capitalism will again strike about itself like a drowning man, and one will be very patriotic and speak enthusiastically of a new world war.

The yellower and more leatherly the skin of the mummified Lenin grows, and the higher the statistically determined number of the Lenin Mausoleum to the Lenin Institute decreases, the more are people concerned about the real Lenin and his historical significance. More and more monuments are erected to his memory, more and more motion pictures turned out in which he is the central figure, more and more books written about him, and the Russian confectioners mold sweetmeats in forms which bear his features. And yet the fading of the faces of the chocolate Lenins is matched by the unclarity and the improbability of the stories which are told about him. Though the Lenin Institute in Moscow may publish his collected works, they no longer have any meaning beside the fantastic legends which have formed around his name. As soon as people began to concern themselves with Lenin's collar-buttons, they also ceased to bother about his ideas. Everyone then fashions his own Lenin, and if not after his own image, at any rate after his own desires. What the Napoleonic legend is to France, and the legend of Frederick Rex to Germany, the Lenin legend is to the new Russia. Just as people once absolutely refused to believe in the death of Napoleon, and just as those who hoped for the resurrection of Frederick Rex, so in Russia till today there are people who pray for the "little father Czar" has not died, but continues to indulge his insatiable appetite in demanding from them ever fresh tribute. Others light eternal lamps under the picture of Lenin; to them he is a saint, a redeemer to whom one prays for aid. Millions of eyes stare at millions of these pictures, and see in Lenin the Russian Moses, St. George, Ulysses, Hercules, God or Devil. The Lenin cult has become a new religion before which even the atheistic communists gladly bend the knee; it makes life easier in every respect. Lenin appears to them as the father of the Soviet Republic, the man who made victory possible for the revolution, the great leader without whom they themselves would not exist. But not only in Russia and not only in popular legend, but also to a large part of the Marxist intelligentsia throughout the world, the Russian Revolution has become a world event so closely bound up with the genius of Lenin that one gets the impression that without him that revolution and hence also world history might possibly have taken an essentially different course. A truly objective analysis of the Russian Revolution, however, will at once reveal the untenability of such an idea.

"The assertion that history is made by great men is from a theoretical standpoint wholly unfounded". Much are the
words in which Lenin himself turns on the legend which
insists on making him alone responsible for the success
of the Russian Revolution. He considered the World War
determining as regards the direct cause of its outbreak
and for the time of its occurrence. Yea, without that war,
he says, the revolution would possibly have been post-
poned for ever again. "The idea that the outbreak
and the course of the Russian Revolution depended on an
very large measure on Lenin necessarily implies a complete
identification of the revolution with the taking over of
power by the Bolsheviks. Trotsky has made a remark to
the effect that the entire credit for the success of the
October uprising belongs to Lenin; against the opposition
of almost all his party friends, the resolution for in-
surrection was carried by him alone. But the seizure of
power by the Bolsheviks did not give to the revolution
the spirit of Lenin; on the contrary, Lenin had so com-
pletely adapted himself to the necessities of the revol-
ution that practically he fulfilled the task of that
class which he ostensibly combatted. Of course it is
often asserted that with the taking over of state power
by the Bolsheviks, the originally bourgeois-democratic
revolution was forthwith converted into the social in-
terproletarian one. But is it really possible for anyone
seriously to believe that a single political act is cap-
able of taking the place of a whole historical develop-
ment which, months--from February to October--had
sufficient to form the economic presuppositions of a so-
cialist revolution in a country which was just engaged
in getting rid of its feudal and absolutistic fetters, in
order to give freer play to the forces of modern capi-

talism?

Up until the Revolution, and in very large measure even
yet today, the decisive role in the economic and social
development of Russia was played by the agrarian ques-
tion. Of the 174 million inhabitants prior to War, only
34 million lived in cities. In each thousand of the
gainfully employed, 719 were engaged in agriculture. In
spite of their enormous economic importance, the major-
ity of the peasants still led a wretched existence. The
cause of their deplorable situation was the insufficiency
of soil. State, nobility and large landed proprietors as-
sured to themselves with asiatic brutality an unconscion-
able exploitation of the population.

Since the abolition of serfdom (1861) the scarcity of
land for the peasant masses had constantly been the ques-
tion around which all others revolved in Russian domestic
politics. It formed the main object of all reform endeav-
ors, which saw in it the driving power of the approach-
ing revolution, which had to be turned aside. The finan-
cial policy of the czarist regime, with its ever new
levies of indirect taxes, worsened the situation of the
peasants still more. The expenditures for the army, the
fleet, the state apparatus, attained gigantic proportions.
The greater part of the State budget went for unproduc-
tive purposes, which totally ruined the economic founda-
tion of agriculture.

"Freedom and Land" was thus the necessary revolutionary
demand of the peasants. Under this watchword occurred a
series of peasant uprisings which soon, in the period
from 1902 to 1906, assumed significant scope. In com-

bination with the mass strike movements of the workers taking
place at the same time, they produced such a violent com-
motion in the heart of Czarism that Czarism in that period may in
truth be denoted as a "dress rehearsal" for the revolu-
tion of 1917. The way in which Czarism reacted to these
rebellions is best illustrated by the expression of the
then vice-governor of Tambirowsk, Bogdanovitch: "Few ar-
rested, the more shot". And one of the officers who had
taken part in the suppression of the insurrections wrote:
"All around us, bloodshed; everything going up in flames;
we shoot, strike down, stab". It was in this sea of blood
and flames that the revolution of 1917 was born.

Notwithstanding the defeats, the pressure of the peasants
grew more and more menacing. It led to the Stolypin re-
forms, which, however, were only empty gestures, stopped
short with the bloodshed and in reality brought the agrarian
question not a single step forward. But once the little
finger has had to be extended, there will soon be snatch-
ing for the whole hand. The further worsening of the
peasants' situation during the war, the defeat of the
aristocratic policy in which all reason

was thrown overboard, the general dilemma resulting to
all classes of society, led to the February revolution,
which first of all finally brought about the violent solu-
tion of the agrarian question, which had been a burning
one during the past half century. Its political charac-
ter, however, was not impressed upon this revolution by
the peasant movement; this movement merely gave it its
great power. In the first announcements of the central
executive committee of the Petrograd workers' and sol-
diers' councils, the agrarian question was not even men-
tioned. But the peasants soon forced themselves upon
the attention of the new government. Tired of waiting for it
to take action in the agrarian question, in April and May
of 1917 the disappointed peasant masses took it upon
themselves to form the land for themselves. The soldiers
on the

fronts, fearful of failing to get their proper share in
the new distribution, abandoned the trenches and hurried
back to their villages. They took their weapons with them,
however, and thus offered the new government no possibil-
ity of restraining them. All its appeals to the sentiment
of nationality and the sacredness of Russian interests
were of no avail against the urge of the masses to provide at least for their own economic needs. And those needs were embraced in peace and land. It was related at the time that peasants who were implored to remain on the front, as otherwise the Germans would occupy Moscow, were quite puzzled and answered the government emissary: "And what's that to us? Why, we're from the Tamboff Government!"

Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not invent the winning slogan, "Land to the peasants"; rather, they accepted the peasant revolution going on independently of them. Taking advantage of the vacillating attitude of the Kerensky regime, which still hoped to be able to settle the agrarian question by way of peaceful discussion, the Bolsheviks won the good-will of the peasants and were thus enabled to drive the Kerensky government out and take over the power themselves. But this was possible for them only as agents of the peasants' will, by sanctioning their appropriation of land, and it was only through their support that the Bolsheviks were able to maintain themselves in power.

The slogan "Land to the peasants" has nothing to do with communistic principles. The cutting up of the large estates into a great number of small independent farming enterprises was a measure directly opposed to socialism, and was only justified on the ground of their own tasks. They could not accede to the revolutionary demands of the agricultural question, since a general expropriation of land might all too easily bring in its train the expropriation of industry. Neither the peasants nor the workers followed them and the state of the bourgeoisie was decided by the temporary alliance between these latter groups. It was not the bourgeoisie but the workers who brought the bourgeois revolution to its conclusion; the place of the capitalists was taken over by the bolshevist state apparatus under the Leninist slogan: "If capitalism anyhow, then let's make it". Of course the workers in the cities had overthrown capitalism, but only in order now to convert the bolshevist party apparatus into their new masters. In the industrial cities the workers' struggle went on under socialist demands, seemingly independent of the peasant revolution under way at the same time and yet in a decisive sense determined by the latter. The original revolutionary demands of the workers were objectively incapable of being carried thru. To be sure, the workers were able, with the aid of the peasants, to win the state power for their party, but this new State soon took a position directly opposed to the workers' interests. An opposition which even today has assumed forms which actually make it possible to speak of a "Red Czarism". The talk now about an extension of democracy in Russia, the thought of introducing a sort of parliamentarism, the resolution of the last soviet congress about dismantling the dictatorship, all this is merely a political maneuver designed to compensate for the governments latest acts of violence against the opposition. These promises are not to be taken seriously, but are an outgrowth of the Leninist practice, which was always well calculated to work both ways. There are certain measures in the interest of the workers' stability and security. The zigzag course of the Leninist policy springs from the necessity of conforming constantly to the shifting of class forces in Russia in such manner that the government may always remain master of the situation. And so there is accepted today what was rejected the day before, or vice versa, unprincipledness has been elevated into a principle, and the Leninist
party is concerned with only one thing, namely, the exercise of state power at any price.

At this place, however, we are interested only in making clear that the Russian Revolution was not dependent on Lenin or on the Bolsheviks, but that the decisive element in the victory of the workers was the Bolshevists, and not the Bolsheviks. The Bolshevik Party Congress (March-April 1921): "It was not the proletarian vanguard on our side, but the coming over to us of the army, because we demanded peace, which was the decisive factor in our victory. The army, however, consisted of peasants. If we had not been supported by the millions of peasant soldiers, our victory over the bourgeoisie would have been out of the question." The great interest of the peasants in the matter of land, the slight interest with reference to the question of government, enabled the Bolsheviks to conduct a victorious struggle for the government. The peasants were quite willing to leave the Kremlin to the Bolsheviks, provided only that they themselves were not interfered with in their own struggle against the large estate owners.

But even in the cities, Lenin was not the decisive factor in the conflicts between capital and Labor. On the contrary, he was pleasantly drawn along in the workers' demands and actions, measures went far beyond the Bolsheviks. It was not Lenin who conducted the revolution, but the revolution conducted him. Though as late as the October uprising, Lenin restricted his earlier and more thorough-going demands to those for control of production, and wished to stop short with the socialization of the banks and transportation facilities, without the general abolition of private ownership, the workers paid no further attention to his views and expropriated all enterprises. It is interesting to recall that the first decree of the Bolshevik government was directed against the wild, unauthorized expropriations of factor- ies through the workers' councils. But these soviets were still stronger than the party apparatus, and they compelled Lenin to issue the decree for the nationalization of all industrial enterprises. It was only under the pressure brought to bear by the workers that the Bolsheviks consented to this change in their own plans. Gradually, through the extension of state power, the influence of the soviets became weakened, until today they no longer serve more than decorative purposes.

During the first years of the revolution, up to the introduction of the New Economic Policy (1921), there was actually of course some experimentation in Russia in the community sense. This is not, however, to be set down to the account of Lenin, but of those forces which made of him a political chameleon who at one time assumed a reactionary and at another a revolutionary color. New peasant uprisings against the Bolsheviks first drive Lenin to a more radical policy, a stronger emphasis upon the interests of the workers and the poor peasants who had come off short-handed in connection with the first distribution of land. But then this policy proved a failure since the poor peasants whose interests are thus preferred refuse to support the Bolsheviks and lead them "turn the face again to the middle peasants". In such a case, Lenin has no scruples about strengthening the private-capitalist elements anew, and the earlier allies, who have now grown uncomfortable, are shot down with cannon, as was the case in Kronstadt.

The power, and nothing but the power; it is to this that the whole political gladius of Lenin finally reduces. The fact that the paths along which it is attained, the means which lead to it, determine in their turn the manner in which that power is applied, was a matter with which he had very little concern. Socialism, to him, was in the last instance merely a kind of state capitalism, after the mass had taken possession of the postal service. And this state capitalism he overtook on his way, for in fact there was nothing else to be overtaken. It was merely a question of who was to be the beneficiary of the state capitalism, and here Lenin gave precedence to none. And so George Bernard Shaw, returning from Russia, was quite correct when, in a lecture before the Fabian Society in London, he stated that "Communism is not a matter of the state, but only of removing into practice the Fabian program which we have been preaching the last forty years".

No one, however, has yet suspected the Fabians of containing a world-revolutionary force. And Lenin is, of course, first of all acclaimed as a world revolutionary, notwithstanding the fact that the present Russian state, by which his "estate" is administered, issues emphatic denial when the press publishes reports of Russian toasts to the world revolution, as happened recently in connection with reports of the New York Times on the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. The legend of the world-revolutionary significance of Lenin receives its nourishment from his consistent international position during the World War. It was quite impossible for Lenin at that time to conceive that a Russian revolution would have no further repercussions and be abandoned to itself. There were two reasons for this view: first, because such a thought was, in contradiction with the objective situation resulting from the World War; and secondly, he assumed that the onslaught of the imperialist nations against the Bolsheviks would break the back of the Russian Revolution if the proletariat of Western Europe failed to come to the rescue. Lenin's call for the world revolution was
peaceful neighborliness. I am far from believing that
Proletarian Dictatorship by the Communist party of
capitalist countries would at any rate be able to live in
tination... There are communists in Russia who have grown
tired of waiting for the European revolution and wish to
make the best of their national isolation.... With a Rus-
sia which would regard the social revolution of the other
countries as a betrayal of which Varga here complains.
It was not much more than this
Primarily a call for support and maintenance of bolshev-
ik power. The proof that it was not much more than this
is furnished by his inconsistency in this question: in
addition to making his demands for world revolution, he
at the same time came out for the "right of self-deter-
mination of all oppressed peoples", for their national
liberation. Yet the double-entry bookkeeping sprang
likewise from the jacobinical need of the Bolsheviks for
holding on to power. With both slogans the forces of in-
tervention of the capitalist countries in Russian affairs
was weakened, since their attention was thus diverted to
their own territories and colonies. That meant a respite
for the Bolsheviks, in order to make it as long as pos-
sible. Lenin and the Bolsheviks used the international.
It set for itself a double task: on the one hand, to sub-
ordinate the workers of Western Europe and America to
the will of Moscow; on the other, to strengthen the in-
fluence of Moscow upon the peoples of Eastern Asia. Work
on the international field was modeled after the course
of the Russian Revolution. The goal was that of combin-
ing the interests of the workers and peasants on a world-
wide scale and control of them through the Bolshevists, by
means of the Communist International. In this way at
least the bolshevik state power in Russia received sup-
port; and in case the world revolution should really
spread, the power over the world was to be won. Though
the war was attended with awareness of the time the second failed of accomplishment. The world re-
volution was unable to make headway as an enlarged imita-
tion of the Russian, and the national limitations of the
victory in Russia necessarily made of the Bolshevists a
counter-revolutionary force on the international plane.
Hence also the demand for the "revolution of world" was con-
verted into the "theory of the building of socialism in
one country". And this is not a perversion of the Lenin-
ist standpoint--as Trotsky, for example, asserts today--
but the direct consequence of the pseudo world-revolution-
ary policy pursued by Lenin himself.
It was clear at that time, even to many Bolshevists, that
the restriction of the revolution to Russia would make of
the Russian Revolution itself a factor by which the world
revolution would be impeded. Thus, for example,
Eugene Varga wrote in his book "Economic Problems of the
Proletarian Dictatorship" published by the Communist In-
ternational (1921): "The danger exists that Russia may be
cut out as the motive force of the international revolu-
tion.... There are communists in Russia who have grown
tired of waiting for the European revolution and wish to
make the best of their national isolation.... With a Rus-
sia which would regard the social revolution of the other
countries as a betrayal of which Varga here complains.
It was not much more than this
Such a bottling up of revolutionary Russia would be able
to stop the progress of the world revolution. But that
progress would be slowed down... And with the sharpening
domestic crisis in Russia around that time, it was not
long before almost all communists, including Varga him-
self, found the feeling of which Varga here complains. In
fact, still earlier, even in 1920, Lenin and Trotsky took
pains to stop the revolutionary forces of Europe. Peace
throughout the world was required in order to assure the
building of state capitalism in Russia under the auspices
of the Bolshevists. It was inadvisable to have this peace
disturbed either by war or new revolutions, for in
either case a country like Russia was sure to be drawn in.
Accordingly Lenin imposed, through splitting and intrigue,
a neo-reformist course upon the labor movement of Western
Europe, a course which led to its total dissolution. It
was with sharp words indeed that Trotsky, with the approv-
als of Lenin, turned on the uprising in Central Germany
(1921): "We must flatly say to the German workers that we
regard this philosophy of the offensive as the greatest
danger and in its practical application as the greatest
political crime". And in another revolutionary situation,
in 1923, Trotsky declared to the correspondent of the
Manchester Guardian, again with the approval of Lenin:
"We are of course interested in the victory of the work-
ing classes, but it is not at all to our interest to
have the revolution break out in Europe, a Europe that is
exhausted, and to have the proletariat receive from
the hands of the bourgeoisie nothing but ruins. We are
interested in the maintenance of peace..." And ten years
later, when Hitler seized power, the Communist interna-
tional did not move a finger to prevent. Trotsky is not
only in error, but reveals a failure of memory resulting
no doubt from the loss of his uniform, when today he
characterizes Stalin's failure to help the German com-
munists as a betrayal of the principles of Leninism. This
betrayal was constantly practised by Lenin and Trotsky
himself. But according to a dictum of Trotsky's, the im-
portant thing is not what he does. Stalin is, as a matter of fact, the best dis-
ciple of Lenin, insofar as concerns his attitude to Ger-
man fascism. The Bolshevists have also, of course, not
refrained from entering into alliances with Turkey and
lending political and economic support to the government
of that country even at a time when the sharpest meas-
ures were being taken there against the communists--meas-
ures which frequently eclipsed even the actions of a Hitler.
In view of the fact that the Communist International in
sofar as it continues to function is merely an agency
for the Russian imperial trade, in view of the collapse
in all countries of the communist movement, in view
from Moscow, the legend of Lenin, the world-revolution-
ist, is no doubt sufficiently weakened that one may

count on its disappearance in the near future. And of course even today the hang-ups on the Communist international are no longer operating with the concept of the world revolution, but speak of the "Workers Fatherland", from which they draw their enthusiasm as long as they are not forced to live in it as workers. Those who continue to acclaim Lenin as the world revolutionary par excellence are as a matter of fact getting excited about something more than Lenin's political dreams of world-wide power, dreams which faded to nothingness in the light of day.

The contradiction existing between the dual historical significance of Lenin and that which is generally ascribed to him is greater and, at the same time, more irreconcilable than in any other personage acting on modern history. We have shown that he cannot be made responsible for the success of the Russian Revolution, and also that his theory and practice cannot, as is often done, be appraised as of world-revolutionary importance. Neither, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, can be regarded as having extended or supplemented Marxism. In the work of Thomas B. Brameld, entitled "A Philosophical Approach to Communism", recently published by the University of Chicago, communism is still defined as "a synthesis of the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin". It is not only in this book, but also generally, and quite particularly in the party-communist press, that Lenin is placed in opposition to Marx and Engels. Stalin has denoted "Leninism" as "Marxism in the period of imperialism". Such a position, however, derives its only justification from an unfounded overestimation of Lenin. Lenin has not added to Marxism a single element which could be rated as new and independent. Lenin's philosophical outlook is dialectical materialism as developed by Marx, Engels and Plechanov. It is to it that he refers in connection with all important problems; it is in his criterion in everything and the final court of appeal. In his main philosophical work, "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", he merely repeats Engels in tracing the oppositions of the different philosophical points of view back to the one great contradiction: Materialism vs. Idealism. While for the first position, Nature is primary and Mind secondary, exactly the opposite holds of the other. This previously known formulation is documented by Lenin with additional material from the various fields of knowledge. And so there can be no thought of any essential enrichment of the marxian dialectic on the part of Lenin. In the field of philosophy, to speak of a Leninist school is impossible.

In the field of economic theory, also, no such independent significance can be ascribed to Lenin. Lenin's economic writings are more marxist than those of any of his contemporaries, but they are only brilliant applications of the already existing economic doctrines associated with Marxian. Lenin had absolutely no thought of being an independent theoretician in matters of economics. As far as his social policy is concerned, he did not go beyond Marx, he even admitted that Marx had already said everything fundamental in this field. Since, to his mind, it was quite impossible to go beyond Marx, he concerned himself with nothing further than proving that the marxist postulates were in accordance with the actual development. His principal work on economics, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", is eloquent testimony on this point. Lenin never wanted to be more than Marx's disciple, and so it is only in legend that one can speak of a theory of "Leninism".

Lenin wanted above all else to be a practical politician. His theoretical works are almost exclusively of a polemic nature. They combat the theoretical and other enemies of Marxism, which Lenin identifies with his own political strivings and those of the Bolsheviks generally. To Marxian, practice decides regarding the truth of a theory. As a practician endeavoring to actualize the doctrines of Marx, Lenin may have actually rendered Marxism an enormous service. However, as regards Marxism again, every practice is a social one, which can be modified and influenced by individuals only in very limited measure, never decisively. There is no doubt that the union of theory and practice, of final goal and concrete questions of the moment, with which Lenin was constantly concerned, may be acclaimed as a great accomplishment. But the criterion for this accomplishment is again the success which attends it, and that success, as we have already said, was denied to Lenin. His work not only failed to advance the world revolutionary movement; it also failed to advance the preconditions for a truly socialist society in Russia. The success (such as it was) did not bring him nearer to his goal, but pushed it farther into the distance.

The actual condition in Russia and the present situation of the workers throughout the world ought really to be sufficient proof to any communist observer that the present "Leninist" policy is just the opposite of that expressed by its phraseology. And in the long run such a condition must without doubt destroy the artificially constructed Lenin Legend, so that history itself will finally set Lenin in his proper historical place.

* * * * *

* * * * *
On the resolution adopted by

THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE

The Group of International Communists of Holland has taken a stand on the result of the Brussels conference (cf. Council Correspondence #11, Sept. 1935) and its views of the conceptions there formulated are set forth below. The editorial board of Council Correspondence has found it necessary to leave out portions of the Dutch criticism, since they deal with matters which are foreign to our readers, as, for example, the discussion regarding the present tasks of the German council movement. The Council Communists of America will shortly publish their own views regarding the Brussels conference and the discussion to which it has given rise. It may be stated at once, however, that we agree neither with the conference resolution nor with the criticism here presented. We have to regard them both merely as contributions to a discussion which will have to be further extended before it can lead to a truly international program.

In the first part of the Brussels resolution it is stated that no fundamental differences of opinion exist regarding the international tendencies of capitalist development and the resulting tasks and tactical necessities. Such differences of opinion do, however, exist, and we wish to refer to them briefly here. It is not very difficult, for example, to see that the "actual conditions" in Germany are interpreted from two different points of view, and for this reason also the statement of these "actual conditions" must turn out different. Our "Basic Principles on Communist Production and Distribution," our conception regarding the capitalist laws of motion, as we have published them, form the criterion of our judgment of the German situation. The German delegates at the conference saw the situation in Germany from the viewpoint of the daily, practical struggle against the bourgeoisie under National Socialism. To them, accordingly, the question as to how the council communists must organize themselves (groups of three, five, etc.) as of more importance than the question as to how the working class itself is to appropriate the necessary knowledge of the forces by which society is moved. Their conception of the tasks and tactics of the council communists of the new labor movement is directly influenced by the practical necessities of the daily struggle; theory occupies second place, and is regarded as resulting from experience of the practical class struggle. They go still a step farther, however; they want to take what is believed to have been found as the tasks and tactics of the council communists as a result of the practical struggle against National Socialism in Germany and give it validity as a directive for the council communists on an international scale. And this because in their view the development throughout the world is driving to conditions like those in Germany.

The actively working groups in Germany have not yet completely broken with the conceptions of the old labor movement now in a state of collapse. Thus we see it is not true that theory is a secondary matter resulting from practice and experience. Without a certain insight into the course of the development of society, and without the conception deduced therefrom regarding the tasks to be mastered, not a single movement is possible. Inversely: theoretical insight is the presupposition of any movement which wants not merely to incite to insurrection and to rebel against suppression, but wants to work in a revolutionary sense, that is, in a manner calculated to transform society. . . .

The entire resolution there runs like a red line the endeavor to construct on an international scale: the shaping of an international program and of an international speaking-tube for propagating the same; forming a committee for binding together more firmly the international work; organizational and financial measures; international support. In short, the new fifth or sixth International is here present in crudely revised edition; all that is still needed is to give it, after a few conferences, a more concrete form, and then the international party work on the basis of the adopted program can begin. It is beyond the scope of these remarks to furnish the proof that in this way we enter once more upon the path of the old labor movement. We confine ourselves here to stating that such a conception regarding the tasks of the new labor movement stands in contradiction to that of the Dutch group. We are not of the opinion that an international council organization has been formed, with ready-made program and organization hereafter all those will enter which embrace its program. We are of the opinion that revolutionary workers throughout the world must form independent groups to the end of developing themselves, forming their own orientation. It is only becoming independent, the question as to how the working class itself is to appropriate the necessary knowledge of
of the opinion that under the very sort of conditions that exist in Germany it is only such independent groups that are possible. The building up of a straight-laced, international organization, held together by means of a program, will prove illusory.

The working class itself must be in a position to orient itself continually, ever anew; it must be able to analyze and see through the social relations. In a word: it must itself be able to do what parties and leaders think that they have to do for it. That can come about, however, only provided that in independent groups this "self-orientation" is constantly accomplished and becomes daily practice.

What can we do in the matter? We can propagate this recognition; namely, that the new labor movement must necessarily take this course if the working class is to attain victory. What today takes place sporadically or, if on a larger scale, still only spontaneously, must take place consciously and be recognized as a necessity. Just as in revolutionary time (1919-20) we recognized the independent shop organizations as the instrument for the mastering of production, so we now recognize in the independent discussion and propaganda groups the instrument for intelligently mastering the social forces. It is a matter of propagating and spreading this recognition: that is the one side of our activity. The other is this: that we the marxist such groups have to form, in what the essential part of their activity consists, and what methods they have to employ in order to master their tasks. We ourselves must be such a group.

The second part of the resolution surely shows that the analysis of the social relations differs even in the small circle of the groups represented at the conference. The resolution here posits the development of bourgeois society to state capitalism, and draws the conclusion that the mammoth economy on a continental scale is put- ting itself across as planned economy. And the opinion is expressed that capitalism will overcome in this space the competitive struggle by which it is disrupted. We should like to go on and ask: What stands in the way of carrying this thought construction through to its end and asserting that finally, when the continental oppositions are fought out (the resolution assumes that in order to conduct this struggle the oppositions within the continents will be overcome through state capitalism), capitalism by means of planned economy will eliminate the competitive struggle on a world-wide scale and overcome its crises?

Hitherto we have met with such a characterization of the capitalist development only among the social democrats, with the difference that the social democrats welcome this alleged development because it "smooths the way" for socialism, while the resolution wants to overcome it through the communist revolution. The group in Holland rejects this analysis as false and unmarxist. We have been demonstrating for years, in our writings, the exact opposite; namely, that capitalism rears from one crisis into another and furthermore, we have been showing arguments of our own and our marxian co-readers who have coined the concept of the "permanent crisis" and who say that capitalism and planned economy are contradictions which mutually exclude each other.

The analysis of capitalist development as given in the resolution is not an analysis in the marxist sense, because it starts out from the assumption that through organizational and political measures on the part of the state power the inner contradictions of capitalism can be overcome and systematically ordered. The marxist analysis, on the other hand, has as its starting point that the inner contradictions of capitalism (i.e. competitive struggle) are at the same time its vital element. Now if one assumes that these contradictions are overcome through planned and mammoth economy under state capitalism, then under such an economy one can also no longer speak of capitalism. One is then at home in the fascist fantasy of overcoming capital rule through the omnipotence of the fascist or national-socialist party-state. Here the owners and masters of the means of production--private entrepreneurs, trust- and monopoly magnates, etc.--are given the new designation of "leaders", while the wage-workers employed by them are made over into their "following". The idea is borrowed from feudal conditions and is hence utopian; it is incapable of affecting capitalist reality with all its contradictions and the resulting crises.

The social-democratic idea of the overcoming of the capitalist crises through international trustification of capital ("general cartel" of Hilferding) is also of utopian character. Here also the development of capitalist society appears as a process of concentration carried out by persons, the owners of capital. These owners of capital are at the same time, by reason of such ownership, commanders of productive processes. If, now, this command over capitalist production is combined through capital concentration, in "one hand", then in this general command, according to Hilferding, the goal of the capitalist development is attained. The capitalist general command can then no longer pursue any capitalist ends, it is itself the end-result of the capitalist development. Therefore it must now direct the economy according to plan,--no longer capitalistically, chaotically, in the mutual competitive struggle by which the inner
contradictions are reproduced on an ever higher level, but in accordance with new, socialist ends. Naturally, the social democrats are of the opinion that they know the socialist ends better than the capitalist owners; their endeavor is to take over the general command themselves.

It is scarcely necessary to say in this connection that this social-democratic conception is fully shared by the Bolsheviks (Lenin). The thing that distinguishes these latter from the official social democrat is merely the manner in which they have brought about the change of command: the Bolsheviks by way of revolution and the Social Democrats by way of bourgeois democracy.

The historical progression appears here, just as in the fascist fancy, as the action of persons. Today it is capital owners, acting according to capitalist motives, which finally find their goal in the completed concentration of capital; tomorrow it is party leaders, revolutionary dictator, centrally directed economic organization, acting according to social-democratic, communist, national-socialist party programs.

The marxist analysis turns this fancy around and stands it on its feet. It shows that the capitalist mode of production consists essentially in the separation of the direct producers from their conditions of labor, while at the same time production is carried on socially. The means of production belong to non-workers; the workers themselves can produce with them only in case they sell their labor power, and hence themselves as workers, to the owners of the means of production. The workers are thus themselves turned into means for the purpose of producing, into a flesh-and-blood productive instrument in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalist mode of production is accordingly a certain relation of human beings among each other, namely, the relation in which they stand to the production of means of production. From this relation, which is historically given, arises the concentration of capital as a natural necessity, for this concentration is essentially nothing other than the separation of the producers from their means of labor and carried to the extreme. One can also say just as well that the capitalist productive relation of human beings among each other - which consists essentially in the expropriation of the producers - is accomplished on an ever higher level.

In this analysis, the capital owners by whom the concentration of capital is brought about appear as acting persons in an inevitable process of development, in the development of the capitalistic relation of human beings to each other. And this process, from which all the inner contradictions of capitalist economy arise, cannot be held up through planning at any desired stage of development, or altered in its result, any more than one can alter the fact that fire develops heat and consumes fuel. So long as social production is carried on in the forms of expropriation of the producers and of appropriation of the product by non-workers, so long also does this appropriation reproduce itself on an ever higher level and so long also will the capital owners fight among each other for the booty. This holds for state-planned economy on the national, continental or worldwide scale (whether under national-socialist, social-democratic, or bolshevist leadership is a matter of indifference) as well as for the mammoth capital organization sketched by the social democrat Hilferding in his general cartel.

The development to planned and mammoth economy is set forth in the resolution obviously sets out from the supposition that the planning can be brought about by way of the state power. This statement of the capitalist development is insofar essentially the same as that of the exponents of planned economy. It is distinguished from this latter only in the fact that it predicts as a consequence that a state-run socialist economy could be planned, whereas the capitalist economy is based on sharper opposition between capital owners and wage working class. This prediction comes somewhat as a surprise: for if one holds planning under capitalism to be possible, then surely the situation of the working class is also embraced in the general scheme. A planned economy which fails to take account of that is to be envisaged as a contradiction and hence the development of the state planned economy to be possible. We must accordingly assume that the planned economy is thought of as a forced welding together of the owning class through the omnipotence of the State, which suppresses the competitive struggle among the class and prescribes its share of the earnings. On the other side, again through the omnipotence of the State, the wage workers are assigned their share of the product, and to be sure, as the resolution assumes, a share which becomes smaller and smaller.

But why, then, must the share of the workers become smaller? The Bolsheviks, and also the National Socialists, promise the workers that their situation in life is to become better just as soon as the socialist construction within the framework of the planned economy is once sufficiently advanced. What is the source of the resolution's assertion that this state planned economy can bring only sharpened exploitation, if after all it regards this planned economy as possible? Is the increased exploitation of the workers owing to the bad leaders of the National Socialists or Bolsheviks, or to the distorted program, or to the circumstance that the plan is directed to the workers' impoverishment? No, it
will be answered, the best leadership and planned economy cannot affect the fact that the exploitation and the opposition between owning and wage-working class grows sharper, for capital requires its profit. That, however, is the same thing as saying that the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production assert themselves in opposition to all planned economy. With the expression of this latter view, the first, which holds planned economy under capitalism to be possible, is again overthrown; the one conception excludes the other.

We are unable to conceive that such a self-contradictory characterization of capitalist development can become the common conception and also starting-point of the international council movement. We are of the opinion that the German comrades have been dazzled by the theatrical magniloquence of the national-socialist state and have taken appearance for reality. That in itself would not matter so much if this appearance had not led to a theory which, even though set forth with windings and turnings, breaks with the Marxist mode of thought. That, however, is what has happened in the resolution, so that finally the door is opened for all possible personal views and opinions which may be anything whatever except "general opposition to all planned economy." With the expression of economy under capitalism to be possible, is again overthrown; the one conception excludes the other.

We take up these categories in the order named, hoping that our remarks will serve to clarify them in a way to make them readily distinguishable, though at the same time realizing that there is considerable transmutation of one into the other, and that the fascist, say, of today may be the socialist of tomorrow, but more often the other way 'round.

The chief difficulty involved in getting a clear picture of the fascists is the hierarchization within their ranks. This is owing to the fact that fascism, in the final analysis, really emanates from above—from the ruling classes and seeps down, or rather is poured down, into the masses, who lap it up in their daily newspaper as well as in their daily bread. It is probably true, as old Lloyd George has said, that "scratch a conservative, and you will find a fascist." But some people are conservative out of interest, and others out of more instinct or inertia. Thus, in the United States, the prime, if still only incipient, fascists are men like W.F. Heart and Henry Ford: the one furnishing, for the present, mainly the ideology and the other mainly the more material forms of seduction (wages, profit sharing, subsistence gardens, etc.). These are comparatively intelligent fascists; at least they know what they want.

Capitalism is now, as we have all heard, in its stage of decline. That means—to anyone who has no illusions about the conduct of a ruling class—that revolution is on the order of the day. All humanity becomes divided more and more clearly into two great groups: on the one side, those who recognize the nature of the impending change and have the courage to help in promoting it—the revolutionists; on the other, those who want to evade or soften it, who want to reform and compromise and modernize—the ruling class and its various grades and categories of lackeys and flunkies. The out-and-out revolutionists—those who are heartily sick of capitalism in all its distinctive manifestations, whether in peace or war, and whose main preoccupation is that of doing away with it in the shortest possible order—are as yet a comparatively very small group with well defined characteristics. We leave their portrait to be drawn by others. The portrait of the counter-revolution, on the other hand, is highly complex, reflecting the various shades of opposition or perfect conformability to the established order, but in which the twilight tints distinctly predominate. We have here established the four great categories: out-and-out revolutionists, fascist, socialists and sheep. But even these terms are far from being mutually exclusive; the "sheep" particularly may easily be conceived as embracing them all.

We take up these categories in the order named, hoping that our remarks will serve to clarify them in a way to make them readily distinguishable, though at the same time realizing that there is considerable transmutation of one into the other, and that the fascist, say, of today may be the socialist of tomorrow, but more often the other way 'round.

The chief difficulty involved in getting a clear picture of the fascists is the hierarchization within their ranks. This is owing to the fact that fascism, in the final analysis, really emanates from above—from the ruling classes and seeps down, or rather is poured down, into the masses, who lap it up in their daily newspaper as well as in their daily bread. It is probably true, as old Lloyd George has said, that "scratch a conservative, and you will find a fascist." But some people are conservative out of interest, and others out of more instinct or inertia. Thus, in the United States, the prime, if still only incipient, fascists are men like W.F. Heart and Henry Ford: the one furnishing, for the present, mainly the ideology and the other mainly the more material forms of seduction (wages, profit sharing, subsistence gardens, etc.). These are comparatively intelligent fascists; at least they know what they want.
and are more or less successful in having it got for them. Insofar as they are still opposed to fascism—as, for example, to the fascist tendencies inherent in the Roosevelt administration (K. A.)—it is merely to the regimentation necessarily involved for the capitalists, to some extent, as well as for the workers. But the fascists with whom we are here concerned are of the much more numerous and humble variety: those who, even if they may know what they want, are not in a position to get it under the present system—except possibly at the cost of prostituting themselves completely—but who still find capitalism to their taste and believe in its possibilities, and who are determined to defend the system. This sort of fascist, who may be regarded as typical, can with perfect right take as his motto: "Duty toward others". The "others", however, whether he knows it or not, are the bourgeoisie-capitalist class of his own country.

Nationalism is the most distinctive characteristic of the true fascist. He not only believes in the innate superiority of his own country (or "race") over all others, but in the superiority of his own state, county, village.... He has all the savage's distrust of anything strange or foreign. To the extent that his nationalism leads him to the realization of totalitarianism and hence evoking his horror of what is foreign, he would also have to believe in his own superiority over all other human beings. But he has to admit, at least to himself, that this would be a reductio ad absurdum; the true fascist—of the humbler category—is neither a maga-man nor a solipsist; when in his patriotic fervor he gets down to himself, he quickly recoils and shifts his ego off onto the "leader", without whom there is nothing to be done. The leader on earth, and God in heaven are equally indispensable to the fascist: the one is simply the representative of the other. For this reason—the realization of his own insignificance—the true fascist can never be really irrational; he can only be opposed to certain forms of religion or to certain sects, particularly to the Jews and Catholics as being tinged with internationalism and hence evoking his horror of what is foreign. He needs particularly the belief in the soul and a future life, because this helps to assure him of his own superiority to the dogs, swine and other such animals who have never been able, even as far as known, to set up any pretensions to immortality. In fact, the fascist is very likely to be afflicted with an inferiority complex, and his zeal in serving the ruling class is a natural outgrowth of that condition. He actually imagines that by putting himself on the side of the ruling class, he therefore belongs to it. The hundred-percent fascist is a very distinctive type of homo insipiens; just as he claims to be able always to smell a Jew, so it is very easy, if not to smell, at least to spot a fascist.

These fascists, however, are not particularly to be blamed. Their educational opportunities have usually been very limited—or neglected—and as a result of their more or less exclusive communist preoccupation with the non-qualitative features of the whole, they have been thoroughly infected with the capitalist ideology. There is no possibility of "converting" them, except possibly by way of letting them see that being a revolutionist is a sign of superiority which it is within their power to attain. Otherwise, they are quite immune to communist propaganda, and retain their extreme susceptibility to the capitalist variety. This is on the assumption, however, that they still find it possible to live somehow under capitalism. If that becomes quite impossible, even by criminal means, then these fascists may furnish some of the best recruits to the revolutionary cause.

The half-fascist is chiefly distinguished from his "pure" brother by being a more intellectual, hence more sophisticated, specimen of the same type. He has read more or less and makes some pretensions to culture. He has accordingly shuffled off most of the prejudices of the fascist proper, and is more open to reason. His reading, however, has usually been of a sort by which he could become really enlightened, but is chiefly of the conventional or academic variety. His education in economics has been particularly neglected, and his notions on the subject are of the most naive capitalist character. His favorite "economist" is very likely to be Stuart Chase (Mrs. Blue Bonnet) and he usually displays a weakness for "technocracy" and other such ravings of a Spengler, or of a sort by which he could become really enlightened; he has accordingly shuttled off most of the prejudices of the fascist proper, and is more or less immune to communist propaganda, and retains his extreme susceptibility to the capitalist variety. This is on the assumption, however, that they still find it possible to live somehow under capitalism. If that becomes quite impossible, even by criminal means, then these fascists may furnish some of the best recruits to the revolutionary cause.

He is not, however, violently opposed to radicalism or anything else in particular. He pride himself on being broad-minded and tolerant—a tolerance which extends also to the more "idealistic" phases of fascism. His fascist tendencies come out chiefly in his reverence for the "strong man"—the unscrupulous wielder of power—and in his contempt for the masses. And yet the half-fascist would be mortally offended at the very suggestion that he might harbor a fascist streak. He looks upon himself as a liberal pure and simple. And "pure and simple" at least is correct; the half-fascist is pure and simple enough to read the ravings of a Spengler and to think that this is the last word in philosophy (and not merely that of the bourgeoisie), without suspecting that Spengler is only furnishing the ideology for fascism. Thus the half-fascist is a very half-and-half sort of person indeed, and whether when the time comes he jumps one way or the other will probably depend entirely on circumstances of the...
moment or, as we say, on the constellation of forces.

Of all the counter-revolutionists, actual or potential, the most contemptible are, without doubt, the socialists. These, in the main, lack the excuse of ignorance which we readily grant to the fascists and half-fascists. They have mostly had at least some smattering of Marxism, as well as some political experience in the "labor movement", and have accordingly had an opportunity to know what capitalism and against the workers themselves—can be explained only in terms of the most abject cowardice and the most brazen prostitution on the part of the leading apostles of the Second International. Deep down in their hearts, these old "labor leaders" know better, but they haven't the guts to admit it, even to themselves, much less to act in accordance with that recognition. Nor, as a matter of fact, is there any ground for expecting that they ever will.

Even the leaders of the socialist movement—more cowardly, more supine, more muddled and more bourgeois than the most contemptible—are, without doubt, the socialists. They are the people who never accept or reject a thing outright, but—if they find it uncomfortable or otherwise obnoxious—can only suggest amending it gradually or modernizing it. This applies to capitalism no less than to Christianity. They can point to all sorts of evils and "injustices" under capitalism, but insist that they can all be remedied within the system itself. Sooner or later, however, it will be made evident only that everybody becomes as nice and sheep-like as themselves, which they hold to be quite possible as well as desirable. Likewise as regards religion: the Catholic Church is rotten, naturally, but Protestantism—or at any rate the sect to which they themselves belong (usually one of the "modernist" persuasion)—is just what the country itself needs on that plane. In accordance with this course of development—and to arrive at certain conclusions regarding the manner in which it is to be set aside. The circumstance that they still cling, in the main, to their dogma of non-violence—except in the interests of capitalism and against the workers themselves—can be explained only in terms of the most abject cowardice and the most brazen prostitution on the part of the leading apostles of the Second International. Deep down in their hearts, these old "labor leaders" know better, but they haven't the guts to admit it, even to themselves, much less to act in accordance with that recognition. Nor, as a matter of fact, is there any ground for expecting that they ever will.

The leaders of the socialist movement, more cowardly, more supine, more muddled and more bourgeois than the most contemptible—are, without doubt, the socialists. They are the people who never accept or reject a thing outright, but—if they find it uncomfortable or otherwise obnoxious—can only suggest amending it gradually or modernizing it. This applies to capitalism no less than to Christianity. They can point to all sorts of evils and "injustices" under capitalism, but insist that they can all be remedied within the system itself. Sooner or later, however, it will be made evident only that everybody becomes as nice and sheep-like as themselves, which they hold to be quite possible as well as desirable. Likewise as regards religion: the Catholic Church is rotten, naturally, but Protestantism—or at any rate the sect to which they themselves belong (usually one of the "modernist" persuasion)—is just what the country itself needs on that plane. In accordance with this course of development—and to arrive at certain conclusions regarding the manner in which it is to be set aside. The circumstance that they still cling, in the main, to their dogma of non-violence—except in the interests of capitalism and against the workers themselves—can be explained only in terms of the most abject cowardice and the most brazen prostitution on the part of the leading apostles of the Second International. Deep down in their hearts, these old "labor leaders" know better, but they haven't the guts to admit it, even to themselves, much less to act in accordance with that recognition. Nor, as a matter of fact, is there any ground for expecting that they ever will.

The economic and political innocence is such that socialism is practically nothing but fascism under a different name; that is, state capitalism. If the fascists call the Selvage socialists (or National Socialists, or anything else but fascists), and refrain from too much violence, they are assured in advance of the support of all the people. And after fascism is once established or gets into power, it may do as it likes and still retain their support or at least their passive acquiescence; for that is the nature of sheep, to be on the side of a ruling class and never aspire to be the masters of their own destinies.

These compromisers and modernizers and shilly-shallyers are, in a sense, the strongest bulwark of capitalism and the worst enemies in the way of the revolutionary movement and the reconstruction of society. Not because of their numbers (which are considerable enough) nor because of any power of attack or defense (which is practically nil), but rather because of their demoralizing influence, their fertility in conjuring up new hopes and illusions as an excuse for delay and inaction. Far better, from the revolutionary point of view, are the forthright reactionaries in the wrong or the absolute fundamentalists in religion than these pious sheep with their liberal tub-thumping.
Fortunately for the revolution and for the fate of humanity, world history is not determined by sheep, nor in times such as the present can the sheep continue long in their sheepishness. In the great majority of cases—and particularly among the workers—this sheepishness is only a superficial adaptation to the capitalist environment and will be quickly thrown off under the pressure of capitalist collapse. These working-class "sheep" will then undergo a metamorphosis no less remarkable than those recorded in fable, and will come forth as heroes; not the sham heroes of capitalist wars of destruction, but the true heroes of the communist revolution of creation and redemption, in which humanity sloughs the brute and at last comes into its birth-right.

And in the final result, it is only the workers who really count; not the timid, respectable philistines who try to excuse their own cowardice on the ground of the workers' alleged backwardness, for which the philistines and their idolized leaders are largely responsible. These petty-bourgeois poltroons who never advance beyond the stage of voting, and many of whom regard even that as an act of rare courage, are best characterized by Engels in "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", where, speaking of the small trading class, he says that it "never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything was lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter was settled."
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They merely serve to confuse an issue which should be kept clear, and to delay a process which has every need of being accelerated.

Fortunately for the revolution and for the fate of humanity, world history is not determined by sheep, nor in times such as the present can the sheep continue long in their sheepishness. In the great majority of cases—and particularly among the workers—this sheepishness is merely a superficial adaptation to the capitalist environment and will be quickly thrown off under the pressure of capitalist collapse. These working-class "sheep" will then undergo a metamorphosis no less remarkable than those recorded in fable, and will come forth as heroes; not the sham heroes of capitalist wars of destruction, but the true heroes of the communist revolution of creation and redemption, in which humanity sloughs the brute and at last comes into its birth-right.

And in the final result, it is only the workers who really count; not the timid, respectable philistines who try to excuse their own cowardice on the ground of the workers' alleged backwardness, for which the philistines and their idolized leaders are largely responsible. These petty-bourgeois poltroons who never advance beyond the stage of voting, and many of whom regard even that as an act of rare courage, are best characterized by Engels in "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", where, speaking of the small trading class, he says that it "never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter was settled".
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Notes on the War Question

The problem of war, which has long been the object of so much discussion, has become a concrete question of the day thru the proceedings in Ethiopia. The enormous significance of this war lies in the fact that it illuminates as with a flash of lightning the general imperialistic rivalries and points to the inevitability of a new world slaughter. No thinking person seriously believes today that the war for the redistribution of the shares of profit can long be deferred any more, and the various nations are consciously making ready for this conflict. What the bourgeoisie and the various capitalist groups of interests have to say or conceal as to the war situation, we learn from their press; what they are doing in order that the war shall find them prepared is indicated by their arming manoeuvres and their "diplomacy".

The only thing that interests us here is the position to be taken on the war question by the revolutionary workers. First, in case the african war remains localized or is brought to an end thru imperialistic understandings before the world war breaks out; and secondly, what their position shall be in case the african adventure should presently develop into a new world war. The criterion for the position taken by us are the
real, international class interests of the proletariat. We have no desire either to defend the feudalistic regime in Abyssinia nor to justify fascist Italy nor to identify ourselves with the imperialistic interests of England; nor to confine ourselves, for lack of anything else to say, to the problems of the class struggle in the United States; nor thru the "maintenance of world peace" to preserve state-capitalist Russia from convulsion; nor to take up with the alliance policy of France against Germany (or the other way round). Our standpoint poses only the one question: what must, can and will the working class do?

The war—whether the one in Africa or the coming world war—has no other immediate significance for the workers than that a part of them will be killed off in the most revolting manner and that as a class, insofar as they are not slaughtered, they will be immeasurably impoverished. War, bringing death and misery to the workers, cannot from the working-class standpoint be bade welcome. But the preponderant working masses have today no class standpoint of their own; they are under the sway of the bourgeois ideology and follow the movements of their masters, willingly or unwillingly ready to suffer and die for them.

Our standpoint is not that of the working masses, but of a small part of their more or less class-conscious elements. We don't, however, damn the working class because of its impotence, but because of the circumstances that it is again making ready on an international scale to go under in millions for Capital. We realize that the ideas of a time are always those of the ruling class, and we know the objective as well as the subjective grounds which for the moment repress the revolutionary nature of the proletariat and which cause it to continue waging war for Capital, just as it also works for Capital.

The causes of the revolutionary unripeness of the proletariat shall not concern us at this place; we make these statements merely in order to draw the conclusion that the international working class will not in the near future thru revolutionary overturns put an end to capitalism and its wars. In this case there remains to the proletariat nothing other than to go along with capitalist policy; it has to decide for this or that capitalist group of interests and to fight for it.

What the proletariat would have to do in its own interest—that is, prevent the war—is possible only thru the revolutionary setting aside of capitalism. Still, the improbability of a revolution prior to the coming war makes the war certain already; and if the proletariat takes part in the war, it will do so with a special ideology, but that of its bourgeoisie. In such circumstances, the great mass of the workers will no doubt, just like the bourgeoisie, line up against revolutionists, and for these latter there will be for a time no other working possibility than such as exists under the present-day German fascism: the training and most careful selection of the revolutionists themselves, cautious increase of their numbers, and the endeavor to bring them alive thru the "dead time" (from the revolutionary standpoint), until the war has exhausted itself and has created the subjective ripeness for revolution. For if capitalist production has a revolutionizing character, so also has its destructive phase. If, in the course of its development, Capital shapes the greatest productive force, the proletariat, which is compelled to shatter the capitalist relations in order to consume itself, --so in war it shapes, under the present conditions, a situation which, seen from any point of view, can only issue in the proletarian revolution.

While the last war had led almost to the door of the world revolution, this door will no doubt be opened by the new world war. For just as Capital is incapable of controlling production, which turns against it, so it is equally incapable of keeping destruction in forms and paths which offer the possibility of any desired diversion into "normal" situations. The magnitude and virulence of the coming war preclude its mastering by way of Capital. As in crisis, so also in war, Capitalism stands helpless in a sea of troubles; which is merely another confirmation of the fact that it is historically surpassed.

From the revolutionary point of view, war accelerates the advent of a truly revolutionary situation, and all forces will have to be properly directed to this factor. In unrevolutionary times, one need not, because of some silly idealistic fancies or other, lavish himself to no purpose, but will adjust his tactic and his will to the final struggle, which will be found in the wake of the war.

Capital pursues no social goals; there is today no "social will", but only particular strivings and groups of interests. Capital develops thru the sharpening of the conflicts of interests. If the number of these conflicts diminishes thru concentration, they become correspondingly harsher and more disintegrating. The more the conditions for a systematic social direction of economy from the technical and organizational standpoint are evolved, the more this possibility is precluded by reason of the persisting economic relations of present-day society. If economy cannot be planfully
organized even within the framework of a single nation, or any peacefully regulated distribution of the shares of profit introduced, such a thing is still more thoroughly on the international level, where all these reorganizations, forced by reason of the sharpening contradiction between increasing productive forces and the persisting profit order (so as not to abolish the latter) can be brought about only by way of violence. If capital's concentration process and the crisis are means to the "extra-human" reorganization of profit economy—a reorganization determined by commodity fetishism—warwise has no other significance. A capitalist war is not, however, always the same capitalist war. If the capitalist problem is one of creating additional surplus value, then a war which increases the profitability of capital may mean a way out of the capitalist difficulties, and furnish the impulse for an accelerated advance. The war would here be a means of hastening the accumulation and would be followed not by revolutionary uprising but possibly by a general upswing. The fact that war always enriches only a few and impoverishes the masses under all circumstances is not the particular feature of war but the general tendency of the capitalist development. War not only does not create but destroys profits, moreover, lead to the opening of new sources of profit which not only make up for the temporary loss but convert it into gain. War in this case is an accelerator for an otherwise slower movement. If war can accelerate accumulation, it lies on a higher stage of accumulation it is necessarily compelled to allow this accumulation down or, when it has come to a standstill, make its revival still more difficult. If the accelerated accumulation leads to over-accumulation and thereby to its arrest, it leads also to a situation in which the war must become a hindrance to further accumulation; a situation in which the war, instead of revealing new sources of profit, can continue to be conducted only for the sake of reorganizing the distribution of the profit internationally won and internationally determined. It is then a question not of increasing the profit and hence of overcoming the crisis but of the altered distribution of the profit, in which connection the expenses of this process of distribution, the war costs, have to be set down as a pure loss by which the difficulties of capital are made more difficult.

The concentration of capital is, from the capitalist standpoint, progress—meaning only a simultaneous growth of capital. Concentration without growth is only accelerated increase of the capitalist contradictions and difficulties. The character of the present crisis, as we have pointed it out (Council Correspondence, Vol 1, #5,) is not such as to permit of seeing in the coming world war a means of overcoming crisis.

The war can only deepen the crisis to a point at which the proletarian revolution must be released. But even though the war cannot be regarded as a means of overcoming the international capitalist crisis, it remains to capital no other activity than the sharpened competitive struggle for the diminished or stagnating profit mass. The longer the crisis lasts, the more closely the war approaches. Though war most probably makes the beginning of the capitalist crisis, still at the same time it is the only way out for capital, which can live only so long as it destroys. The paradoxical nature of this situation rests on the capitalist contradiction between exchange value and use value, on the fact that capital has to exercise production and destruction at the same time in order to exist at all. This is illustrated also in the increasing wealth of society with simultaneously decreasing profits, in the starving of human beings in the midst of superfluous products, etc.

We have said that if the proletariat cannot conduct an independent policy and if it fails to do so, then it can only come forth as an appendage of the bourgeoisie, with the interests of which it is compelled to conform. The African conflict presents an example of this fact. The fact that the mass of the workers still stands on the side of Mussolini, as the mass of the German workers still stands behind Hitler (indifference amounts to support) is a reflection of capital's necessities. Mussolini represents the interests of its bourgeoisie, as in the case of Mussolinism. Even the policy of the "official labor movement" is a mere reflection of capitalist necessities. The Second International has identified itself with the imperialis measure and plans of England against Italy. The policy of "sanctions", the support of the League of Nations, the transport strike which has remained no more than a phrase, or the petition for the closing of the Suez Canal—whatever was recommended against the war promoters on the part of the labor movement were recommendations in the interests of English imperialism. And if the Second International came out for English imperialism, so in turn English imperialism has come out for the labor movement in its struggle against Fascism, which it has attacked as an "inciter of war." We live in a funny world. Both the Second International as well as English imperialism naturally want to maintain peace, which maintains the privileges of English imperialism, but the programs selected to this end are practically declarations of war. The Second International is for the English "peace" and hence for the English war.
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The French reformists were more cautious in their demands for sanctions; the interests of the English are not identical with those of France. France’s support of the English policy is an involuntary one. The policy of the Second International with regard to the war situation is a repetition of its position during the previous war: it is driving the masses to the shambles in the interest of the bourgeoisie.

The position of the Third International, identical with Russia’s attitude on the war, is outwardly a silly cry for peace. On the African situation, it scarcely ventures to take a position. Radek writes in the "Rundschau" (#57) : "Throughout the world the working people are following this war, and wish for the Abyssinian masses not only to remain but will not come under any colonial yoke, but also that in this great historical test they will rend asunder the chains of feudalism and of slavery at home". But even this plausibly wish of the Third International in the interest of Abyssinian independence came rather late, since Russia, like France, has no desire to offend Italy if such can in any way be avoided. It was not until her French ally, considering that the time for the world war has not yet come, made half-way concessions to England that Russia also found herself in a position where it became advisable to emit a few weak-kneed protests against Italy’s aggressions, without, however, for that reason imposing any restrictions on how they may or may not come under any colonial yoke. The Abyssinians, who wish the Abyssinian masses to remain free from all national movements and suppressed peoples. So then the "uncorrupted Leninsts" write in "The New International" (Oct. 1935), without realizing how ridiculous they make themselves: "The position of neutrality of the international revolutionary proletariat we disclaim with a wave of the hand: if it is true that the revolutionary proletariat is for the defeat of Italy, when it is not neutral, then it is for the victory of Ethiopia. If it desires the victory of Ethiopia, then it must help to produce it. This means that it does not remain neutral, but that it actively intervene for Ethiopia." According to this conception, the most consistent revolutionists would be those who should "keep out" of Italy, support for arms and munitions for Italy; support for arm supplies to Ethiopia, unambiguous, loud, fearless propaganda for the justness of the war from the ethiopian standpoint."

The question occurs to these people that the whole question of the "neutrality" of the proletariat, so hotly rejected, is no question at all. Either the proletariat fights with its bourgeoisie is the war of the bourgeoisie, or else it makes revolution. These are the only two possibilities, and the position of a "neutral" attitude on the part of the proletariat does not exist. And so these people are merely tilting at their own fancies. Like parrots, they repeat leninist phrases which were revealed as humbug even during the last war. In the present-day imperialistic milieu there are no longer any national wars of liberation. Not much was lacking during the last war and taken from any matter may have gone under the carpet. This is why not go still farther and carry on-time exploiting their slaves by the grace of England.

Within Ethiopia there are "suppressed nations" which line up against Haile Selassie just as Selassie does against Italy. So why not go still farther and carry on-time exploiting their slaves by the grace of England.

The Abyssinian conflict has so far remained localized because the fronts for the coming world war are not yet drawn clearly enough. We see no use in considering here the question of when and with what combinations of powers the next war will occur and which of these combinations will have the best prospects. There is no imperialist country which has like-directed and unequivocal imperialist interests; if only with the development of capital export, new oppositions of interests have come forth both on the international and the national planes, oppositions by which country and world
are divided into groups, some of which gain by peace and others of which profit from war. German fascism is actually being directed against Capital, that is, against capitalist circles which are unable to identify themselves completely with the interests of the German imperialists. German as well as Italian fascism have anticipated what had to wait until after the outbreak of the last war to be created: the coordinating war economy which is directed also against Capital, that is, against capitalist interests under the strongest imperialist interests, and which Lenin celebrated as state capitalism and the presupposition for socialism. Fascism is thus not merely an expression of the monopolistic concentration of economic policy, of the complete subordination of the workers under the profits of Capital, but also a war measure for the new imperialistic conflicts. The objective unimportance of the war situation was illustrated in the Japanese policy with regard to China, a policy which met with no real opposition among the other interested powers. The re-arming of Germany, the tearing up of the Versailles treaty, showed once more that a new world war requires first a reorientation of the various imperialisms. The isolation of the war in Africa merely points to the fact that this regrouping of imperialist interests is not yet completed. The war in Africa has so far given a new impetus only to diplomacy, the process of clarification, and only in this sense is it tied up with the coming world war.

The restraint on the part of England is to be understood only as preparation for war, just as the "neutralism" of Germany is identical with her re-arming and the vacillation of France is to be explained by the military unpreparedness of Germany. A great number of surprises are still possible before the world war breaks out. It cannot be foreseen as yet what groups of powers will stand opposed to other groups. The one thing that is clear is that rivalries of great magnitude, such as the one between England and the United States, will help in determining those of the other countries, and that the smaller rivalries can work themselves out only within the framework of the large ones. If Japanese imperialism functions almost exclusively on the basis of the English-American opposition, so the European alliance policy is likewise adjusted to that opposition. In whatever particular section the powers may line up because of the desire for war, the process of formation may last a few years longer, but it may also be decided all of a sudden. The war is possible tomorrow, but it may equally well be delayed a few years longer. The question is whether the proletariat can only come out for its own life and must fight against Capital for its material interests. Sharpening of the class struggle in peace and in war is ever the correct watchword. So far as concerns the present war in Africa, it presents no special problem. The proletariat can only come out for itself, by which it comes out for humanity. It cannot come out for the "independence of Ethiopia". The backward peoples fight, when they fight, for the development of their national capitalisms because nothing else is possible. It cannot be the task of the proletariat to fight for new as against old capitalisms, it has to overthrow world capitalism. The proletariat has no word for Ethiopia, since Ethiopia still has no proletariat. But the proletariat has a word for Italy and for all other capitalist countries: the overthrow of world capitalism, and therewith the end of imperialism. With the end of world capitalism there is taken away at the same time the possibility of capitalizing the backward countries. However, complicated the colonial question may appear within the framework of capitalism, the position of the proletariat has to be limited to the simplest formula: the safeguarding of the class interests of the proletariat, and nothing else.

The United Workers Party has found it advisable to drop the party name. In view of the fact that the U.W.P. was not a "party" in the traditional sense, the retention of the word has led to a lot of needless misunderstandings. The name "United Workers Party" had been selected at a time -- and then only as a temporary solution -- when the members of this organization were just beginning to find their present position. The new name, "Groups and Councils of Councilists," strikes us as a more accurate indication of our attitude, and all concerned are requested to note this change.

Please Notice

READ: Raetekorrespondenz, (theoretisches- und Diskussionsorgan fuer die Raetebewegung).
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How must the working class fight capitalism in order to win? This is the all important question facing the workers every day. What efficient means of action, what tactics can it use to conquer power and defeat the enemy? No science, no theory, could tell them exactly what to do. But spontaneously and instinctively, by feeling out, by sensing the possibilities, they found their ways of action. And as capitalism grew and conquered the earth and increased its power, the power of the workers also increased. New modes of action, wider and more efficient, came up beside the old ones. It is evident that the changing conditions, the forms of action, the tactics of the class struggles have to change also. Trade unionism is the primary form of labor movement in fixed capitalism. The isolated worker is powerless against the capitalistic employer. To overcome this handicap, the workers organized into unions. The union binds the workers together into common action, with the strike as their weapon. Then the balance of power is relatively equal, or is some times even heaviest on the side of the workers, so that the isolated small employer is weak against the mighty union. Hence in developed capitalism trade unions and employer's unions (Associations, Trusts, Corporations, etc.), stand as fighting powers against each other.

Trade unionism first came up in England, where industrial capitalism first developed. Afterward it spread to other countries, as a natural companion of capitalist industry. In the United States there were very special conditions. In the beginning, the abundance of free unoccupied land, open to settlers, made a shortage of workers in the towns and relatively high wages and good conditions. The American Federation of Labor became a power in the country, and generally was able to uphold a relatively high standard of living for the workers who were organized in unions.

It is clear that under such conditions the idea of overthrowing capitalism could not for a moment arise in the minds of the workers. Capitalism offered them a sufficient and fairly secure living. They did not feel themselves a separate class whose interests were hostile to the existing order; they were part of it; they were conscious of partaking in all the possibilities of an ascending capitalism in a new continent. There was room for millions of people, coming mostly from Europe. For these increasing millions of farmers, a rapidly increasing industry was necessary, where, with energy and good luck, workmen could rise to free artisans, to small business men, even to rich capitalists. It is natural that here a true capitalist spirit prevailed in the working class.

The same was the case in England. Here it was due to England's monopoly of world commerce and big industry, to the powerful competition on the foreign markets, and to the possessions of rich colonies, which brought enormous wealth to England. The capitalist class had no need to fight for its profits and could allow the workers a reasonable living. Of course, at the first, fighting was necessary to urge this truth upon them; but then they could allow unions and grant wages in exchange for industrial peace. So here the working class was also imbued with the capitalist spirit.

Now this is entirely in harmony with the innermost character of trade unionism. Trade unionism is an action of the workers, which does not go beyond the limit of capitalism. Its aim is not to remove capitalism by another form of production, but to secure good living conditions within capitalism. Its character is not revolutionary, but conservative.

Certainly, trade union action is class struggle. There is a class antagonism in capitalism—capitalists and workers have opposing interests. Not only on the question of conservation of capitalism, but also within capitalism itself, with regard to the division of the total product. The capitalists attempt to increase their profits, the surplus value, as much as possible, by cutting down wages and increasing the hours of labor. On the other hand, the workers attempt to increase their wages and to shorten their hours of work. The price of his labor power is not a fixed quantity, though it must exceed a certain hunger minimum; and it is not paid by the capitalist of his own free will. Thus this antagonism becomes the object of a contest, the real class struggle. It is the task, the function of the trade unions to carry on this fight.

Trade unionism was the first training school in proletarian virtue, in solidarity as the spirit of organized fighting. It embodied the first form of proletarian organized fighting. In the early English and American trade unions this virtue often petrified and degenerated into a narrow craft-corporation, a true capitalistic state of mind. It was different, however, where the workers had to fight for their very existence, where the utmost efforts of their unions could hardly uphold their standard of living, where the full force of an energetic and expanding capitalism attacked them. There they had to learn the wisdom that only the revolution could de-
finely save them.

So there comes a disparity between the working class and trade unionism. The working class has to look beyond capitalism. Trade unionism lives entirely within capitalism and cannot look beyond it. Trade unionism can only represent a part, a necessary but narrow part, in the class struggle. And it develops aspects which bring it into conflict with the greater aims of the working class.

With the growth of capitalism and big industry, the unions to must grow. They become big corporations with thousands of members, extending over the whole country, having sections in every town and every factory. Officials must be appointed: presidents, secretaries, treasurers, to conduct the affairs, to manage the finances, locally and centrally. They are the leaders, who negotiate with the capitalists and who by this practice have acquired a special skill. The president of a union is a big shot, as big as the capitalist employer himself, and he discusses with him on equal terms, the interests of his members. The officials are specialists in trade union work, which the members, entirely occupied by their factory work cannot judge or direct themselves.

So large a corporation as a union is not simply an assembly of single workers; it becomes an organized body, like a living organism, with its own policy, its own character, its own mentality, its own traditions, its own functions. It is a body with its own interests, which are separate from the interests of the working class. It has a will to live and to fight for its existence. If it should come to pass that unions were no longer necessary for the workers, then they would not simply disappear. Their funds, their members, and their officials, all these are realities that will not disappear at once, but continue their existence as elements of the organization.

The union officials, the labor leaders, are the bearers of the special union interests. Originally workmen from the shop, they acquire, by long practice at the head of the organization, a new social character. In each social group, once it is big enough to form a special group, the nature of its work, mode and determines its social character, its mode of working and acting. Their function is entirely different from that of the workers. They do not work in factories, they are not exploited by capitalists, their existence is not threatened continually by unemployment. They sit in offices, in fairly secure positions, they have to manage corporation affairs and to speak at workers meetings and discuss with employers. Of course, they have to stand for the workers, and to defend their interests and wishes against the capitalists. This is, however, not very different from the position of the lawyer who, appointed secretary of an organization, will stand for its members and defend their interests to the full of his capacity.

However, there is a difference. Because many of the labor leaders came from the ranks of the workers, they have experienced for themselves what wage slavery and exploitation means. They feel as members of the working class and the proletarian spirit often acts as a strong tradition in them. But the new reality of their life continually tends to weaken this tradition. Economically they are not proletarians any more. They sit in conferences with the capitalists, bargaining over wages and hours, pitting interests against interests, just as the opposing interests of the capitalist corporations are weighted one against the other. They learn to understand the capitalist's position just as well as the worker's position; they have an eye for the needs of industry; they try to mediate.

Personal exceptions occur, of course, but as a rule they cannot have that elementary class feeling of the workers, that does not understand and weigh capitalist interests over against their own, but will fight for their proper interests. Thus they get into conflict with the workers.

The labor leaders in advanced capitalism are numerous enough to form a special group or class with a special class character and interests. As representatives and leaders of the unions they embody the character and the interests of the unions. The unions are necessary elements of capitalism, so the leaders feel as necessary items, as most useful citizens in capitalist society.

The capitalist functions of unions is to regulate class conflicts and to secure industrial peace. So labor leaders see it as their duty as citizens to work for industrial peace and mediate in conflicts. The test of the union lies entirely within capitalism; so labor leaders do not look beyond it. The instinct of self-preservation will of the unions to live and to fight for existence, is embodied in the will of the labor leaders to fight for the existence of the unions. Their own existence is indissolubly connected with the existence of the unions. This is not meant in a petty sense, that they only think of their personal jobs when fighting for the unions, means that primary necessities of life and social functions deterring any other. Their whole existence is concentrated in the unions, only here have they a task. So the most necessary organ of society, the only source of security and power is to them the unions; hence it must be preserved and defended with all possible means. Even when the realities of capitalist society undermine this position, this capitalism does, when with its expansion class conflicts become sharper.
The concentration of capital in powerful concerns and their connection with big finance renders the position of the capitalist employers much stronger than the workers. Powerful industrial magnates are reigning as monarchs over large masses of workers, they keep them in absolute subjection and do not allow "their" men to go into unions. Now and then the heavily exploited wage slaves break out in revolt, in a big strike. They hope to enforce better terms, shorter hours, more human conditions, union's power must be used as a weapon to subdue the workers. The strike leaders may understand this point of view, because trade unionism cannot reach beyond capitalism. He opposes this kind of fight. Fighting capitalism in this way, means at the same time rebellion against the trade unions. The labor leader stands beside the capitalist in their common fear for the workers rebellion. Is there another way out then? Could the workers win anything by fighting? Probably they will lose the immediate issue of the fight; but they will gain something else. By not submitting without having fought, they rouse the spirit of revolt against the capitalist class. When simultaneous strikes break out in other trades, when a wave of rebellion goes over the country, then in the arrogant hearts of the capitalists there may appear some doubt as to their omnipotence and some willingness to make concessions.

The trade union leader does not understand this point of view, because trade unionism cannot reach beyond capitalism. He opposes this kind of fight. Fighting capitalism in this way, means at the same time rebellion against the trade unions. The labor leader stands beside the capitalist in their common fear for the workers rebellion. When the trade unions fought against the capitalist class for better working conditions, the capitalist class hated them, but it had not the power to completely destroy them. If the trade unions would try to raise all the forces of the working class in their fight, the capitalist class would persecute them with all its means. They may see their actions repressed as rebellion, their offices destroyed by militia, their leaders thrown in jail and fined, their funds confiscated. On the other hand, if they keep their members from fighting, the capitalist class may consider them as valuable institutions, to be preserved and protected; and their leaders as deserving citizens. So the trade unions find themselves between the devil and the deep sea; on the one side persecution, which is a tough thing to bear for people who want to be peaceful citizens; on the other side, the rebellion of the members, which may undermine the unions. The capitalist class, if it is wise, will recognize that a bit of sham fighting must be allowed to uphold the influence of the labor leaders over the members. The conflict arising here are not anyone's fault; they are an inevitable consequence of capitalistic development. Capitalism exists, but it is at the same time on the way to perdition. It must be fought as a living thing, and at the same time, as a transitory thing. The workers must wage a steady fight for wages and working
conditions, while at the same time communistic ideas, more or less clear and conscious, awaken in their minds. They cling to the unions, feeling that these are still necessary, trying now and then to transform them into better fighting institutions. But the spirit of trade unionism, which is in its pure form a capitalist spirit, is not in the workers. The divergence between these two tendencies in capitalism and in the class struggle appears now as a rift between the trade union spirit, mainly embodied in their leaders, and the growing revolutionary feeling of the members. This rift becomes apparent in the opposite position they take in various important social and political questions.

Trade unionism is bound to capitalism; it has its best chances to obtain good wages when capitalism flourished. So in times of depression it must hope that prosperity will be restored, and it must try to further it. To the workers as a class, the prosperity of capitalism is not at all important. When it is weakened by crises or depressions, they have the best chance to attack it, to strengthen the forces of the revolution and to take the first steps toward freedom.

Capitalism extends its dominion over foreign continents, seizing their natural treasures in order to make big profits. It conquers colonies, subjugates the primitive populations and exploits them, often with horrible cruelties. The working class denounces colonial exploitation and opposes it, but trade unionism often supports colonial politics as a way to capitalist prosperity.

With the enormous increase of capital in modern times, colonies and foreign countries are being used as places in which to invest large sums of capital. They become valuable possessions as markets for big industry and as producers of raw materials. A race for getting colonies, a fierce conflict of interests over the division of the world arises between the great capitalist states. In these politics of imperialism the middle classes are exploited, often with horrible cruelties. The working class denounces imperialist exploitation and opposes it, but trade unionism often supports imperialistic politics as a way to capitalist prosperity.

In the violent clashings, all those careful tariff regulations are swept away; in the strife of its gigantic proportions the modest skill of the bargaining labor leaders is disarmed, as material element of power. It has its spiritual influence, upheld and propagated by its periodical papers as mental element of power. It is a power in the hands of the leaders, who make use of it wherever the special interests of trade unions come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of the working class. Trade unionism, though built up by the workers and consisting of workers, has turned into a power over and above workers. Just as government is a power over and above the people.

The forms of trade unionism are different for different countries, owing to the different forms of development in capitalism. Nor do they always remain the same in every country. When they seem to be slowly dying away, the fighting spirit of the workers sometimes is able to transform them, or to build up new types of unionism. Thus in England, in the years 1830-50, the "new unionism" sprang up from the masses of poor dockers and the other badly paid, unskilled workers, bringing a new

The working class, as the most numerous and the most oppressed class of society, has to bear all the horrors of war. The workers have to give not only their labor power, but also their health and their lives.

Trade unionism, however, in war must stand upon the side of the capitalist. Its interests are bound up with national capitalism, the victory of which it must wish with all its heart. Hence it assists in arousing strong national feelings and national hatred. It helps the capitalist class to drive the workers into war and to beat down all opposition.

Trade unionism abhors communism. Communism takes away the very basis of its existence. In communism, in the absence of capitalist employers, there is no room for the trade union and labor leaders. It is true that in countries with a strong socialist movement, where the bulk of the workers are socialists, the labor leaders must be socialists too, by origin as well as by environment. But then they are right-wing-socialists; and their socialism is restricted to the idea of a commonwealth, where instead of greedy capitalists, honest labor leaders will manage industrial production.

Trade unionism hates revolution. Revolution upsets all the ordinary relations between capitalists and workers and it violates this class feeling, all those careful tariff regulations are swept away; in the strife of its gigantic proportions the modest skill of the bargaining labor leaders loses its value. With all its power, trade unionism opposes the ideas of revolution and communism.

This opposition is not without significance. Trade unionism is a power in itself. It has considerable funds at its disposal, as material element of power. It has its spiritual influence, upheld and propagated by its periodical papers as mental element of power. It is a power in the hands of the leaders, who make use of it wherever the special interests of trade unions come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of the working class. Trade unionism, though built up by the workers and consisting of workers, has turned into a power over and above workers. Just as government is a power over and above the people.

The forms of trade unionism are different for different countries, owing to the different forms of development in capitalism. Nor do they always remain the same in every country. When they seem to be slowly dying away, the fighting spirit of the workers sometimes is able to transform them, or to build up new types of unionism. Thus in England, in the years 1830-50, the "new unionism" sprang up from the masses of poor dockers and the other badly paid, unskilled workers, bringing a new
spirit into the old craft unions. It is a consequence of capitalist development, that in founding new industries and in replacing skilled labor by machine power, it accumulates large bodies of unskilled workers, living in the worst of conditions. Forced at last into a wave of rebellion, into big strikes, they find the way to unity and class consciousness. They mould unionism into a new form, adapted to a more highly developed capitalism. Of course, when afterwards capitalism grows to still mightier forms, the new unionism cannot escape the fate of all unionism, and then it produces the same inner contradictions.

The most notable form sprang up in America, in the "Industrial Workers of the World." The I. W. W. originated from two forms of capitalist expansion. In the enormous forests and plains of the West, capitalism reaped the natural riches by Wild West methods of fierce and brutal exploitation; and the worker-adventurers responded with as wild and jealous a defense. And in the Eastern States new industries were founded upon the exploitation of millions of poor immigrants, coming from countries with a low standard of living and now subjected to sweatshop labor or other most miserable working conditions.

Against the narrow craft spirit of the old unionists, of the A. F. of L., which divided the workers of one industrial plant into a number of separate unions, the I.W.W. put the principle: all workers of one factory as comrades against one master, must form one union, to act as a strong unity against the employer. Against the multitude of often jealous and bickering trade unions, the I.W.W. set up the slogan: one big union for all the workers. The fight of one group is the cause of all. Solidarity extends over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labor towards the unorganized immigrants, it was these worst paid proletarians that the I.W.W. led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the I.W.W. who taught them how to fight; who raised relief funds all over the country; and who defended their cause in its papers and before the courts. By a glorious series of big battles it infused the spirit of organization and self-reliance into the hearts of these masses. Contrary to the trust in the big funds of the old unions, the Industrial Workers put their confidence in the living solidarity and the force of endurance, upheld by a burning enthusiasm. Instead of the heavy stone-masoned buildings of the old unions, they represented the flexible construction, with a fluctuating membership, contracting in time of peace, swelling and growing in the fight itself. Contrary to the conservative capitalist spirit of trade unionism, the Industrial Workers were anti-capitalist and stood for Revolution. Therefore they were persecuted with intense hatred by the whole capitalist world. They were thrown into jail and tortured on false accusations; a new crime was even invented on their behalf; that of "criminal syndicalism".

Industrial unionism alone as a method of fighting the capitalist class is not sufficient to overthrow capitalist society and to conquer the world for the working class. It fights the capitalists as employers on the economic field of production, but it has not the means to overthrow their political stronghold, the state power. Nevertheless, the I.W.W. so far has been the most revolutionary organization in America. More than any other it has contributed to rouse class consciousness and insight, solidarity and unity in the working class, to turn its eyes toward communism, and to prepare its fighting power.

The lesson of all these fights is that against big capitalism, trade unionism cannot win. And if at times it wins, such victories give only temporary relief. And yet, these fights are necessary and must be fought. To the better end? - no, to the better end.

The reason is obvious. An isolated group of workers against an isolated capitalist employer, might have equal forces. But an isolated group of workers against an employer, backed by the whole capitalist class, is powerless. And such is the case here: the state power, the money power of capitalism, public opinion of the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers.

But does the working class back the strikers? The millions of other workers do not consider this fight as their own cause. Certainly they sympathize, and often collect money for the strikers, and this may give some relief, provided its distribution is not forbidden by a judge’s injunction. But this easy-going sympathy leaves the real fight to the striking group alone. The millions stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, when the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one undivided unit.

The matter will be different, of course, when the mass of the workers really consider such a contest as directly concerning them; when they find that their own future is at stake. If they go into the fight themselves and extend the strike to other factories, to ever more branches of business. Then the state power, the capitalist power, has to be divided and cannot be used entirely against the separate group of workers. It has to face the
collective power of the working class.

Extension of the strike, ever more widely, up to a general strike in the end, has often been advised as a means to avert a defeat. But to be sure, this is not to be taken as a truly expedient pattern, accidentally hit upon, and ensuring victory. If such were the case, trade unions certainly would have made of it repeatedly as regular tactics. It cannot be proclaimed at will by union leaders, as a simple tactical measure. It must come forth from the deepest feelings of the masses, as the expression of their spontaneous initiative; and this is aroused only when the issue of the fight is or grows larger than a simple wage contest of one group. Only then the workers will put all their forces, their enthusiasm, their solidarity, their power of endurance into it.

And all these forces they will need. For capitalism also will bring into the field stronger forces than before. It may have been defeated and taken by surprise by the unexpected exhibition of proletarian force and thus have made concessions. But then afterwards, it will gather new forces out of the deepest roots of its power and proceed to win back its position. So the victory of the workers is neither lasting nor certain. There is no clear and open road to victory; the road itself must be hewn and built through the capitalist jungle at the cost of immense efforts.

But even so, it will mean great progress. A wave of solidarity has gone through the masses, they have felt the immense power of class unity, their self-confidence is raised, they have shaken off the narrow group egotism. Through their own deeds they have acquired new wisdom: what capitalism means and how they stand as a class against the capitalist class. They have seen a glimpse of their way to freedom.

Thus the narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But now the workers themselves must change. They have to take a wider view of the world. From their trade, from their work within the factory walls, their mind must widen to encompass society at large. Their spirit must rise above the petty things around them. They have to face the state; they enter the realm of politics. The problems of revolution must be dealt with.

J. H.

PROBLEMS OF THE NEW
LABOR MOVEMENT

In August 1935 the Council Correspondence published an article by our Dutch comrades, dealing with the rise of a new labor movement and which was to serve as the basis of a discussion for the reorientation of the working class. The September number of the C.C. contained a series of theses which had been adopted by an international conference of council-communist groups held in Brussels. The October number of the C.C. brought out some critical remarks on the first-mentioned article, The Rise of a New Labor Movement, which were written by H.V., a member of a council-communist organization whose standpoint is very similar to ours. Finally, we published in the C.C. a reply of the Dutch comrades to the Brussels theses. A large number of letters have reached us, dealing either with the Brussels conference or with H.V.'s disquisitions, as well as with the article of the Dutch group. The points of view set forth in the correspondence were those which had already been expressed in the earlier contributions to the discussion as published in the C.C.; their publication could therefore be dispensed with. The Groups of Council Communists of America have stated in the last number of the C.C. that they could not be satisfied with the discussion to date, and are now presenting their own ideas on the subject, in a regretfully condensed form. This is not, however, the end of the discussion: in further numbers of this periodical we shall again take up these questions in more detailed as well as more definite manner.

I

The work of the Dutch group on "The Rise of a New Labor Movement" confines itself to a compendium of the general and essential principles of the council-communist movement. If one regards it as nothing more than this, it can no doubt be accepted with slight reservations. Still, one is then compelled at the same time to work out or convert the general principles into serviceable and concrete directives, in which connection the general principles must undergo more or less important modifications if they are not to be regarded as a utopian abstraction and lose all value.

We too are convinced that the old labor movement is objectively surpassed, however much the heads of a lot of workers may still be afflicted by its ideologies. Since there is no possibility of realizing its ideas, it is only a question of time until the old labor move-
of organization. During the spontaneous uprisings, committees of action (councils) take form, since the forming of anything else is out of the question; and these represent the organization of any struggle whatsoever, and their fate depends on the development of this struggle. The unfolding of the struggle is at the same time the extension and centralizing of the council organization. A defeat may destroy it, until a new outbreak again brings it into existence. The necessarily small labor groups under the conditions of illegality can at most exercise influence upon these spontaneous organizations, never determine or directly lead them. Their activity has to be carried on within the councils as they arise, and not as a special organization by the side of these latter. Under the conditions of the dictatorship of Capital they can only exist at all as a special organization when they are so small that they are incapable of becoming the decisive factor of the revolution. They form, as a matter of fact, only the conscious element in the compulsory action of the masses. But even the we decline to overrate the ideologically conscious element of the revolution, it has to be furthered. The greater the councils against the workers who know what is the better for the revolution; but their number will never be sufficient to direct the overturn all by themselves. The councils remain the determining factor. The more clearly these councils recognize their tasks, the more radically will the revolution be carried thru. The conscious element must work in the councils, and not attempt to impose their policies on them from the outside.

What holds for the revolution, holds also for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The workers have no more need of a special machinery of suppression than they have of a special political organization by the side of the councils. The special political organization is, after all, only an indication of the unripeness of the revolutionary situation,—an indication of the impossibility of the overthrow of capitalism. The councils must alone have the economic and political instruments of power in their hands—and in fact they have those instruments, provided that they do not voluntarily turn them over to a special body. The existence of two different centers of power can only lead to the elimination of one or the other. The councils organize the dictatorship, as later on they also organize production and distribution. They can not tolerate a special power beside themselves, for such a condition is a sure sign of their future impotence. The councils can only assert themselves and become the basis of the social organization when they can assert themselves as the exclusive instrument of power. "All power to the councils" is not

ment as a council movement is the yardstick with which the conscious application of the class forces can be measured. The idea that the workers' councils arise only in the revolutionary situation, we too reject. In any movement preceding from the working class the main emphasis must be laid on the formation of workers' councils. The significance of a mass movement does not consist so much in the material successes which it attains, but in whether and to what extent it succeeds in applying the class forces thru its councils.

The labor movement which is consciously interested in the development of the movement of labor and which can be denoted as new we too regard as composed of those still very small groups—which see the essential part of the struggle for emancipation in the independent movement of the masses; the goal of whose striving is not the power for themselves, but for the class, not party power but council power. H. W. too, in his critical remarks, shares our conception, and takes a different position for the first time in his treatment of the relation of the organized labor movement to the revolution. Of course, it is only in case the arguments of the Dutch group re to be regarded as a concrete analysis of the present-day situation—which apparently is not the case— that we are open to H. W.'s reproach of not being concrete. As a "broad perspective" capable of dispensing with more detailed treatment, that analysis has its validity.

Furthermore, to H. W., the exposition of the Dutch group regarding the mass movement were rendered "obscure" for the reason that they are not concerned with bringing forth a new "organizational apparatus", but a new "vital principle". We too regard this substitution of a "vital principle" as very much out of order. One need not always as the councils are the organization of the masses, things which one has recognized as no longer serviceable. Things are not replaced; they disappear, and new ones take form. We agree with H. W. that "any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible without suitable organization", and we see in this "vital principle" of the Dutch group nothing more than new organizational forms. The councils are the organization of the revolution and that of the new society after their victory. Though prior to the revolution they may be possible only temporarily, take form and again disappear, and have no possibility of developing without a moment apparatus, still after the taking over of power as well as in the actual revolutionary process, they become the machinery of social organization. Under the capitalist dictatorship, the ground of the proletarian revolution, the working class has no possibility of shaping for itself revolutionary, permanent forms
sense of the class movement; it is of practical importance only in the narrower sense of the relation of the wage workers to the organizations to the class struggle of the proletariat. The revolutionary as well as the indifferent worked for Capital, the ones unwillingly, the others against their will. The ones carried on the struggle against Capital, the others went along with Capital. One group waited for wage increases, the other struck for them. Both these attitudes were possible only because wage increases were possible and necessary and were in conformity with the interests of Capitalism, however strongly resisted by the individual capitalist. Reformism, even when it was aggressive and denoted the attained stage of proletarian class struggle, had to move within a capitalism the end of which was beyond the range of vision — a stage in theory, which must first become actuality in order to seize the masses. The indifferent workers merely sought to safeguard their advantages and interests in another and cheaper manner — precisely by means of their indifference — since they were still less in a position to see beyond the mighty capitalist system. The proletarian class itself is a product of Capital; it forms and grows with the growth of Capitalism as weak and becomes stronger, up and down of capitalist economy it is compelled to activity and made passive; it acts revolutionary and reactionary out of necessity. But in all situations it is constantly present "in itself" and endeavors to act "for itself". One would do better, instead of making use of these limited formulas, to investigate the grounds by which the working class in different situations is moved in one case to take a revolutionary stand and in another to remain completely passive. But the passivity also is a form of action and invalidates the formulation in question, which has to restrict itself to the comparatively meaningless ideological attitude of the workers in order to justify itself at all. In reality, the class is never "lifeless", the it often lives on its inactivity. From the isolated standpoint of ideological maturity one may work with formulas, but such a procedure does not suffice for characterizing the whole class movement.

II

With the other sections of the article on the rise of a new labor movement we are, on the whole, in agreement, and we refrain from repeating the points there brought out, in which our own views are embraced. We are in accord with the Dutch group when it states that the "movement of labor assumes in the workers' councils the form whereby it is in a position to master the social forces". And to us also "the growth of the mass move-

In order to make clear the development of class consciousness, the Dutch comrades adopted the formulation of the class "in itself" and the class "for itself", concepts such as had been employed by Marx and others. The use of such distinguishing methodological formulas for facilitating the understanding of many-sided problems does not, however, do away with the many-sidedness itself. And, for that matter, we read further: "Naturally, there is no complete and unbridgeable opposition between the class 'in itself' and the class 'for itself'; ... In reality, however, there is not even an incomplete opposition of this nature. The class is at any time both 'in itself' and 'for itself'; it merely expresses itself differently in different situations and at the different stages of its development. Its possibilities and necessities change, and thereby its tasks and its attitudes. From the viewpoint of proletarian consciousness in the sense of ideology, the class exists only 'in itself' when it renounces the representing of its specific class interests and apathy is its distinctive point. The indifference of the working class with respect to its real necessities surely does not abolish it as a class. But it has no obviously revolutionary character; it exists apparently not yet for itself, but for Capital. To the Dutch comrades, it then exists "like any lifeless thing, hence passively." As living, active being it exists, as the 'revolutionary passive class' only when it "comes into motion and to the consciousness of itself". H. V. in his criticism of this viewpoint (C. C. Vol. I; # 12) points out correctly that it is false to denote the working class as a lifeless thing. "For the working class even today is a quite 'active' force in the social development ... This 'activity' becomes determinate, even into capitalist reality. A revolutionary passive class is not a "lifeless thing"; the it is true that its activity is, in the first place, relatively weak and, secondly, goes in a direction which does not consciously lead to communist struggle. Unconsciously, however, even a reformist policy in which class interests are represented contributes a certain social propulsion and drives things forward." If one conceives class-consciousness not only as ideology, but still more as the workers' acting initiative, born of necessity, then the class always exists 'in itself' and 'for itself' at the same time. It was only because 'enlightened' workers stood over against the indifferent masses that the old labor movement was able, of course, to identify the conscious part with the entire class. But this difference of ideology does not mean much in the broader...
ment has disappeared from the mind as well, or until it has reached also its subjective end. The passing of
the movement as a tradition and as a totality at win-o-mills depends on so many different, yet interdependent factors that the point of time for it
cannot be definitely fixed. Our only consolation on this
point is the certainty of the objective untenability
of those ideas and improbability of objective retrogression, as well as the tempo of capitalist decline, which of course is no less rapid than the capitalisupwasing. The momentum attained by the capitalist move ment as a result of the previous development precludes
for the further development any long and relatively static periods.

We further share the view of the dutch comrades regarding the reasons of the present impotence of the labor movement and regarding its decline by reason of this
impotence. The old labor movement is not only no match for the power of capital, but has itself become a part and expression of this capitalist power. The capitalist class must be opposed by the class front of the proletariat. The organized labor movement was neither interested in the forming of a genuine class front nor, even if it had been so, would have been capable of such
a thing. It constantly championed group interests, and
it was only to such conflicts that the movement was organizationally adapted. The end of the old labor movement was necessarily involved with the capital concentration in the decline of capitalism. The class struggle against the capitalist system, and in its
most radical form, has thus become the only objective possibility.

Even tho the source of reformism - the capitalist upswing - was dried up, and the Dutch capital decline mir rode only the unavoidable end of the reformist mov ement, it was still possible to go on with the old reformist propaganda. The possibility of organization without the possibility of reform gave rise also to the neo-reformism of post-war time, until fascism came to look upon the existence of even the most incompetent working-class organizations as burdensome and dangerous, and set them aside. The indirect subordination of the workers to the interests of Capital by
means of reformism has been followed by the direct
subordination thru fascism. So that one may no doubt say with the dutch comrades that the organized labor movement as hitherto existing has found its historical end. It can not be formed anew. The thing with which we are concerned, in connection with the coming revolutionary conflicts, is the movement of labor. This movement of labor, which already represents the class

As to whether we shall succeed, - we are, of course, only a part of the working class, and without special interests, - in putting our principle into pratie in its pure form: that is a question by which the principle itseIf is not affected. One does not always attain the thing that he aims for. But because too many opposite forces work counter to the objectively possible goal - forces which may succeed in turning the goal aside - it is well for that very reason to hold unw a reringly to the maximal program. If by reason of the situation the councils are compelled to have resort to special measures not always in conformity with the final goal, which is not clear even to themselves, in order to exist at all, or if the councils fail to take proper account of the objective situation and fall back into a policy which must bring about their own end: that is regrettable, and will compel us also to flexibility and tactical maneuvers which can not yet be forseen. But for the very reason that these dangers have to be reckoned with, one obliited prevails over their occurrence, and as long as possible, to stand all the more consistently for the maximal program and to fight for it. There are enough backward forces, and there is no need to help them to victory; the more concessions are made to them, the more backward they become. To use an expression of Liebknechts, one must strive for the impossible in order to make the possible possible." It is only when one renounces intrusion into the real struggle, because history goes other ways than one desires, that one has forfeited the name of revolutionary. What the dutch group has had to say on these questions is no doubt insufficient: how the class is capable of a genuine class front nor, even if it had been so, would have been capable of such a thing. It constantly championed group interests, and it was only to such conflicts that the movement was organizationally adapted. The end of the old labor movement was necessarily involved with the capital concentration in the decline of capitalism. The class struggle against the capitalist system, and in its most radical form, has thus become the only objective possibility.

Even tho the source of reformism - the capitalist upswing - was dried up, and the Dutch capital decline mirrored only the unavoidable end of the reformist movement, it was still possible to go on with the old reformist propaganda. The possibility of organization without the possibility of reform gave rise also to the neo-reformism of post-war time, until fascism came to look upon the existence of even the most incompetent working-class organizations as burdensome and dangerous, and set them aside. The indirect subordination of the workers to the interests of Capital by means of reformism has been followed by the direct subordination thru fascism. So that one may no doubt say with the dutch comrades that the organized labor movement as hitherto existing has found its historical end. It can not be formed anew. The thing with which we are concerned, in connection with the coming revolutionary conflicts, is the movement of labor. This movement of labor, which already represents the class

an empty phrase, but inexorable necessity. Any devia tion from this principle is a step toward the emaculation of the councils and thereby to putting obstacles in the way of the communist struggle.
the ground that, to be sure, it is fine and lovely in theory, but that practice compels to watering it. Once more the existence of the middle strata, the backwardness of the farmers, etc., must be made to blame for one's own inconsistency, tho in reality it is precisely because of the backwardness and enmity of these strata that the full measure of revolutionary consistency and unambiguity must be maintained. These groups cannot be hoodwinked by means of a shrewd policy; their activity can only be prevented and, if necessary, combatted by force. The more the amount of resistance, the more unambiguously must the revolutionary program be represented. The first concession compels a series of concessions; in the end there will be nothing left of the original design. When, as will undoubtedly be the case, concessions are forced upon the revolutionary movement, that is bad enough; but to make of these possible necessary concessions a matter of principle and set them down in a program is equivalent to the councils, not by the size of them. H.W.'s political councils by the size of the economic ones (why separate, anyhow, what practically is quite inseparable?) are a restoration of the previous party policy which asserted that the party dictatorship realizes that of the masses and is identical with the dictatorship of the class. On this point we reject H.W. absolutely. His warning to the effect that if we reject his position we thereby "leave the field to the other organizations which for the moment are still capable of action" does not move us, since we have no desire to compete with these organizations for following among and control over the masses. We do not wish to persuade the masses to follow us and promote their independent movement. We don't say: "Follow us and not the others". We say: "Follow no one, but only your own interests and necessities." These necessities are also ours, so that the framework of the council movement suffices us for our own activity. Until the councils arise, we are of course compelled to form in separate groups, but this defect can not be converted into a quality. We must disappear as a special organization as soon as the masses shape for themselves their organization in the councils. Our place is in the councils, not by the size of them.

No doubt the diquisition of the dutch comrades regarding the work groups and their relation to the mass movements have to be supplemetal. The present formulation of theirs on this point often has a painfully realistic flavor. But this defect can be remedied, and in no case can one make concessions here to H.W.'s conception.

III

In addition to the questions discussed above, the Brussels theses (C.C.:Vol.I;N.o.11) brought still others up for consideration: the questions of centralism and of state-capitalist tendencies. The question of centralism has already been touched upon by H.W. in his critical remarks, and the article on the new labor movement is as a matter of fact weakened owing to inadequate treatment of this problem. The practical demand of the Brussels theses for more thorough organization of the work groups and illegal formations to the end of safeguarding them and making them more effectual, for the establishment of international connections and better coordination, for the working out of programmatic directives with a view to clarification and orientation in the interest of a more unified and rational procedure—such demands are likewise represented by us in the fullest measure. The criticism directed at them by the Dutch group (C.C.:Vol.II;N.o.11), which takes the form of an objection to the centralization necessarily involved in this coordination, comes to us as a complete surprise. All that we have been able to gather from the Brussels theses on this point are the simplest practical and obvious steps for the solution of the tasks with which we are faced: the centralization necessarily in the "Sixth International" on the part of the dutch group strikes us as uncalled-for and having reference to other matters not referred to, for the Brussels theses themselves do not justify such an objection. The independence of the work groups is not abolished by bringing them organizationally together; rather, without such organization any work group is sooner or later doomed to death. Independence and centralization are opposites, but nevertheless unavoidable ones, and the marxist doctrine of the unity of opposites should alone suffice to indicate the uselessness of the "for or against" argument. Practically, the Dutch group also can not help doing what the Brussels theses propose, unless it should quite renounce any truly revolutionary work at all. Its fear that the following of the Brussels proposals would lead to a dictatorship of the central apparatus over the groups, thus restricting their independence, is the fear of life itself. One can not reject things merely because they involve dangers; one must work in the conditions such as they are and try to carry thru in them and in spite of them.

With the advancing monopolization of world capitalism,
the permanent crisis and the period of world wars, the national peculiarities in relation to the proletarian come to the fore; for better international cooperation, an internationalizing of capital and the world-wide over-accumulation create in all capitalist countries the same objectively revolutionary conditions. In the various capitalist countries the tasks and goals of the workers are not essentially distinguishable. In the United States one has, as a matter of fact, to take the peculiarities in relation to the proletariat.

This program, limited like any other, can contain only the more general directives of principle. The only influence which it can exercise upon the various groups is by giving them the assurance that forces everywhere are working in our direction. Practically, it can not do other than assist each individual group in its development. Under the present conditions, it is simply out of the question to form an International which could exercise upon the various groups the influence feared by the Dutch comrades. The question of the councils is a question of principle; the matter at issue is the making use of the possible, however limited, international cooperation of our groups. An International does not depend on the resolution to form it, nor is it prevented by an objection. The council-international can, in our opinion, only be the result of a new world-revolutionary wave, and as things stand today there is no probability of such a wave until after the on-coming new world war has run its course. Or else the international crisis would have to deepen so fast as to paralyze in almost inconceivable measure the capacity for action on the part of Capital; but such an eventuality is less likely than an early war.

We share with the authors of the Brussels theses the desire for better international cooperation to the full extent possible, and the organizational and technical matters involve seem to us so obvious that we think they can be left to the correspondence of the different groups. The immediate program for better international cooperation is the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. Even in the U.S.A., already the possibility of any extensive reformist activity is no longer present. The most far-going demands have here also become the most real one. Thus is given the material basis of a unified class-struggle program for all developed capitalist countries. This program, limited like any other, can contain only the more general directives of principle. The only influence which it can exercise upon the various groups is by giving them the assurance that forces everywhere are working in our direction. Practically, it can not do other than assist each individual group in its development. Under the present conditions, it is simply out of the question to form an International which could exercise upon the various groups the influence feared by the Dutch comrades. The question of the councils is a question of principle; the matter at issue is the making use of the possible, however limited, international cooperation of our groups. An International does not depend on the resolution to form it, nor is it prevented by an objection. The council-international can, in our opinion, only be the result of a new world-revolutionary wave, and as things stand today there is no probability of such a wave until after the on-coming new world war has run its course. Or else the international crisis would have to deepen so fast as to paralyze in almost inconceivable measure the capacity for action on the part of Capital; but such an eventuality is less likely than an early war.

In its reply to the Brussels theses, the Dutch group speaks of two different points of departure by which the conceptions in question are differentiated. It holds that the Brussels theses are based exclusively on the actual problems of the German illegal movement, while its own conception is based on the more far-reaching, general attitude to the problems of communism as they have received expression in the previous publications of the Dutch group. In the view of this group, the Brussels theses merely reflect the momentary German practice, which has been willfully elevated to a general theory.

Well, one can have a theory for the daily practical struggle, and one can have a theory which takes into consideration longer spaces of time and broader problems. One can also have a theory which embraces both these points of view. The union of the narrower theory of the Brussels theses with the broader one of the Dutch group would do away with the dispute as to which of the two should be given greater importance. The one does not
Brussels theses are not rated by the Dutch group as theory at all, but as practical work presented which speaks for itself and nothing else. And then an attempt is made to demonstrate that without theory no proper practice is possible, as if this were all that was needed to dispose of the Brussels theses. Practice appears to the Dutch group not as the necessary counterpart of theory, but as a second-rate factor completely dependent on theory. But, anyhow, this has nothing further to do with Marxian dialectic, whose doctrine of the unity of opposites shows up the problem of the priority of theory or practice as idle chatter. Theory and practice, consciousness and necessity, are inseparable. Things can be changed with false consciousness as well as with correct consciousness (always within the limits of the social necessities), but one must cease to be human in order to practice without consciousness, without theory. The degree in which theory conforms with the practical needs of the class determines its value for the class, and under certain circumstances a self-justifying theory may have more practical value than one which tries to embrace in itself more of the direct necessities. And the choice between these theories is not a voluntary, but a compulsory one. Any theory has to proceed from the actual environment, and the greater the extent to which the theory can be reduced to the direct necessities, the greater its direct effect. This direct effect conditions more than the quality of the theory; it conditions also the life of those who do the theorizing. The circumstance that the theses of the Brussels conference sprang from the straight-jacket outlook of German fascism does not diminish their value. The reproach of the Dutch group is based on the still persisting social-democratic conception of development of human consciousness. Just as the Social Democracy rests its hopes for the development of the social-democratic ideology, so the Dutch comrades hold the communist revolution and communism as possible only when a preponderant mass of the workers have more or less clearly "comprehended" their tasks and possibilities. Here also, consciousness, conceived as ideology, makes history; man first thinks, then he comprehends and then he acts. But such a conception is in contradiction to the actual historical process, and the senselessness of the thing is shown very clearly in the fact that the masses don't comprehend and nevertheless in the last instance act correctly. The revolution is not brought about consciously, if we have reference to a consciousness such as it is to-day generally understood. The great number of errors in relation to the connection between history and class-consciousness result from transferring the law of the growth of consciousness in the individual onto the class problem. (To shall now deal with this question thoroughly.) Class-consciousness is something different and is subject to other laws than is the consciousness of the individual. With the neglect of this difference, the Dutch group has deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem. The mass of workers-regardless of the extent to which its class consciousness is developed—comes into situations which compel it to action. Once it has acted, the new situation arising thereby brings forth its own consequences. Whether they will or not, the workers are compelled to ever more radical steps, and each of these steps compels the further pursuit of a goal which conceptually is not at all but faintly realized. If struggle forces are existence-compulsory action that the proletariat confronts with on section of the working masses, without that reason precluding the possibility of self-creation. If capitalism lives and develops itself blindly, so also the revolution must develop itself, and can only come about in the same way. Any other conception not only violates historical materialism; it is in contradiction to all historical facts. To reckon upon a point of time at which the masses know in advance exactly what they have to do in an insurrection is nonsense. It is only with the struggle action that the possibility is formed for intellectually comprehending the new situation. The compulsion to action must be stronger than the influence of the capitalist ideology in order to make the latter ineffective. There is by no means any contradiction involved in saying that the workers begin the revolution contrary to their own conviction. And it is only the compulsive action that the possibility is changed and the consciousness adapted to the new reality. (Attempts have been made to solve this problem of consciousness by means of soralian mysticism and the Leninist leadership principle. It is hardly necessary to say that we have nothing to do with these attempts.)

The Dutch group is no doubt right in characterizing as a remnant of social-democratic thinking the excessive importance attributed by the Brussels theses to the
state-capitalist tendencies of the present time, even tho an equal amount of social-democratic attitudes has been taken over by the dutch group itself in its own attempts with reference to the problem of capitalist development of consciousness. To us also, the Brussels theses have overrated and falsely interpreted the "planned economy tendencies" under capitalism. All the factors brought out by these theses are tendencies actually created thru monopolization and concentration but which work in a direction exactly opposite to that assumed in the thesis with reference to the revolutionary overturn and the abolition of the present possessing class. The matter that ought to be investigated is whether the Russian example can be repeated in other countries or on a world scale; in other words, whether the coming revolutions might remain stuck in a state capitalism after the Russian model. We do not regard this as possible, tho the grounds for our rejection of the idea shall not be given at this place. However, on the basis of the existing capitalism, it is precisely the "state-capitalist" tendencies and the attempts at "planned economy" which demonstrate with all clarity the impossibility of planned economy on the national as well as the international plane. It is only through revolutionary overturn and the setting aside of the present private-property relations that a true planned economy could merit consideration. The belief that the present-day capitalism could be converted into state capitalism is opposed to Marxism and to the real turn of events. The very factors brought out by the Brussels theses are an expression of the sharpening of the capitalistic contradictions. In earlier numbers of the C.C. we have endeavored to prove that the present-day capitalism and planned economy exclude each other. We do not deny the existence of the capitalist tendencies pointed out by the Brussels conference, but we repeat that these tendencies are working in a direction exactly the opposite of that toward which their sponsors claim to be striving. Capitalist planning is the magnification of planenessness. This is the paradox in which reality is figured.

By way of summary, we say that we approve (with the state limitations) the article "The Rise of a New Labor Movement". At the same time, however, we should like, with H.W., to see the principles there represented worked out into concrete, serviceable directives a task in which we shall participate. We reject, however, that part of H.W.'s diatribes which we have denoted as a mere recollection of the old party ideology with new terms. As regards the desire for the concretizing of the general principles expressed in the first mentioned article we can not, in relation to our own movement do otherwise than get behind the practical demands of the Brussels conference. Yet at the same time we reject, with the dutch group, the conceptions developed by that conference with regard to the further tendencies of capitalist development. While in this respect, however, we see eye to eye with the dutch group, still we object most strenuously to the idealism expressed by that group with reference to the question of the development of class consciousness. We ourselves want an international uniting together of all council-communist groups on the basis of a unified program.

The discussion to date must be continued until sufficient clarification has been attained. In subsequent numbers of the Council Correspondence, we shall publish our own proposals, and the questions here broached will be taken up in detail.
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The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capitalism, constant conditions of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. This is given the capitalist countries, for the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in this the fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' council! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET RUSSIA'S FOREIGN POLICY.

Recent developments in the policy of a number of Communist Parties have been labeled the August 4th of the Third International. Although this label has certain justification, it does not take into consideration the actual historical background of these developments. When the phraseology of the Comintern is disregarded and only the essence of its activity is considered, it becomes evident that the present action of the Comintern is a logical step in a process that was initiated in the first stages of the Russian Revolution by Lenin himself.

It is a well-known fact that the Comintern is completely dependent upon Russian Foreign Policy and in turn the latter is determined by the innerdevelopment of Russia as well as the position Russia takes among the capitalist powers. An outline of the development of Russian foreign policy will clearly illustrate this relationship,

THE PERIOD OF THE REVOLUTION

The Bolsheviks met the World War with a program for revolution in Russia which contained all the fundamental laws of insurrection and which--due to the necessity for the struggle against imperialist war--was internationalized. This program was not based on proletarian internationalism—as it was for example expounded by the German
"Left" around Rosa Luxemburg—but instead it was based on the social and political conditions of Russia and the position the Russian revolution would be required to take towards the imperialist policies of the European powers and their colonial suppression of the Asiatic peasant countries. Upon these basic conceptions Lenin built his theories which were to guide the bolsheviks and the international proletariat in their struggle against war and for revolution. The world war, he wrote, was an imperialist war which must be terminated by the anti-imperialist revolution of the working class. As this is an international task, it can be solved only by the revolutionary socialists in their own countries. For the Russians the situation is different. We must be content to advance, merely as a phase of the general upheaval, namely the overthrow of the czarist regime through the combined forces of the workers and peasants. Such a revolution, he continued, would merely be a radical bourgeois revolution but it might mean the beginning of the world revolution if other countries should follow our example. For example, the proletarian masses might rise against their capitalist exploiters in favor of a socialist revolution and the peasant and colonial countries in Asia, Africa, etc., might rise against their imperialist oppressors in favor of a national bourgeois revolution. Such developments might serve to initiate a general reorganization of the present ruling powers.

In the highly developed capitalist countries of Europe, the proletariat—a class—was thus looked upon as the advance guard of the world revolution while in agricultural and colonial countries the struggle was to be waged by "suppressed Nations*. Lenin steadfastly believed that an amalgamation of these forces—regardless of the prevailing antagonistic contradictions—would serve the interests of the proletariat and the communist world revolution. As a result of these conceptions the bolsheviks deemed it proper to attack the Kerenski regime in 1917 under the following slogans: No separate peace with Germany; fraternalization of the soldiers on all war fronts; ending of the war by international revolutionary action of the working class; disregard of all former and new annexations; self-determination of all national minorities up to and including national independence.

Having attained power, the bolsheviks immediately began to carry out this program. In a declaration of November 8, 1917, they proposed to all warring nations a "just and democratic peace*. At the same time they appealed to the class-conscious workers of the three most developed nations, England, France and Germany, to give the Bolshevists immediate support in their struggle. This was to serve a twofold purpose: first, a compromise with the capitalist powers in order to bring about peace, and second, the utilization of the rest period thus won to arouse the proletariat against the master class speculating that the necessary world revolution would soon follow. Concrete reality soon proved, however, that their plans were ill-conceived and unworkable.

The First Defeat of the Bolshevist's Foreign Policy

The hope of the bolsheviks of a general soldiers' strike within the enemy armies was not realized. The Bolshevists themselves were unable to continue the war. The old czarist army was smashed and demoralized; a new army could not be stamped out of the ground. Furthermore, their appeals to the European proletariat to rise against their governments met with no response. Consequently they began to question the hope of a speedy world revolution. Only one point in their program proved to be effective: the right of national self-determination led to the separation of the Russian border states, a move which proved to be very disastrous for the young Soviet Republic. These newly founded states were suppressed at first by the revolutionary movement within their own boundaries, and later on permitted the Entente and white guards to use their territory as a military base against the Soviet Union. These fateful developments forced the bolsheviks to enter into separate peace negotiations with Germany. At the conference of the two governments at Brest-Litovsk, the German generals demanded more than the bolsheviks were willing to concede, and Trotsky attempted to save his face with the counter-move: "Neither war nor peace*. But when the German armies began to march again, the Russians were compelled to accept the German peace dictate under much worsened conditions.

Shortly before the conference at Brest-Litovsk, the executive organ of the soviets had invited the Entente to participate in joint peace negotiations, but in this note they included also the following passage: "Should the allied governments refuse again to participate at the peace conference, the revolutionary working class will face the task of wresting power from those who in blind stubbornness do not want or wish to give the people the long desired peace."

The Entente considered such a language an open challenge and an indirect declaration of war. All relations were severed and the Entente began at once the armed intervention which proved so disastrous for Russian internal development.

The bolsheviks, however, did not as yet abandon entirely the hope of world revolution. They frantically believed that the German workers would rally to their assistance as soon as the anticipated collapse of the German armies
would become an established fact. In the meantime, they considered it necessary to compromise with whatever State was willing to bargain with them and increase, at the same time, their propaganda among the European workers. The development of events after the collapse of the German war machine clearly convinced the bolshevik leadership, however, that the European proletariat was not ripe for the revolution and that for the time being, the hope for a speedy world revolution had to be given up.

The Period of Civil War

The executive of the Soviets announced on November 25, 1917: "The leaders of the successful revolution do not need any approval of any of the representatives of the capitalist diplomacy". Instead, the Russians cancelled all Czarian Treaties dealing with the division of Persian and Turkish Territories and appealed to the masses of the working class to free themselves of their imperialist exploiters. Their aim was to combat imperialism from both sides, to meet the very aggressive imperialist invasion against the Bolsheviks. The numerous counter-revolutionary manifestations were supported by the Entente powers with arms, money and special troops to the white Russian Generals. These powers were not able to wage a direct war against the Soviet Union due to the very critical situation within, but nevertheless they succeeded in occupying the border territories and gaining control of the Murman Railroad; they waged a direct war with the Czechoslovakian Army against the Soviets, cut off Central Russia from the Southern Russian corn supply, robbed a good deal of the Russian Treasury, destroyed Soviet councils and had many Russian workers shot to death.

The Bolsheviks fought the counter revolution with terrorist force and utilized all available resources in this obstinate fight. The period of war communism was introduced to further bolshevik interests in the Civil War on the economic front. The revolutionary situation in many European countries was expected by Soviet Russia to introduce a Western European revolution which they believed was due. The Bolsheviks cancelled all war debts of the czaristic and Kerensky Governments, but were forced to make a concession in October, declaring in a note to Wilson: "that they agreed for the present to participate in negotiations with such governments that do not yet represent the will of their subjects". They asked Wilson whether the U.S.A. and her allies would accept intervention "providing the Russian people would agree to make payment just as a kidnapped person would pay ransom to free himself". In January 1919 the Bolsheviks again negotiated with the government of the United States: "We share your desire to re-establish normal relations between America and Russia, to abolish everything that may hinder these normal conditions". Beginning February 1919, the allies suggested that a conference be held at the Prince Islands with the aim of ending all intervention through direct negotiations with Russia, and the Soviet Government then declared in regard to the war debt problem: "to be ready to meet in some way the demands of the Entente powers".

All these offers could not prevent the continuance of the civil war, as the Entente Powers were set on the destruction of the Bolshevists. They were in an extremely threatening situation when the first Congress of the 3rd International was called to be held at Moscow during March 1919. The foreign member parties represented there were very small and had to go through a number of decisive defeats. The chances for a direct revolutionary action by the new organization were very slight. But the situation was favorable and the first Congress was directed by the revolutionary slogans of Lenin: joint action against the imperialists; change war into civil war, worker councils, dictatorship: "the old capitalist order ceased to exist; it can't exist any longer".

A Bolshevist socialization program was outlined and the relations between Socialist Russia and the triumphant imperialist powers and their vassal states and countries of besieged imperialism were delineated. The newly founded League of Nations was considered to be an instrument of the holy Alliance of Capitalism to overthrow the workers' revolution; the epoch of world revolution was announced. The days preceding the first Comintern Congress were days of defeats in Europe. The March Revolt at Berlin, the Rate-Republic of Munich, the Hungarian Revolution were decisive defeats by the middle European counter-revolution against the revolutionary lefts isolated by the proletarian masses. The Russians as before were in a peace position. Isolated, they believed the time was not ripe for a revolutionary upsurge in Western Europe. They started the Bolshevist tactics centralized at Moscow, with its methods so well proven on Russian soil. "Appeal to the Masses" was the slogan through and through. They did not change along the path of a radically edged opportunism. At the time when by means of the bad bureaucratic methods of Radek and Lovi the Communist Party of Germany was directed to parlia-
dentary action and participation in the work of the counter-revolutionary Unions and the ultra-left majority was ousted (fall 1919, Heidelberg Party conference) they had not yet disposed of their illusions of a timely revolutionary advance. However, as direct experience showed, that Lenin's methods, so infallible in Russia, did not work out in Western Europe with its highly developed Capitalism, Russia had to establish herself as a national state in the midst of her capitalist surroundings. Her Comintern policy became, without altering her Bolshevik line, a policy of deferring the West European Revolution. The revolutionary policy was never given up, but it was changed from a problem of hazardous venture to a question of an enterprise with a lock success guarantee in advance. This meant, if not theoretically, so practically the absolute end of all revolutionary struggle.

The Turn Toward National Self-Assertion

By the end of 1919, the Soviet Government had succeeded in subduing by military force the counter-revolution at home, i.e. to repel the cloaked invasion of the Allies. The victory in the civil war, however, was accompanied by the defeat of the system of war communism. In the first place, the economic supply of the country diminished by 50%. Secondly, the proletariat began to rebel against the bureaucratic dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and to demand council-democracy. Furthermore, the peasants violently put forth their economic demands which they emphasized by acts of far-reaching sabotage. (The Kronstadt rebellion was a typical combination of the workers' political and the peasants' economic demands. Trotsky, through Stalin's assistance, made himself the slayer of the Kronstadt proletariat, surpassing a Moeke in cold-bloodedness and savagery and thereby clearing the path towards fulfillment of the peasants' demands.) The new economic policy (NEP) flung the door wide open to small private capital, primarily of peasant and merchant character. A private economy of small capital, controlled by the state, was to insure the economic rise of the nation.

In foreign politics, the Russians adopted the policy of retreat, after having suffered a considerable military defeat in the war against Poland. In a proclamation to the "toilers" of the Allied countries of January 28, 1920, Tchicherin declared that Russia had no intention of expanding her power to any other foreign country or to force the Soviet system upon any people against their will. The appeal for the proletarian revolution assumed a meek and platonist character. Not the world revolution but the necessity to establish her place among the nations of the world, determined Russia's foreign policy.

Just as Lenin—before and during the Russian revolution—developed a broadly conceived strategy of making use of the various class forces, so he developed now a strategy of making use of the various nations for the purpose of strengthening Russia's foreign-political position. With the renunciation of an immediate revolutionary world policy, was bound up the necessity of diplomatic security for the Soviet state. Russia started with the first Western securities. In the course of the year 1920, she gained final recognition by Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland. Those border states felt the immediate pressure of the Soviet state; they also had the urgent need for a counter balance in order to escape domination by the Western powers, at least to a certain degree.

This policy of the small nations, which—with the assistance of the Allies—two years earlier had put an end to the communist revolution, caused Lenin to proclaim in the year 1920 the direct alliance with "the bourgeoisie of the small states". He declared that the Bolsheviks had been successful in winning for themselves not only the workers of all countries, but also the bourgeoisie of the small states, because imperialism was not only suppressing the workers of all countries but also the bourgeoisie of the small states. For this reason, the Bolsheviks "had won for themselves the wavering bourgeoisie of progressive countries.

In this period of growing alliances between the Soviet Union and the Bourgeoisie of certain capitalistic countries, the second congress of the Comintern convened. It laid the foundation for a revolutionary bluff-philosophy, which left the Comintern leadership free of all obligations. The manifesto of the congress announced the downfall of Europe and the world, and the uprising of the proletariat: "Civil war throughout the world is the order of the day". For the rest, the congress directed its attention largely to the colonial East and proclaimed "a policy of concluding a close alliance between Soviet Russia and all movements for national and colonial liberation". Particularly did the congress recommend the organization of the peasant movement in the colonies with the aim of creating peasants' soviets.

This stand for an East-Asiatic revolution still implied a strong will for a peasant revolutionary attack upon imperialism. A counter-bolshewist movement of Western Europe, however, were mainly of a different character. There the Russians were interested in founding for themselves a broad parliamentarian—trade union mass movement. "Penetrate the masses" demanded their slogans, giving directions for the displacement of the old leadership and creating bolshevist-bolshhevist reformistic labor organizations. The twenty-one conditions concerning the joining of the Comintern by new
parties brought forth no fundamental struggle on the question of tactics. Parliamentarism, trade-unionism and the ultimate international proletariat dictatorship brought centrists and Bolsheviks together. These twenty-one conditions, however, served the Russian leadership with regard to the mass parties of centrist that were to join the Comintern. The old leadership was to be disposed of, the centrist - democratic traditions within the organizations were to be destroyed. The lack of unity standing among the followers of these parties rather benefitted the Moscow leadership, which intended to direct these organizations in the momentary interest of its complicated foreign policies, and, at the same time, aimed to make them the reserves for a future revolution. These two tasks necessarily contradicted themselves, which explains the duplicity of the Comintern policies and led to the disregard of the interests of the Western Europe proletariat. The core of all decisions of the second congress, however, is to be found in the following statement of the manifesto of the Communist International: "The Communist International has made Soviet Russia's cause its own." 

ENTERING INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

Moscow's ideas of participating in International Diplomacy, born in 1920, blossomed out during 1921. The gradual consolidation of the NEP brought with it the first easing of neutrality and non-aggression with Persia, Afghanistan and Turkey. While Russia forsook old Czarrist claims and agreements, it gained the assurance of mutual military support. Persia announced its readiness to admit Russian troops on Persian soil in case of a foreign (British) invasion. Afghanistan gladly accepted the promise of Russian money and material, and Turkey embraced the assurance of the "Nations of the Near East of her freedom and independence and her self-determination in matters concerning her own form of state." Simultaneously, Soviet Russia procured recognition from Poland which was then trying to liberate herself from French domination, and finally, in November 1921, outer Mongolia was taken under Russian protection. Besides all these achievements, including annexing and Bolshevising Georgia, the Soviet Union realized many political victories all along the Asiatic frontier, which in turn improved her position in the West as well.

The NEP Program, of course, included the commencement of trade relations with capitalist states, as well as the invitation to foreign capital to invest in private concessions in the U.S.S.R. Economic distress, which was so weakened by the World War, was in no position to do other than to finally accept the existence of Soviet Russia, and the latter's repeated assurances that economic relations would lead to mutual economic benefits.

In 1921 Russia had already concluded economic treaties with Great Britain, Germany, Norway, Austria and Italy, with Czechoslovakia following in June 1922. All these treaties, of course, brought de facto recognition of the U.S.S.R.; the German-Russian Agreement included even extra-Territoriality Rights for Russian trade representatives.

Russia, in turn, obligated herself to the strict enforcement of the so-called "Propaganda Clause", and in 1919 already announced her willingness to include in the general treaty with the Entente Powers this clause, i.e. "to abstain from interfering in their (Entente's) home affairs". In Germany, after the signing of the Russo-German Treaty of May 5, 1921, Russian representatives had to bind themselves to repress all propaganda against the German state or its institutions. A step further in that direction is illustrated by the pact with Czechoslovakia. Here the governments of the respective countries pledged each other to refrain from any propaganda against the government of the co-signer or against any of its institutions, and not to take part in any possible economic disturbances which might arise in either country. 

Great Britain, finally in 1923, received from the U.S.S.R. the following declaration: Russia shall not support or finance any agents, organizations or institutions whose aim it is to create unrest in Great Britain, or in any other part of her empire, no matter how loosely connected, and to impress upon her officers to completely and permanently live up to this contract. (Memorandum of the Soviet Government of June 4, 1923.) It is well known that this very clause led to the severance of British-Russian relations in 1924 when England, basing her argument upon the fabricated letter of Zinoviev, tried to arrange a new contract. Directed against the Comintern, the new Pact, which was not accepted until 1929, would also include all alliances and organizations under direct or indirect control of U.S.S.R. and organizations which accepted money from these. The Soviet Union, of course, refuses with formal right to have any influence upon the Comintern, and this is sanctioned by all so-called experts of International Law.

Under this shadow, the Third World Congress of the
Comintern convened. Although at that time Russia had only started an international diplomatic apparatus but nevertheless supplanted the comintern's foreign office very soon. As world capitalism presently recognized the Soviet Union, Russia in turn gave up her faith in World Revolution and observed the rehabilitation of world capitalism. The perspectives of the Third Congress were greatly reduced when Zinoviev announced: "The Third International has her tactical principles adjusted to a slow development."

The relative consolidation of power of the Bourgeoisie brought about a renunciation of revolutionary activities of the Third International. By formally condemning Levy (Germany) the Comintern refused to support the March revolution ary activities in Germany and stated that the fight of the workers in the future could only be defensive, while the Congress theoretically decided against centralistic leadership in Italy, practically there were not many changes. In Germany, the C.P. amalgamated with the U.S.P. (Independent Socialist) while they refused to remain with the "Ultra Left" K.A.P. (Communist Workers Party). All these selected tactics, of course, brought the European C.P. toward the S.P. The possibilities of "United Front from above" and "the perspectives toward parliamentarian Labor-Governments" were marked out, and it was under the influence of those tactics that Brandt before a German Court announced: "It is the goal of our party to establish the dictatorship of the Proletariat under the Weimer (German) Constitution".

Russia Becomes A Factor of International World Politics

"Without Russia there will be no restoration of world economy", Radek declared in 1920. This statement not only served the interest of Russian domestic economy, but also those of world capitalism, and enabled Russia to begin negotiations with Western powers. Having been successful in signing satisfactory commercial treaties with several smaller states, she began the fight for participation at the important international conferences. In 1921 she protested vehemently for not having received an invitation to the Washington conference which dealt with colonial policies (sphere of influence) in the Pacific Ocean, China, etc. Her protests were in vain; but in March 1922 she obtained admission to the conference at Geneva which dealt with the economic and financial restoration of Europe. Tchicherin, the Russian foreign secretary, declared in behalf of the Russian delegation: "Soviet Russia is of the opinion that the present time makes possible the parallel existence of the old capitalist and the gradually developing new social order, necessitates close co-operation between the two social systems, in the interest of a general economic restoration". He continued to point out the reasons for Russia's wish to obtain friendly relationship and commercial treaties with other powers. And because "the economic restoration of Russia—the largest country in Europe, with the greatest supply of natural resources—is the prerequisite for a restoration in all other countries" therefore Russia is willing to open its boundaries for international transit, to lease millions of acres of soil for cultivation, and to grant extensive concessions in coal, forest and ore development. The Russian memorandum assured foreign entrepreneurs more than adequate guarantees and promised even to compensate foreign state subjects for losses suffered during the world war. By offering such concessions, Russia hoped to obtain capitalistic support for its own economic restoration. "The financial support from other countries is of utmost importance for the economic restoration of Russia." Tchicherin told Lloyd George, the leader of the British delegation, on April 20, 1922. The eight capitalistic delegations at this conference, however, demanded not only a number of political guarantees but also repayment of the czarist war debts which the Russians could not grant. Consequently, they arrived at no agreement. But in the final memorandum the Russian delegation declared again: "In order to bring about a mutual understanding, Russia is still inclined to grant far reaching concessions providing the other powers do likewise".

For Russia the conference at Geneva was not a success as far as financial support was concerned, but due to the antagonistic constellation of the European powers, it opened the road towards closer connection with Germany and soon afterwards the two governments signed the treaty of Rapallo. Germany recognized Russia de jure, and thereby won an ally in her fight against the Treaty of Versailles. Both governments renounced all claims regarding payment of war debts. "The Rapallo treaty opens the door to Russia for German capital," Preobrashenski wrote in a pamphlet. The German capital, however, was not utilized in the interest of Russian restoration but instead was used for building German aeroplanes and poison gas factories. It is even suspected that there existed a secret clause in the treaty which called for close military co-operation in case of a German-Polish war similar to the one which called for combined military operation against France should Germany choose to liberate herself from the Treaty of Versailles.

The elimination of Germany as a possible aggressor thru the Treaty of Rapallo induced Russia to seek similar treaties with her border states. She offered to reduce her standing army to 200,000 but when the border states refused to discuss disarmament, Russia, in turn, refused to participate at a conference which was to discuss non-aggression pacts. Thru this maneuver, Russia indirectly
obtained for herself a raison d'être for the anticipated German-Polish war—a circumstance which seems to indicate the existence of the above mentioned secret clause. Russia thus became the partner of Germany, a state which bitterly struggled to restore its former imperialist position.

Strengthened by the Treaty of Rapallo, Russia began to exploit the capitalistic antagonisms between the great powers in order to obtain further concessions and thus fortify her own position. The Fourth world congress of the Communist international which assembled early in 1922 in Moscow was given the task of revising the "line" of the Comintern parties along these new developments, a task which—needless to say—was solved in extraordinary fashion. More distinct than ever before was Russia the center, the alpha and omega, of international Bolshevik politics.

"The greater and stronger Russia becomes, the more powerful will become her revolutionary influence internationally", read the theses about tactics and the resolution about the treaty of Versailles spoke of a people which "disarmed and deprived of all defensive means is at the mercy of the imperialist powers". This was said of a Germany whose rulers had just completed a bloody campaign against the revolutionary working class. The congress advised the German and French peoples to fight unitedly against the shameful treaty of Versailles. On questions regarding united front action it was considered important to fraternize on an ever broadening basis with social-democratic organizations. In conclusion, the thesis declared: "Since the CI emphasizes the slogan for united front action of all workers and since the CI permits her various sections to co-operate with groups and parties of the Second and Second-a-half Internationals, therefore the CI cannot refrain from entering similar agreements on an international scale". The Comintern was thus led close to the Second International whose immense parliamentary and moral influence—it was hoped—would accelerate the Bolsheviks' endeavor to gain capitalistic concessions. The result of this change in policy, the theory of a "workers coalition government", was developed. Such a coalition, the Comintern pointed out, not only could be possible but actually would be desirable as it is the logical step towards the complete abolition of the capitalist system.

All these resolutions were made to fit the German situation, and to suit the German military clique with whom the proposed secret military treaty was still an uncertain fate. The CPG, however, began in impudent frivolity to prepare the stage for a national peoples front. Later, at the party congress in Essen (1925), the CPG declared that until 1923 Germany was not an imperialist but a nationally suppressed country and the at that time expected war with France would not have been an imperialist war but instead a national war waged for the purpose of liberating a suppressed people. In such a case, it would have been the duty of the CPG to support it unhesitatingly, it was hardly conceivable that the ECCI in 1923 considered it possible to carry its "socialism" on the bayonets of the red army to Germany, and after having succeeded in helping her to throw off the Treaty of Versailles undertake the difficult task of crushing the united German bourgeoisie. It is worthy to note that this ideology resembles to a hair the one expounded by the National-communists, Wolfheim-Lauffenberg, in 1919. But even Lenin himself renounced whatever basic revolutionary ideas he left in the Comintern when he declared that socialism in the highly developed countries of Europe would not grow out of the capitalistic economic contradictions but rather thru imperialist exploitation of one state by another. (Coll., Works, Vol.XVIII, p. 136; Russ. ed.)

Having thus formulated the new slogans, the Comintern began to identify the German war for national liberation with the German workers revolution. Still greater stress was laid upon the necessity for united front action and parliamentary participation in coalition governments, in order to assure success for the real German revolution which was scheduled to break out in the fall of 1923. At the last minute, however, after all plans had been carefully worked out, the orders for the uprising were withdrawn "due to the treachery of the SFG and the inability of certain communist leaders". The fact however, is that the Comintern had suddenly discovered that an armed insurrection of the German proletariat would not lie in the interest of Russia's foreign policy and for that reason the German proletariat had to be sacrificed. With this step the Comintern, which for years had subordinated the world revolution to inner Russian development, completely abandoned the last straws of revolutionary class-consciousness. Russia realized that neither a war against France nor a revolution in Germany would be of any benefit to her. She accepted as the lesser evil the "status quo", and thereby laid the foundation for the now "famous" slogan of "socialism in one country".
The Pacification of Russia's Western Policy

Although a quick economic recovery was achieved in the NEP period, the final results, nevertheless, were considerably below the Bolshevist expectations. The difficulties of construction increased; the first planned experiments were experiments outside of the economic system, and the foreign concessions continued to be of very moderate size. Therefore, the energies of the Bolshevists were concentrated on the interior situation, and there the difficulties demanded their whole attention. Their foreign policies towards Western capitalism were of a purely diplomatic-defensive function: development of economic relations, protection against all disturbances and interferences, no matter whether of war-like or revolutionary character.

Russia's relations to Germany lost their former intimacy, although further cooperation was assured on a remote scale under the leadership of German "Reichswirtschaft" circles. A German-Russian commercial treaty was signed in 1925 which for a long time occupied the first place in the German-Russian commercial relations. It declared its willingness to participate in a conference for the restriction of sea-armaments. In the course of 1924 it finally succeeded in obtaining the official (volkerrechtliche) recognition from a number of countries. Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Austria, Greece, Sweden, Denmark, Mexico, Hedchas, Hungary, France, etc. resumed normal diplomatic relations with Russia in 1924. Beginning of 1925 Japan followed suit. Only the U.S.A., which was sufficiently occupied with its own internal problems, did not follow.

The fifth world congress of the Comintern, which took place in the summer of 1924, responded adequately to the "changed situation", i.e. the changed character of the foreign policies. Thus it took notice of the "beginning of a certain democratic-pacific phase" in the world policies, and it praised the Soviet Union as the only country with a policy of "real peace". As usual, the responsibility for the German defeat was denied by the leadership of the Comintern. For this they held responsible, according to the resolution on the report of the ECCI, the "deceit of the leaders of the SPG and the inability of the leadership of the CPG." The united front tactics were now regarded as only "a revolutionary method of agitation and mobilization of the masses"; the "right deviation" of Brandler-Thalmann was recorded, with the simultaneous election of Brandler as honorary chairman of the congress!; and the short interim Ruth Fischer-Maslow was approved of to conceal the defeat of the Comintern. Practically, the strengthened "ultra left" phraseology was combined with purely parliamentary perspectives. Although the Socialist Parties were called the third parties of the bourgeoisie, the possibility of the formation of "workers' governments" in a "number of countries" was viewed viable. Such governments would "objectively" mean progress as they announced the decay of the bourgeoisie. The task of the "real followers of the proletarian revolution" would consist in transforming the so-called workers' governments into "the dictatorship of the proletariat". However, the parliamentary-bureaucratist character of the Comintern doubtlessly reached the limit with the consideration of the German defeat. It was declared: "After the severest defeat of the revolutionary movement in Germany, after a subsequent inner crisis and after the most brutal persecutions, the Communist Party of Germany succeeded in quickly reassembling its ranks.

Having switched over to this course, the Comintern parties now represented nothing but a thorn in the flesh of the capitalist countries, operated in a half-bureaucratist and half-parliamentary fashion, and representing a reserve iron which could at a later time eventually again be used on the Soviet anvil. In this course the leaders of the Comintern took care that the fire was properly banked. Already in 1925 the "ultra leftists" Fischer-Maslow were disposed of, an action which lead to the splitting off of the Trotskyian "Lenin Group" and which resulted in bringing the kowtowing Thalmann to the foreground. In reality, Russia tried to suppress any revolutionary movement. Although Germany did not represent any field for revolutionary action after the shameful and rightless defeat of 1923, England now became the place of an arising crisis. Unable to build an effective C.P. in England, the Bolshevists made a whole effort to find a counter-force against the sharp anti-Russian course of the English bourgeoisie. They accepted the ultra-reformist trade unions as this counter-force and figured on their parliamentary influence. From 1925 to 1927 the glorious Anglo-Russian Committee was active.
the United Front between the leadership of the Russian State and English reformism, as a united front against the anti-Russian diplomacy of England as well as the English proletariat. In 1926 the gigantic English miners' strike took form, the largest workers' fight in English history. The British trade unions, allied with the Russians, suppressed the general strike and prevented extension of the fight to the front of all the English working class. During nine hard months of terrific struggle, neither trade unions nor the Bolsheviki came to the aid of the starving English miners who were giving their blood for the proletarian cause. Carefully avoiding any steps of attack, the Bolsheviki continued the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee as their diplomatic interests were worth far more to them than the interests of the English and the international proletariat. The Bolsheviki tried to prevent the European revolution which would threaten their shaking social system just as much as a military detonation.

Russia Turns East

Abandoning their hope for a speedy revolution in Europe, the bolsheviki began to direct their "revolutionary activities" towards the East. At the time the Comintern was calling off the German revolution in October 1923, they were busy organizing the first international peasant congress. With this instrument—the Peasant International—they hoped to embrace all colonial and half-colonial peasant countries and unite them—as they had done before with the Communist Parties—under the leadership of Moscow. In spite of the fact that their attempt met with little success due to adverse objective conditions, they never ceased to bend every effort towards achieving that goal. Even as late as 1928, the sixth world congress of the Comintern instructed the EOCI to renew its activity towards the founding of an international peasant soviet. We may recall here that the fifth world congress (Summer 1924) had already ratified the organization of the peasant international and had instructed its sections to work in closer contact with the peasant organizations in order to consolidate everywhere "workers and peasants blocs". These resolutions were made to fit the situation in China and to introduce the new policy under which the Chinese Communist Party was compelled to cooperate with the Chinese nationalist party, the KUO-WIN-TANG.

The theses condoning the new tactics frankly stated that "the Comintern had paid too much attention to the development in Europe" and that it is now of utmost importance to further the development of those mass movements in the East which struggle to liberate themselves from the imperialist oppression and from which—as Stalin declared—would spring the decisive initiative for the world revolution. But also here the bolsheviki played a double role, while they endeavored to mobilize the peasant masses, at the same time they signed pacts of mutual agreement and understanding with the respective governments. In the pact with Turkey, they renounced all revolutionary activity because Kemal Pasha held the key position to Minor Asia about which a silent but bitter struggle was being waged between Russia and England. That under Kemal Pasha's regency every Communist was imprisoned or even hanged did not bother the Russian bolsheviki. The treaty with Turkey in 1926 followed the treaty with Afghanistan which provided mutual armed support should a third party trespass the borders of either of the two signatories. Russia thereby hoped to save Afghanistan as a military base against her. A similar pact was signed in 1927 with Persia. These treaties were important to Russia insofar as they protected her South-Eastern frontier against an English invasion.

Of far greater importance, however, were the treaties she signed with China in 1928. The Chinese governments in Manchukuo and Peiping recognized her de jure. Russia annulled the czarist treaties, renounced all compensation due her for the boxer rebellion, and established China's right, on an equal basis, to the Eastern Railroad. This treaty brought about closer relationship to the Kuomintang which was openly supported by the bolsheviki. An harmonious co-operation between the Chinese Republic and Russia appeared to be a certainty.

The Betrayal of the Chinese Workers Revolution

The bolsheviki were victorious in Russia because they had been able to combine the interests of the workers with those of the peasants, and in their conception, the world revolution was merely a repetition of this procedure on an international scale. Although they had to realize that this policy was instrumental in the defeat of the European proletariat, they nevertheless hoped to employ it successfully in China.

Since 1925, the revolutionary movement of the Chinese proletariat had registered an hitherto unknown upswing, and China became the only country in Asia in which it was possible for the Comintern to build up a strong and active party. In conformity with the leninist-stalinist theory of the national liberation of imperialistically oppressed nations, this party—which had led heroic struggles against an infantile capitalism—was compelled to join the Kuomintang. The bolsheviki instructed the CPCh to organize united front bodies with the Bourgeoisie.
and middle class. In 1926, the Kuomintang began in Canton the military offensive against the rebellious Northern provinces. Within two years they were the sole rulers of China. The source of this speedy success had been made possible by the many revolts of the peasants and workers against the Northern generals. Shanghai was conquered in 1927, again with the aid of the workers who had risen against the Peiping troops. After the capture of Shanghai, the victorious Kuomintang general Chiang-Kai-chek demanded disarmament of the proletariat. The CPCh, following the advice of their Russian comrades, surrendered all weapons after which Chiang-Kai-chek ordered the persecution and beheading of thousands of rebellious workers. Moscow betrayed the proletariat of Shanghai because it considered a mutual understanding with the bourgeois elements and their butcher—general of greater importance. The CPCh had to remain within the Kuomintang but shortly later it was dealt another severe blow. Instead of attacking the Northern stronghold Peiping, Chiang-kai-chek's army marched against Wuhan where a communist government had been erected. The leaders of this government—all of them were former influential delegates to the Comintern—saved their necks by joining the invading hostile forces. This must be considered as an act in the consequence of the national policy the Comintern had pursued in China. Moscow tried to white-wash herself by expelling scores of 'unnecessary' leaders.

The proletarian uprising of the Canton workers against the regime of Chiang-Kai-chek in December 1927—which was instigated and provoked by the Comintern—was not only a hazardous adventure, but a deliberate crime. Thousands of workers lost their lives in what was known beforehand as a losing battle, and thousands of others were massacred after the struggle. The Canton Soviet of 1927 can be compared with the Paris Commune of 1871: both struck a deathly blow to the revolution. The defeat at Shanghai and Canton—instigated and provoked by the Comintern—choked the Chinese revolutionary movement.

Only very slowly and laboring under great difficulties, the CPCh began to rebuild the party but not any more as a workers organization but instead sought to recruit new members from the peasantry. Since 1930 she has been actively engaged in many peasant uprisings and was also instrumental in the formation of the so-called Soviet-China, which comprises a few provinces in the interior. Moscow managed to remain the adviser and guide, and at this front it is really aggressive. But as Russian activity in Eastern Asia embroilsgrave consequences to English interests, the latter untringly endeavors to head off the Russian drive by irritating diplomatic maneuvers in Europe which compel Moscow to act with utmost caution and further compromises to her Western neighbors.

Should China consolidate in one form or another, it is highly probable that Russia would completely abandon her interest in the Chinese revolution—certain recent events point already in that direction—and would confine herself to the "building of socialism" within her own boundaries. She would then—as far as Asia is concerned—follow the road she has pursued in Europe since 1923.

On the Way to the "League of Nations"

When—after a four-year intermission—the sixth world congress of the Comintern assembled in the year 1928, the liquidation of the Chinese workers' revolution had only to be recorded. It had by this time been noted even in Moscow that the Kuomintang had "gone definitively over into the camp of the counter-revolution" and inflicted "severe defeats" on peasants and workers of China. The orientation upon the peasant movement was clearly expressed and entered as the last credit item in Comintern affairs: "The colonial countries are at present the most dangerous sector for the front of world imperialism," declared the Theses on the revolution in the theses with reference to colonial policy in the official protocol of the congress, while the theses on the orientation of the Chinese workers' revolution had to remain within the Kuomintang but shortly later it was dealt another severe blow. Instead of attacking the Northern stronghold Peiping, Chiang-kai-chek's army marched against Wuhan where a communist government had been erected. The leaders of this government—all of them were former influential delegates to the Comintern—saved their necks by joining the invading hostile forces. This must be considered as an act in the consequence of the national policy the Comintern had pursued in China. Moscow tried to white-wash herself by expelling scores of 'unnecessary' leaders.

The proletarian uprising of the Canton workers against the regime of Chiang-Kai-chek in December 1927—which was instigated and provoked by the Comintern—was not only a hazardous adventure, but a deliberate crime. Thousands of workers lost their lives in what was known beforehand as a losing battle, and thousands of others were massacred after the struggle. The Canton Soviet of 1927 can be compared with the Paris Commune of 1871: both struck a deathly blow to the revolution. The defeat at Shanghai and Canton—instigated and provoked by the Comintern—choked the Chinese revolutionary movement.

Only very slowly and laboring under great difficulties, the CPCh began to rebuild the party but not any more as a workers organization but instead sought to recruit new members from the peasantry. Since 1930 she has been actively engaged in many peasant uprisings and was also instrumental in the formation of the so-called Soviet-China, which comprises a few provinces in the interior. Moscow managed to remain the adviser and guide, and at this front it is really aggressive. But as Russian activity in Eastern Asia embroils grave consequences to English interests, the latter untringly endeavors to head off the Russian drive by irritating diplomatic maneuvers in Europe which compel Moscow to act with utmost caution and further compromises to her Western neighbors.
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of the delegations with the idea of a partial disarmament, the Soviet delegation has decided to look about for another delegations, even the it be on the restricted field of such a partial disarmament. The stage on which the groupings, coalitions and counter-coalitions for the future imperialist world war were forged and disrupted had been entered upon. The Russians displayed a very high degree of diplomatic skill in the fog of this and the following disarmament conferences, which in the enthusiastic socialism throughout the world, was signed by all the more important States and led practically to this: that, firstly, the States warded wars without a formal declaration to that effect (e.g., Japan in Manchuria), and, secondly, the League of Nations, in the case of any military conflict, declared its incompetence as sponsor of the Kellogg pact. Tschitcherin referred to the Kellogg pact as a part of the war preparation against the Soviet Union, with which expression he probably meant to explain and justify the adherence of Russia.

Peace Diplomacy in the World Crisis of Capitalism

The advent of the world crisis was accompanied by a great increase of economic and political uncertainty in world policy. Accordingly, the Russians intensified their endeavors to assure economic and political understanding with the capitalist Powers and to hold off all outer disturbances from their work of construction at home. The year 1929 saw the conclusion of an eastern Kellogg pact, in which Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania and Russia undertook to recognize the Kellogg Pact independently of its ratification by the 14 States by which it was originally concluded. This eastern protocol was adhered to later by Turkey and Persia.

The economic business with the capitalist States made progress. In 1930 a trade agreement was entered into with England, and the one with Italy (dating from 1924) was considerably expanded. In March 1931 the Russians took part in the international agrarian conference at Rome so as to promote the export of Soviet cereals. They likewise participated in the agrarian and export conference at Stresa in the autumn of 1932. The relations with German capitalism became so close that in the spring of 1931 there journeyed to Moscow a number of big German industrialists who conducted negotiations regarding ex-
pansion of Germany's "Russian business" and came away with over a half-billion gold marks in orders alone. The economic crisis provided 300 to 400 thousand German workers with "wages and bread", as the C.P. Press of Germany proudly announced, and a part of the bankrupt German capitalism with profits and the possibility of existence, as the same press modestly failed to state.

The economic diplomacy of the Russians was mostly conducted, however, only in the interest of their political diplomacy. And in this latter field they were immeasurably more active. In the spring of 1931 they introduced in the European Committee of the League of Nations the draft of a general non-aggression pact, which in autumn they laid before the League itself in the shape of an economic non-aggression pact. These drafts and proposals of the sort, a definition of the "aggressor". All these definitions were distinguished by a formal exactness which met with general approval. In exchange, the Bolsheviks practically struck from the Soviet lexicon all the conceptions regarding the essence of imperialistic war as they had been entered there by Lenin. They broke up the "imperialist" and a "defensive" one, and thereby went back to the shabby ideology with which parties of the Second International in the year 1914 justified their support of war being waged by their national and imperialistic bourgeoisie. And that was done for quite the same reasons, for the Russians were seeking alliance with imperialistic bourgeoisies, and they had to lock in advance for the ideological justification of such a coalition policy with imperialist groups, a policy the practice of which had been delayed by the Social Democracy until the outbreak of the World War.

The Bolsheviks pointed the way throughout the world for the system of regional pacts which distinguishes the distracted foreign policy of imperialism in the world crisis. In the year 1932, they concluded the non-aggression pacts with the countries on the western border of Russia: Finland, Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Rumania (with the exclusion of the Bessarabian question). This diplomatic act of securing the Russian west boundary was followed by the conclusion of the non-aggression pact with France, which was ratified in February 1933. This diplomatic step released Russia from Germany and paved the way for the great change of front in European policy which was accomplished with Hitler's accession to power. Soviet diplomacy had well calculated the change of imperialist horses in Soviet foreign policy.

In the year 1932 there were still in existence, besides, non-aggression pacts with a number of other countries: with Germany, with Italy, with Turkey, with China, etc. Diplomatic relations with the government of Chiang Kai-shek, which had been broken off with the outbreak of the civil war in December 1932. The upheavals in the course of the world crisis led a number of other countries to recognize the Soviet Union definitively: Spain and the United States in 1933, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia in 1934. The recognition on the part of the three latter came about in the wake of the Franco-Russian alliance policy, while the U.S.A. became reconciled to the act because this country could no longer dispense with the Soviet Union in the game for pre-eminence in Eastern Asia, the game against Japan.

The sharp turn in German foreign policy—onto the line of Hitler's old plan for colonization in the East—brought about, in conjunction with the intensification of German arming activity, a reordering of the entire foreign policy of Europe. Since the methods of fascist domestic policy were also applied in German diplomacy, Hitler Germany did indeed offend its Versailles opponents, but nevertheless carried out its aims without delay. An essential success of this policy was the turning of the League of Nations towards a "non-aggressive" one, and thereby went back to the shabby ideology with which parties of the Second International in the year 1914 justified their support of war being waged by their national and imperialistic bourgeoisie. And that was done for quite the same reasons, for the Russians were seeking alliance with imperialistic bourgeoisies, and they had to lock in advance for the ideological justification of such a coalition policy with imperialist groups, a policy the practice of which had been delayed by the Social Democracy until the outbreak of the World War.

The Bolsheviks pointed the way throughout the world for the system of regional pacts which distinguishes the distracted foreign policy of imperialism in the world crisis. In the year 1932, they concluded the non-aggression pacts with the countries on the western border of Russia: Finland, Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Rumania (with the exclusion of the Bessarabian question). This diplomatic act of securing the Russian west boundary was followed by the conclusion of the non-aggression pact with France, which was ratified in February 1933. This diplomatic step released Russia from Germany and paved the way for the great change of front in European policy which was accomplished with Hitler's accession to power. Soviet diplomacy had well calculated the change of imperialist horses in Soviet foreign policy.

In the year 1932 there were still in existence, besides, non-aggression pacts with a number of other countries:...
is in general, he said, merely one of drawing closer to "those or these countries which are not interested in disturbing the peace". With which Italian fascism, just as in the minds of certain German pacifists, marches up as a defender of the "peace".

The change of front on the part of Bolshevik foreign policy was therefore the consequence of the change of front on the part of German foreign policy. The Russians were zigzagging between the imperialistic Great Powers in order to put thru their "peace policy"; that is, in order to bring about and support that coalition of powers which at any given moment may appear the most reliable for warding off a military attack on the Soviet Union and for isolating any aggressive powers - today, Germany and Japan.

France, on her part, as the main pillar of the bankrupt Versailles system and, standing next door to Germany, the most directly menaced by Hitler, became one of the main champions of understanding with Russia. She was able to plan her great counter-moves against the new German foreign policy, if not without casualties, still on the whole in accordance with the recipe of a preventive military encircling of Hitler Germany (Poland being the first). in this connection, the French Foreign Ministry, as the representatives of the French Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the "anti-Russian" ideas of the first optimists, the pacifistic effectualness of the League was at last discovered by the Bolsheviks. Behind the facade of peace protestations there certainly stands a knowledge about the facts. But they are carrying on in capital-ist diplomacy, and it demands that offensive as well as defensive military alliances be clothed with pacifist phrases.

While the entry into the League of Nations has brought the Russians a great number of further diplomatic successes, among which the politico-commercial rapprochement with England is rated as one of the most important, practically it has above all legitimized the co-operation between Russia and France. For one thing, Russia was concerned with the continuation of the security policy on her western boundary, so that as early as December 1934 negotiations were started with a view to the eastern part, which was to be guaranteed primarily by France. These endeavors, which for the present have miscarried, owing to resistance of Germany and Poland, the Russians have not yet given up. The real, essential point of joining the League of Nations is, however, the alliance with France, which doubtless is based on a military agreement and provides for mutual security against a German aggression.

But, true to the very methods of imperialist diplomacy, Bolshevism from the earliest times of its existence has had two irons in the fire. For a long while the Comintern was a second iron. That, however, is past. Today the Russians are concerned with keeping the fire free for new readjustments of their foreign policy, for broadening and altering their alliance front against the imperialist Powers themselves. This has been confirmed in the first place by their east-asian policy, insofar as their dealings there have been with Japan. Since the beginning of the Manchurian advance, they have been endeavoring to come to an understanding with Japan (sale of the Eastern Railway for a song) and to bring about the conclusion of an anti-aggression pact. But the European policy of the Soviet Union is likewise a policy of attempts at rapprochement with its principal adversaries of the moment. The former cooperation between Russia and Germany is unforgotten in Germany; Molotov declared at the 7th soviet congress in January 1935 that "we had and have no other desire than to continue maintaining good relations with Germany. Everyone knows that the Soviet Union is filled with a
profound impulse to develop its relations with all States, those with fascist government not excluded. The "ultra-nationalistic and revisionist theorems" of the National Socialists, Molotov emphasized, "naturally" form no hindrance to the development of the russia-german relations, and added: "Altho we have no very high opinion of those 'theories', we do not conceal our respect for the german people as one of the greatest peoples of the present epoch. The question is merely as to 'what precisely is the basis of the foreign policy of present-day Germany', namely, the question whether Hitler's conception of german foreign policy still holds."

The Inner-Political Presuppositions of the Latest Phase of Russian Foreign Policy

The actual line of russia's foreign policy at any given time is thus in large measure determined by the momentary constellation of the imperialist Powers. The measure in which the Bolsheviks carry on this foreign policy depends, however, on their inner forces. And these in turn have recently been subjected to significant shifts.

The regime of bolshevik absolutism has passed a critical point. In accord with its origin and its conditions of social equilibrium, in the first period of its development, it supported itself decisively upon the Russian working class. The proletariat appeared as the political and economically privileged (even tho very modestly hand, was capable of defending its own interests as a class. Stalin had, however, as early as the 17th party congress, declared that the petty-bourgeois egalitarianism of the communes must be liquidated. The agrarian collective capitalism arose which, on the one hand, was capable of defending its own interests against the state apparatus as well as against the working class, and which, on the other, was able to become the supporting foundation for the state apparatus itself.

With the successes of the policy of the second five-year plan, the Bolsheviks have announced the transformation of Russia from an agrarian into an industrial country. Between the years 1928 and 1934 the Russian proletariat increased from 17.3 to 26.1 percent of the total population. The number of collective peasants mounted from 2.9 to 45.9 percent, while the number of individual peasants declined from 72.9 to 22.5 percent. The working class, to be sure, still constitutes a minority of the population. However, it is not only highly organized industrially; it also turns out today the predominant part of all soviet products. This preponderance, however, compels the absolutistic regime of the Bolsheviks to draw up the agrarian class as its main support, to shift the center of gravity of the state apparatus to the weaker side, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the two classes and thereby, for the absolutistic peak of the pyramid, the possibility of governing.

The russian collectivized peasantry becomes the privileged class of the Soviet Union. While the industrial ascent of Russia down to the year 1928 was accomplished at the expense of the peasantry, the collectivizing itself was accomplished at the expense of the proletariat. The billions invested for the sake of russian agriculture had to be withdrawn from the industrial sector of the Russian economy, and are in themselves sufficient to explain in large part the tense social situation in which the russian proletariat found itself in spite of all five-year-plan successes. The doing away with bread cards and the succeeding rise in the price of bread was a present to the collectivized peasants, to whom in 1932 Stalin had promised "well being. In the last four years, the government has expended about five billion rubles for organizing the machine and tractor stations, a sum which had to be raised by russian industry. The money indebtedness of the collectives to the State down to the year 1933, amounting to a total of 435 million rubles, was struck off the books at the end of 1934, the money accordingly presented to the peasants as a gift.

Ostensibly, the collective enterprises, as even the Menshevikess Domanevskaya has now discovered, are of socialist character. Stalin had, however, as early as the 17th party congress, declared that the petty-bourgeois egalitarianism of the communes must be liquidated. The agricultural collectives are guilds, which leave considerable play to the initiative of the peasants. In Feb. 1935, at the congress of the collective peasants, model statutes drafted by Stalin for the collective enterprises were adopted. These statutes have deeded the land to the collective enterprises for all time, as was declared by the secretary of the Moscow party organization (v. Rundachau, 1935, No. 22). The nationalized soil has been made the private possession of the peasant collectives. "Every collective peasant feels now," the secretary said further, "that the general assembly of the members of a collective economy is master over the collective-economy property, that no 'plenipotentiary' of any sort can exclude him from the collective economy, that he has an equal voice in determining the common affairs of the collective economy." The sharpest tones were adopted in condemning the "absolutely inadmissible blundering intrusions into the life of the collectives" on the part of "certain party organizations", to whom it was made..."
clear that "people who infringe the collective-economy statutes cannot be tolerated either in the party apparatus or that of the Soviets". The collective peasants, unrestricted masters of their properties, were accordingly released from the tutelage of the party organs. The "leading role of the proletariat" over the peasantry was thereby definitively abolished.

And as it has been economically, so also politically. Hand in hand with this astounding reform of the collective went the abolition of the formal disadvantaging of the peasantry on the political field. The 7th soviet congress introduced equal, direct and secret suffrage and thereby a sort of "soviet parliamentarism" by means of which the weight of the peasantry can be thrown into the scale in all cases of voting. The future soviet congresses will therefore, just like the congresses of the parliaments which are subordinated to them, be dominated by peasant majorities. The peak of the bolshevik state apparatus thereby frees itself from the pressure of the proletariat, a pressure which it once needed in its apparatus but which would now necessarily turn out to be too dangerous for it. For in spite of all dictatorial securities, the soviet revolutionaries exist only on condition of utilizing the country's mass forces, to which it has to render account simultaneously and between which it has to manoeuvre.

The transition of the bolshevik system of absolutism onto the peasantry as its main support meant, however, the destruction of the party strata of proletarian origin. It represents, moreover, such a break with the party tradition that it could not come off without producing inner convulsions in the party apparatus, regardless of the fact that this party had already been purged dozens of times. Stalin was obliged once more to oppose his party in order to break its conservatism. He did this with the usual bolshevik ruthlessness, in that he introduced, if not the gradual and complete dismantling of the party apparatus, yet after all the further depoliticizing of the party. If the predominance of the proletarian class in soviet absolutism consisted in the factual superiority of the party apparatus over the state apparatus, while Stalin combatted and dominated both, the predominance of the peasantry in the soviet system will bring it about that the state apparatus takes a position above the party apparatus.

So far, this fundamental upheaval has brought forth two measures of the greatest significance. The first was the liquidation of the union of old Bolsheviks; that is, the destruction of the center of the "proletarian"-revolutionary tradition of the CPR. (According to bourgeois press reports, Krupskaya was also taken into custody.) The second of these measures was the reorganization (as it was shamefacedly expressed) of the Young Communist League. This League, according to the "production principle" like the CP itself and anchored in the factories. It rated as one of the party's most spirited weapons in the factories and played an important part there as organizer of the shock brigades, as gatherer of the state loans, etc. It was a lively political instrument of the bolshevik party; perhaps the liveliest, for the youth organization was always at the same time a center of the most various oppositions and an exponent of "bolshevik self-criticism", of which nothing more has been heard for some time. As the relatively weakest link of the party, the Young Communist League had to knock under first. As early as Feb. 22, 1935, hence directly following the 7th soviet congress, which also had the precedent right to liquidate the "reorganization" was decided upon. This decision was complied with by the June plenum of the central committee of the youth organization. The social-democratic standpoint, that the youth organization has no political, but only educational functions, was here converted into fact. The youth organizations in the factories are being broken up. The YCL is being redistributed into seven sections: working-class youth, peasant youth, young pioneers, students, school children, leading YCL organs, juvenile work of the state and trade organizations. Politically, the YCL is thereby liquidated, and the field that is left to it is the youthful idyll: "Like a provident gardener," writes Pravda in an editorial around the middle of June, "it is called upon to bring up millions of people, to form their view of the world, to instruct, to nourish and to cherish them.*

The Liquidation of the Comintern

With the accomplishment of this inner-political turn—the political NEP-turn of Stalin's—the last traditional restraints have fallen which had previously still existed with respect to bolshevik foreign policy by reason of the existence of the communist parties in Europe. The co-operation of Russian state-capitalism with the monopolistic and in part openly fascist imperialism is henceforth unimpeded by any exterior consideration whatsoever. The embarrassing revolutionary phraseology can finally be discarded.

Hitherto, the "world revolution" was at least on paper recognized as the first and most essential guarantee against an intervention on the part of imperialist Powers. Practically, the Bolsheviks relied, however, exclusively on their diplomacy and on that institution which was rendered possible with its aid: the highly organized and technicized Red Army. The late acting president of the Soviet of people's commissars, Kubushev, has even...
clothed this undisguisedly in words. In January 1935, at the third Soviet congress of Moscow, he stated: "While we are fighting for peace on the international arena, we must nevertheless consider that the best assurance against a war, against an intervention, is as before the increasing might of the armed defender of our Fatherland, the Red Army of Workers and Peasants".

Even before this time, the proletarians who joined the communist parties in good revolutionary faith and took upon themselves the martyrdom of the fascist terror no longer counted among the Bolsheviks. In general, they were remembered with declarations of sympathy or protest resolutions which were not allowed to affect in the slightest degree the policy of concluding pacts of peace and friendship between the "Fatherland of all Workers" and their fascist oppressors. Occasionally, however, the hired writers of the Bolsheviks also expressed their sentiments more openly. Thus, on the occasion of the conclusion of the new non-aggression pact with Italy, Peri wrote in the Rundschau (1933, No. 31) with a shameless cynicism of which the equal would no doubt be hard to discover: "On the part of our Italian brothers in arms who are suffering in the penitentiaries and on the islands of exile, the fact that their torturers are compelled to deal with the representatives of that revolutionary order for whose triumph the noblest of our comrades have offered up their freedom will be interpreted as an incentive to resistance and struggle." The communist worker had accordingly long been abandoned when the Comintern was still conducting the "anti-fascist" pseudo-struggle against those Powers which were already tied up in the closest manner with the Soviet Union.

With the latest Franco-Russian pact, however, in which it was no longer a question of a diplomatic agreement, but of direct military co-operation, the leaders of Bolshevism were obliged to give up even the appearance of a "revolutionary" equivocalness. Obviously, the French insisted upon guarantees against a disturbance policy on the part of the CP of France. Stalin gave them. He assured Laval, on the occasion of his visit to Moscow, that France is naturally obliged to adopt measures in the interest of her military defense. Izvestia wrote on May 16: "The task of the public opinion of both countries is the support of the policy of their governments, which is the policy of peace and of defense."

The pact with France was followed by that with Czecho- slovakia, which forthwith adhered to the Franco-Russian pact by reason of her menaced position between Hitler Germany and contested Austria. The Izvestia presented the grounds for this new alliance (until 1934 no diplomatic relations had existed between the two countries) in the following words: "German fascism, in order to conceal its policy of conquest, may fashion a theory according to which the Slavic peoples supply the manure of history. But the Soviet Union, while taking no stock in any sort of pan-Slavic masquerades, vouches in every manner that it deems the defense of the Slavic peoples, who are in danger of being attacked, as no less well grounded and worthy of support than is the defense of France." Since the remaining apparatus of the Comintern parties no longer has any life of its own, the readjustment of their policy to the new situation was not accompanied by the slightest inner difficulties. The policy of military alliances with capitalist States required the liquidation of the disturbance policy of the Comintern parties in the countries in question. Moscow carried out this liquidation, which presages the early end of the European CP's in general. The way to this end is twofold. In the first place, it was necessary that the French and Czech parties should swing into the line of national defense. That occurred promptly. Of course, the French CP was faced with the difficult task of combining the liquidation of the traditional anti-militarism of the French working masses, it spoke cautiously and diplomat- ically, "The mutual assistance embraces the corresponding measures for the defense of peace", wrote Magnien on May 16 in L'Humanite. "In order to preserve the peace, a Bolshevik should do everything", declared Vaillant-Couturier, two days later in the same sheet. He compared the pact with the New Economic Policy (NEP). It was a question, he said, of gaining time in order to postpone the war and protect "our socialist Fatherland". No other reasons, he added, are discoverable in the words of Stalin. Furthermore, it was protested that the CFP remains the defender of the French soldiers and wants to win the army. Practically, however, all that remained to do was to demand that the fascist and reactionary officers be driven out of the army, since one could not after all confide to them the serious defense of the USSR.

In Czecho-Slovakia, where nationalism on the one hand and the social-democratic weakness of the CP on the other were considerably greater, the matter was rendered easier. Sverma, a newly elected parliamentarian of the CPs, declared on May 24 at a CP meeting in Prague that the Czech communists, in case the Czecho-Slovakian army would fight consistently against German imperialism, would support this struggle and come out for the army. He declared himself in favor of maintaining the independence of the Czech nation, which could be assured by an army purged of fascists.

In order to make this "defense-of-the-fatherland" policy
effectual in the policy of the allied capitalist nations, in harmony with the designs of Soviet diplomacy, the Comintern parties had to seek out the corresponding parliamentary field. That meant practically that the Comintern parties had to be annexed to the Social Democracy of the countries in question. The united front with the heads of "social fascism" became all of a sudden the one and only line—true watchword of the various CP's. In France there arose the "front commun", releasing waves of enthusiasm and fake activity among the French workers, who, however, did not proceed so smoothly as might have been expected, because the CP was under the illusion that the extension of this front would be a "bouquet". After a campaign in other countries they are working in a similar direction. The CP wanted to draw in even the left bourgeois parties (if coalition anyhow, then all the way to the democratic bourgeoisie), the Social Democrats opposed to this their tradition and fake activity acquired amongst the French workers the reputation of being the most radical, the "leftest" of all the parties. However, Blum, at the congress of his party in Mulhausen (June 1935) could not deny that the declarations of Stalin are in accord with the decisions adopted regarding the national defense by the French Socialists in Tours three years ago and consequently with the general organizational unity demanded by the Socialists and communists. In case of a German invasion, all proletarians would rise against the outer enemy, for the defeat of France would mean the defeat of Russia." (NZZ of June 13.) It is quite conceivable that Moscow will even decree the direct liquidation of its European offshoots, if the discussion are still further. The Bolsheviks succed in winning the influence upon the European capitalistic parties, without being responsible for them, that will be the most favorable to the plans of Moscow in the present world situation. (This tendency to combine by moving to the side of the Social Democracy is not confined to the Muscovites, but is running thru all the various bolshevik current. The Trotskyists of France, of Switzerland, of the Netherlands, of Austria, of other countries they are working in a similar direction. The OPO of Schaffhausen (Switzerland) accomplished its union with the SP's at the beginning of July 1935.)

The procession to the Social Democracy has been followed by the Swiss CP without reserve. After a campaign in opposition to the social-democratic and trade-union "crisis initiative", shortly before the vote was taken it issued a call for support of this initiative. The situation, naturally, had "fundamentally changed". The CP had, to be sure, proposed an extensive elimination of Parliament for the carrying thru of the initiative, but the Federal Council (Bundesrat) had in mind still more extensive full powers for itself. So the CP preferred, in accordance with the approved social-democratic recipe of the lesser evil, the half to the three-quarter dictatorship. This tumble was followed by the offer of a united front to the SP's, which in turn was followed by preparations for the dissolution of the red-union opposition (RGO) in Basel. The SP set five conditions: among others, the liquidation of the RGO and other such separate CP organizations, suspension of all attacks upon the social-democratic policy, particularly upon the social-democratic functionaries in the administrative apparatus, and unconditional assent to the Swiss "Plan of Labor". The CP had as a matter of course to subscribe to all this. It was even obliged to swallow the ironic remark of the SP executive committee to the effect that at any rate no co-operation with bourgeois parties was involved, such as had been demanded by the French communists.

Just as down to the year 1932 it was "social fascism", so at the present time the "united front" has become the axis of all CP policy. Bela Kun, in a long article in No. 11 of the "Communist International", analysed the tactic and the successes of the various CP's on the occasion of the united-front demonstrations on May 1. As to the German question, he expatiated as follows: If the majority of the SPG executive committee in Prague is really trying to prevent that the international unity of the Socialists and communists, in order to get back into the game, then there is need for establishing a much closer contact between the communists and the left members and groups of the SPG, for the creation of "lively examples of the united front" and for strengthening the broad mass pressure upon the SPG executive committee in Prague. These interesting disquisitions demonstrate first, that the CP must be annexed to the Social Democracy, for otherwise it would not turn to the SPG executive committee after it had declared, following Hitler's victory: The SPG remains the principle enemy. They prove, furthermore, that the Comintern is here "fighting" merely for a bit of influence upon the European capitalistic parties, without being responsible for them, that will be the most favorable to the plans of Moscow in the present world situation. (This tendency to combine by moving to the side of the Social Democracy is not confined to the Muscovites, but is running thru all the various bolshevik current. The Trotskyists of France, of Switzerland, of the Netherlands, of Austria, of other countries they are working in a similar direction. The OPO of Schaffhausen (Switzerland) accomplished its union with the SP's at the beginning of July 1935.)

The procession to the Social Democracy has been followed by the Swiss CP without reserve. After a campaign in opposition to the social-democratic and trade-union "crisis initiative", shortly before the vote was taken it issued a call for support of this initiative. The situation, naturally, had "fundamentally changed". The CP had, to be sure, proposed an extensive elimination of Parliament for the carrying thru of the initiative, but the Federal Council (Bundesrat) had in mind still more extensive full powers for itself. So the CP preferred, in accordance with the approved social-democratic recipe of the lesser evil, the half to the three-quarter dictatorship. This
Thus the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has logically, growing out of the original situation of the Russian revolution, ended up as a link in the system of imperialist alliance policy. Corresponding to the momentary needs at the moment but halving places along this way it has directed the communist parties, on the back of the European proletariat, up to the point at which their political liquidation in favor of the national-reformist policy of the Social Democracy has already become merely a question of form. This is not taking place without the recent illusory working up of the "united-front" enthusiasm of a European proletariat which in the present period of universal counter-revolution and reaction has run hopelessly into the blind alley of national limitation. Its further course can only be a further bit-by-bit collapse. A sound class-reaction against the continuing ideological and practical decline is at the moment not yet visible in the European countries even in the most modest beginnings. It appears that Social-democracy and Bolshevism must continue their work of destruction of any proletarian force of action even to the bitter end before the proletarian turn becomes at all possible. But the world situation is overloaded in such a way with economic and political difficulties, counter-forces and contradictions that this proletarian turn will. if it is to come at all, unaccountably come about. The ruins of all "old labor movement" will make the path of the reassertion incomparably painful one, but they will also finally leave it clear.

---

CURRENT TRENDS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Despite the gradual trend toward equalization of the economic-social structure of Europe, the distinction between industrial capitalist Western Europe and overwhelmingly agricultural Eastern Europe is still apparent. Czechoslovakia is a multiracial, multi-national state. Though it is highly industrialized and its history is closely interwoven with that of middle Europe, while its eastern part embraces the typical agrarian characteristics of eastern Europe. This contradiction between the East and West constitutes one important problem of Czechoslovakian politics and economy.

The other problem is that of nationalities. Czechoslovakia is not a unified national state. It is inhabited by approximately ten million Czechoslovaks (Czechs and Slovaks because of different historical background do not yet constitute a unity, although that tendency exists), three and one quarter million Germans, 700,000 Hungarians, 400,000 Ukrainians, and 50,000 Poles. The "national antagonism", especially between the Germans and Czechs, is fundamentally but the conflict between more or less independent capitalist groups for a share in the state control, as well as over internal and foreign markets. The larger part of the proletariat as well as the petty bourgeoisie was dragged into this conflict. This national competition seems to be refuted by the interlocking of German and Czech capital in the monopolistic organizations, but in reality the struggle is merely resumed on another plane, within the monopolies.

The economic differences of West and East and national disunity existed before the founding of the republic, but the difficulties arising out of the breakup of the old Austrian economic entity developed with the republic. In the old Austria, which formed an economic unity with balanced industrial and agrarian production, industry was centered chiefly in the Sudeten countries (Sudeten: mountain-chain). Excepting that part which found a sale in foreign markets, Austrian industry found a market for its goods in the agricultural belt. What is now Czechoslovakia supplied over 50 percent of all the industrial production of the old Austria - some industries as high as 100 percent. After the breakup of the empire, Czechoslovakia industry retained a fourth of the former markets, as the other offshoots of the Austrian empire immediately raised tariff walls under whose protection they started their own industries. The export to these former countries, thus impeded, formerly the exclusive domain of Bohemian industry, now also had to meet sharp competition of the great capitalist countries in these territories, whose position here was now consider-
A number of problems also result from the international position of Czechoslovakia. Deriving its existence as a state from the Versailles Treaty, and its basic imperialist setup, any shifting of the then-existing power affects it closely. Czechoslovakia’s vulnerable position and its economic implications complicate further the problems arising from its international position and, consequently, also the internal political situation.

All these problems, however, are secondary to the general social antagonisms that also rock the foundations of the other capitalist states. The causes of the apparent confusion in the social conflicts of Czechoslovakia lie in the interlocking and interaction of the general conditions of the world crisis with the special conditions peculiar to the founding and development of the Czechoslovakian state.

The wave of international crisis reached Czechoslovakia from one to one and a half years later than the surrounding countries. Then it progressed sharply and rapidly. First hit and hardest was the export industry, situated almost entirely in the Northwestern border territories inhabited by Germans. In contrast, the industries in the interior largely supplying the internal markets have held up fairly well. Recently published statistics estimated unemployment in thirteen districts preponderantly German, with a total population of 1,062,629, at 119,265; while thirteen districts preponderantly Bohemian, with 1,178,534 inhabitants gave only 51,949 unemployed. Unemployment in the German border districts was more than twice that of the Bohemian, namely 11.15 percent as against 4.4 percent.

But even the unequal force with which the crisis struck various sections of industry failed to halt the trustsification efforts that had been initiated as early as the pre-war period in the Sudeten countries. After the war, this trend continued and by 1933, in the midst of the crisis, there were 536 registered cartels. The vertical organization of industries by the banks has proceeded even more rapidly. Four to five Prague banks, through direct or large investment in the most important industries, control four-fifths of the total Czechoslovakian production.

The growing power of the monopolies is increasingly manifested in politics. Banks and other business concerns, even the heads of the “people’s representatives”, try to use the state apparatus for their momentary interests. For example, it is no secret that the success of the greatest bank, “Zivnostenska banksa”, which controls the greatest industrial concern is mainly due to the fact that the financial and trade policy of the state was in the hands of its representatives who ruthlessly subordinated the economic policy of the state to its immediate financial interests. Similarly the agricultural ministers used their offices to further the interests of the well concentrated agrarian industry.

In contrast to the era of liberal capitalism, when the state was almost exclusively the instrument of political power of the bourgeoisie, monopoly capitalism now seized it increasingly for its immediate economic purposes. Thus the state exerts its full force upon capitalist production and distribution in order to keep their contradictions within bearable limits and, simultaneously, furthers the monopolistic trend. In a small way as yet this expresses itself in the economic legal measures of the past years, i.e., the wheat monopoly, compulsory lumber syndicate, etc.

Almost at the outset of the crisis, following the elections, a coalition government was formed, consisting of Czech Agrarians, National-Democrats, People’s Party, National Socialists (Benes), the Czech and German Social Democrats and the German Land League. The government tried to counteract the growing difficulties with the usual deflationist methods; (salary reductions for government employees, reducing the budget, etc.), which, of course, merely intensified the crisis. From the first, the government, due to its heterogeneous composition, could not reckon on more thorough measures. When the advancing crisis nevertheless indicated the necessity of such measures, open disagreement broke out in the coalition. The group urging a devaluation of the crown to revive the export trade had a majority but met stiff resistance by the National Democrats, representing finance capital and the importers of foreign raw materials who felt their interests endangered by currency devaluation. Before the passing of the devaluation law, this group demonstratively withdrew from the government. The remaining government parties now formed a closer coalition of agrarian and reformist parties. Resulting from this close co-operation were a number of “planned economy” reforms (grain monopoly, public works loans, public welfare programs, etc.), which was to culminate in a sort of state capitalism (for example, the nationalization of mines.)

The new reformistic practice of the labor parties now found its ideological expression in the theories of “planned economy”. A theoretical re-orientation further became necessary with the collapse of German (in Germany) social democracy, the chief representative of
the traditional reformism of the Second International. In order to win the vacillating masses of petty bourgeois and farmers for the interests of the reformist labor movement, a "class-coalition" was sought in the formation of a bloc surrendering all class characteristics for the purpose of effecting the structural (state capitalist) reform of capitalism. The labor movement, demanded the collapse of the middle class parties, through this program was to be shown a new way out, while at the same time a mass basis for the struggle against Fascism would be formed.

The National-Socialist victory in Germany had far-reaching consequences for the internal and external politics of Czechoslovakia. It now found itself adjacent to a state from whose imperialist urges for expansion it had nothing to fear. Its immediate reaction to provocative advances of Germany was a closer support of French imperialism and, consequently, of Russia (diplomatic recognition, non-aggression and military assistance pact) as well as closer connection with the states of the little entente. A further effect on foreign policy was clouding of diplomatic relations with Poland which had established friendly relations with German imperialism.

The ideological result of Hitler-German activity was an intensified nationalism by the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie which could operate under the mask of anti-fascism. In the reformist labor parties, Hitlerism resulted in a panicstricken flight to the institutions of the "democratic" state as refuge from the fascist wave. The anti-fascist struggle represented no struggle between groups fighting for their definite capitalist interests, but a struggle for the preservation of certain governmental principles. Followed to its logical conclusion this conception leads to the support of a war of prevention "in order to bring freedom (at the point of French and Czech bayonets) to Germany".

Internally the Hitler overturn in Germany led to the dissolution of the German National-Socialist Labor Party and the German National Party. The leaderless and partyless fascist masses sought and found cover in the German Turnerbund whose social structure and aims most closely approximated those of the dissolved parties and thus was best fitted to act as a substitute organization for the old swastika parties. Its membership was fairly identical with that of the two outlawed parties, in addition to a powerful reserve of youthful elements that had been radicalized and thrown into politics by unemployment and the passion for political action of the Turin functionaries. This membership was indistinguishable from that of a swastika party. Hypernationalism, anti-Semitism and close petty bourgeois connections characterized both. This similarity to the old fascist parties threatened to result in the prohibition of the Turnerbund as well, so a form of organization equally capable of carrying on the fascist campaign and yet sufficiently camouflaged to avoid dissolution under the anti-fascist laws had to be found. The most essential fascist activities were to be carried out illegally, in underground agitation, whispering campaigns, etc.

The needs of Czech Fascism thus found expression in the organization of the Sudeten Home Front (SHF) which soon boasted of a following greater than that enjoyed by the former National-Socialist organizations. In contradiction to swastika traditions, the SHF professed a burning love of homeland, an international program, a further need for more demonstrations for the Czechoslovak state were organized and every connection with the forbidden parties, and especially with the Third Reich was avoided. Thus equipped the SHF was the more active in advocating the ideology of its predecessors although in diluted form but enriched with the freshly imported "people's community religion" and a leader cult centered around one K. H. Henlein, Turnerbund functionary who was being primed as a Sudeten German Hitler.

The new foreign policy of Russia after the Nazi revolution in Germany led to a change in the communist tactics in the countries of Russia's allies. In Czechoslovakia this tactic met with difficulties as the national-Socialist parties emphatically refused union with the Communists; on the other hand, the united front here would have signified the Communist endorsement of the government which so far seemed opportune to them. But concessions in this direction have already been made by the CPC.

In May 1935, when the diplomatic bonds between Russia and Czechoslovakia were tightened by a military assistance pact, the CPC declared itself ready to co-operate with the bourgeois parties in parliament and to defend the capitalist state. Parliamentary Representative Sverma on May 24, 1935 declared: "... German Fascism can be defeated only thru class war within Germany and, by war, thru armed force. The Czechoslovak Communists in case of consistent war by the army against German imperialism would support that war and the army. " We are for the maintenance of independence of the Czechoslovak nation", he added, "which can be guaranteed by a strong army, freed of Fascist elements in which workers enjoy all political privileges. We demand the restoration of the suffrage to the members of the army. We urge the working class to carry forward this united front to carry on the fight against Fascism. We will support the Socialist parties in the government in all measures intended to combat Fascism, and to secure
concrete advantages for the workers. In foreign policy
we will support everything intended to support the
peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and to frustrate
the war plans of Hitler-Germany."

The complicated transitional character of the general
social situation is reflected in the results of the last
elections (May 1935). The total result is undeniably a
swing to the right. Also, the difference of social develop-
ment in German and Czech Czechoslovakia becomes more
apparent. While conditions among the Czechs seem to have
remained about the same, among the Germans there occurred
a complete political overturn. The tremendous growth of
the Sudeten German Home Front to the strongest party in
the state formed the real sensation of the elections and
gained importance far beyond the boundaries of the state.

The swing to the right is seen in the loss of votes and
parliamentary seats of the proletarian parties which al-
together now have 14 seats less than formerly. Compared
to 41.6 percent of all seats held formerly, they now con-
tral only 35.6 percent. The full developments are not so
apparent in these totals as a study of the individual na-
tional groups reveals.

Changes among the Czechs, despite the sixth year of cris-
ise, are so insignificant that the stability of the old
party system seems to be exceptional when compared to in-
ternational developments in general.

In contrast to the largely German border territories, the
inner part of Czechoslovakia, especially Slovakia, is but
little industrialized. Such industry as exists is largely
for domestic consumption and was hardly affected by the
crisis. Besides, industry in the Czech interior has experi-
enced an entirely different development from that of the
border districts. The latter are part of the west European
economy which had its decisive development in the last
half of the 19th century. Now, as formerly during its rise,
industry in the border districts follows the decline of Eu-
rope's capitalist west. But the agricultural Czech in-
terior belongs to the European east which experienced a
period of industrialization after the war. Political in-
dependence, the accompanying tariff and trade barriers,
now separating the old economic units, led to the devel-
lopment of various productive and military interests arising out of the new setup that centered
more in the interior and the east. This industrial
development further moderated the effects of the crisis
on this section of Czechoslovakia which had suffered
least from the first because of the structural nature of interior and eastern economy. Also, the munitions indus-
try located in the Czech districts and operating at high
capacity for years reduced unemployment of the Czech

Thus the comparatively insignificant effects of the crisis
on the Czech districts produced no radical change in
the traditional party system. However, the crisis still
had enough effect in the Czech districts to cause the for-
mation of so-called fascist parties that already
have expressed themselves in the elections, Czech fas-
cism so far consists of two tendencies: the National
Union (Marodni sjednoceni), and the Fascist Party of
Gajda.

The reasons for the growth of Fascism, however, are in
the economic conditions of the Sudeten-German districts.
The crisis here manifested itself in an extraordinary im-
poveryment of the masses. The decline of the highly de-
veloped export industry of the border districts struck
down the whole economy and social life. The ruin of the
export industry involved that of all other branches of
production. Important production centers of finished
goods, textile, glass are veritable industrial ceme-
teries. Even better situated districts such as the soft
coal mines in the northwest and the connected industries
show a severe decline and unemployment problem. Some in-
dustries have been idle for years with no hope of resum-
ing operations. The industrial shifts of the post-war
period and overseas and the tariff, valuation, and autarchic policies of most countries have destroyed
a whole series of industries. Frequently the paralyzed
plants are broken up and transferred to other countries
(textile industry), a part of the border industry is
moving into the interior leaving an army of unemployed
without hope ever to be re-employed, certain only of
continuing life under the most miserable conditions.

But those remaining employed fare little better. The
wages, already low before the crisis (among the lowest
in all Europe), have so far been reduced to an average
50 percent. Short-time employment is the rule, (one day
a week in many plants and others close down for weeks
on end), and contributes to lowering the living stan-
dard of the employed almost to the level of that of the
unemployed.

The chief strength of the fascist movement, its very
foundation, consists of the mass of the impoverished
petty bourgeoisie and peasantry. The decline of the ex-
port industry, partly of a pettybourgeoisie nature, poor
business in general, reduced purchasing power of the masses, taxation, etc., brought small tradesmen, mer-
chants, and the craftsmen to the verge of ruin. The
young intelligentsia found no more room in the declining
workers. Consequently, the fascist ideology, the ideology
of capitalist decline, remained negligible among the
Czech masses.
The German small farmers in the less fertile border districts were injured by the agrarian measures of the in favor of large farmers government. These groups that usually turn to the state for help in a crisis had scant hope from a state that furthered the rising Czech competition that threatened them.

The Germans in Czechoslovakia see the solution to their troubles in Fascism. The Sudete German party has had a degree of success unprecedented in fascist history. It polled 70 percent of the German vote, not only thru re-election of the other bourgeois parties, but thru great inroads into the support of both proletarian parties. The confidence of Henlein's followers in finding new and basic methods for their welfare, thru the Sudeten-German Home Front to overcome the strong social at attitudes of the population.

The election results of the Communists also demand attention. There is a number of differences between the CCP and those of the other European countries. The Czech Socialist Democracy from which it sprang in pre-war times already had been one of the rightest parties of the second international, supporting the position of unconditional co-operation with all classes of the nation. There was practically no Marxian opposition in its ranks. After 1918, following the national revolution which retained all other features of capitalism, a radical tendency developed which, however, lacked a fundamental revolutionary orientation. It was similar to the Independent Socialist Party tendency in Germany though stronger reformist and nationalistic tendencies existed here. But while the third international has split the Independent S.P. in order to exclude the too reformistic elements, shortly after it accepted the whole Czech Left bag and baggage. Junction of the Czech with the German Communists of the country, ideologically more advanced owing to theoretical unity and clarity though a degree of uniformity in concepts and tactics took place thru the years. The lack of theoretical clarity among the party membership formed the basis for frequent serious internal crises that convulsed the party structure until the strong party bureaucracy succeeded in enforcing the strong discipline and upholding the rules of Bolshevik organization. Yet, to this day, the party apparatus must compromise with the ideological backwardness of the membership. Thus the policy of the party central committee consists of constant shifting between the now reformist, now radical desires of the membership on the one hand, and the pressure of the Comintern for decisive action and Soviet influence in the other hand, though Russian interests more and more tend to support the reformism of the party. This shifting soon became the characteristic of the whole policy of the CCP which evaded all fundamental decisions of theory or practice.

In distinction to the Social-Democracy, the Communist movement in Czechoslovakia is not organized into national groups, but embraces members of all nationalities in one unit. The peculiar national composition of Czechoslovakia explained previously, expresses itself in the thought and action of the various groups and only with due consideration to this can the Communist election results be correctly estimated.

The Communists secured a total increase of 96,829 votes as compared to 1929, or 12.78 percent. As the number of votes had increased by 11.45 percent, the percentage of increase was only 1.33 percent.

The growth of the Communist, almost entirely in eastern Slovakia and Karpatho-Russia, can be traced to the almost complete absence of industry. Even agriculture there is very backward. Conditions generally approximate those of the Balkans and a number of east-European states. The greater part of the population suffers much as a result of the backward social conditions and the ruthless exploitation by the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie.

Although the remnants of feudalism had been removed by the large land reform—the expression of the bourgeois revolutionary character of the national revolution—and the Czech peasantry had become conservative, sufficient vestiges of feudalist conditions remained in the east to maintain the desire for a bourgeois reconstruction of agriculture. The smallness of the farms, infertility of the soil, dependence on the few but all-powerful landed proprietors, and the backwardness of their productive methods, coupled with ad-
ministrative oppression (taxes, tax foreclosures, political chicanery, etc.—this part of the country is treated almost like a colony) have created misery that is almost unbearable. Communist success here is due primarily to the protest of the peasant population against these conditions. In addition it is the expression of the agrarian-revolutionary ferment of the peasantry of this as well as other eastern countries as the Communist Party unreservedly supports all interests of the peasant population. To the Karpatho-Russian peasants as to the Russian peasants, the Communist party appears as the sole leader of their social and national struggle.

In Czechoslovakia the crisis appeared later than in the other countries, and earlier in the border districts than in the interior and eastern parts of the republic. The political effects were the later and unequal process of fascization. Following the later outbreak of the crisis, it may be assumed that the low point will be reached at a later period than in other countries. The momentary stabilization of the crisis in Czechoslovakia has obviously not occurred at its lowest point. A further, possibly sudden, collapse is to be expected, especially in the Czech districts. The political effect of a further collapse undoubtedly will be a greater and more effective fascization of the country.

The rise of a real fascist movement among the Czechs must intensify the problem and danger, but also the difficulties, of Fascism in the republic. So long as Fascism was essentially the affair of the minority nation, the decisive policies of the government were but little influenced by it. With the rise of Fascism in the majority nation, all internal problems (above all, that of the relationship of the two main nationalities, which may result in a struggle to determine the dominance of the two fascist movements) renewed and intensified will become the order of the day.

The conquest of the state by the monopolistic great-bourgeoisie proceeds more rapidly than the formation of a mass basis for the petty bourgeoisie. The horizontal and vertical trusts embrace owners of both nations and all fractions and constantly expand their operations. In the International Industrial Association (SVAZ PRUMYSLNIKU) for example, the bourgeoisie has an insurmountably privileged position. As economically, so politically, it demands with increasing insistence absolute control of economy and the state, violently demands the abolition of democratic vestiges and forces through more and more measures for the fascist reorganization of the state. The time is rapidly approaching when the bourgeoisie, with its trusts can exercise unlimited control of the state and then dictate its political and economic measures. But even in the unified dictatorship of monopoly capital, the rivalry of the two national capitalist groups and the different capitalist fractions (industrial, agrarian and finance capital) will continue. The conflict for a share in the fascist rule will flame anew in the economic associations and the state bureaus and administrations. In this struggle, the various groups of capitalists will seek alliances among the petty bourgeoisie of their own countries gained by capital concentration and crisis. Nationalism is the inevitable basis for a fascist mobilization of the petty bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia. To large sections of the petty bourgeoisie, the maintenance and extension of their reduced basis for existence will appear possible only at the expense of the other nationalities. Thus the future crisis will widen the gulf between the two large nations of the state and finally two strong fascist mass movements will confront each other in an embittered struggle. But as fascism indicates the greatest centralization of state power in the hands of the ruling class, and every independent movement within the regime that conflicts with the interests of the ruling fascism becomes a menace for the whole dictatorship, fascism is confronted with the insoluble problem of chaining the very forces it is constantly forced to unchain. Just as the growing class antagonisms constantly force the fascist state to adopt more rigorous measures to maintain its supremacy, so the growing and diverging tendencies of the two nationalities will necessitate increased pressure by the state. The exact manner in which Fascism will try to reconcile the national conflicts with absolutist state centralization cannot be foretold as yet. A part probably will be played by the state bureaucracy whose great power, uncontrollable chicanery and ruthlessness already indicate its possible position.

In general, fascism is a manifold contradictory process that will be even more complicated and difficult of comprehension in the Czechoslovak state of conflicting nationalities than elsewhere. The working class is inactive and helpless in relation to the task of revolutionizing the capitalist system. It confronts the powerful new problems with the traditional methods, organizations and ideologies that arose from almost entirely different conditions, and which are completely insufficient to stop the onslaught of the class enemy. The greatest and decisive critical stage of the work of the working class is a stage of reforms. Attempts to change the policies of the reformist parties among the Czechs are not apparent, while but a weak tendency in this direction is noticeable among the Germans. What oppositional activity exists within German Social Democracy is very indefinite and is rather concentrated against the integration of the new orientation of the German government. Among all these efforts, the group known as the "Socialist Faction" has assumed the most definite forms and gained the most influence. Although
become a conservative factor in the state. Committed to miserably in the coming attack of the class enemy. No uniform development tendencies are discernible because it harbors too half-bolshevik aims of the experienced opposition politicians.

The other wing of the labor movement, that of the Communists, has long ceased to represent a revolutionary factor. Their great turn-about shift, occurring just during the last election, that they were compelled to make in the diplomatic interests of the Soviet Union has stripped them of the last bit of revolutionary significance. Now that they have committed themselves to national defense and, with certain reservations, to support of the government policy (in their repeated united front proposals to the Social Democrats they have emphasized these willingness to make concessions) their fundamental line is undistinguishable from that of the reformists. Like the latter, they have become a conservative factor in the state. Committed to support the ruling political system, even before formation of parliamentary "anti-fascist united front", they, like the Social Democrats, will be involved in the state collapse. More unsteady ideologically and far less prepared organizationally than its Reichs-German sister party, the Czechoslovak Communist party too must collapse miserably in the coming attack of the class enemy.

On the whole, it becomes apparent that even the so-called "island of democracy" will be unable to arrest the international process of fascism. The same developments, here as elsewhere will shake the existing organizations and ideologies of the working class. At first this expresses itself in parliamentary defeats as a result of which must come the recognition that the historic task of the proletariat cannot be accomplished thru parliamentary-reformist and bolshevist methods and organizations. In the further course of fascism, the bourgeoisie, obeying the political and social imperatives of this process, must put an objective end to the parliamentary labor organizations of all tendencies. This objective end, however, for, despite the destruction of their organizations by the class enemy, the old ideology will continue to survive among sections of the masses, The intensified oppression and exploitation, however, destroys the old ideology and prepares the basis for new class action and class consciousness. Sooner or later the class activity thus developed must result in a new organization and ideology adapted to the changed conditions. The practice of the class struggle itself will necessitate organizations in which the militancy of the masses finds direct expression in which the gorms of the new society can be developed. A new revolutionary ideology must come on the basis of this practice in combination with the total experience of previous class struggles. This new working class ideology can have no room for the illusion of a reformist transformation of existing society, nor for the idea of passive subordination of the classes under the leadership and control of an "advanced guard" and their mobilization for objectives incompatible with their class interests. But, most important, every revolutionary ideology, particularly in nationalistic Middle and Eastern Europe, will have to include and maintain an uncosmopolitan internationalism.
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The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capitalism, a permanent condition of crisis, compels ever greater violations of economy; by new impositions and rallies, the capitalist endeavour to ever increasing unemployment of the workers. This is given the form of a call upon the workers to take the leadership of the workers in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deny the workers this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

Election Year

It has long since been recognized that one capitalist kills many, but under the Roosevelt regime the matter has been subject to fantastic complications. The small capitalists on their way to extinction attribute to Roosevelt the design of bringing all private property under state control. A part of the big bourgeoisie feels called upon to exert an oppositional pressure in order to force the Administration more in its own direction. These attacks from the side of certain capitalist strata furnish occasion for the bureaucratic-liberalistic elements to support Roosevelt in his "fight against the money bags". Meanwhile, the truly dominant capitalist element goes calmly about its affairs, and while on the one hand eliminating the sordid competition, at the same time hits upon measures for providing the government with instruments for use against the workers. The middle class, the workers and the small capitalists are continually confusing friend and foe, and the horde of political hacks here at work not only lives on this general confusion, but makes it still greater. The apparently liberalistic, class-conciliating Roosevelt program, once enacted into law, is promptly declared unconstitutional and practically given up. The Supreme Court has apparently more power than the Administration and Congress put together, which willingly bow to its dictatorship. The Administration has in this way kept...
a large number of its promises, without being obliged to
suffer the disappointments of seeing them realized. The
comedian of the "New Deal" play their parts splendidly;
their demagogy serves skillfully to veil the fact that
what passes for unity between the Administration and the
Supreme Court is merely a matter of one hand washing the
other.

The Supreme Court takes its stand on the Constitution,
which in general has now become quite popular. All the
reactionary elements rush to the defense of that vener­
able document, which can be twisted to serve any inter­
est and which by no means stands in the way of the inter­
ests of monopoly. Governor Landon, the most colorless of
the presidential candidates and whose animal seriousness
rarely allows regardless of all his wheeling the baby carriage, says quite correctly that "the American
constitution was devised exclusively for protecting the
interests of minorities against unreasonable majorities";
a trait which it shares with all constitutions, and no
other sort of constitution is even conceivable. Any change
of the constitution can only be a legal modification for
security of monopoly. The Constitution is of interest
to no one except the exploiters. Whatever the bourgeoises
may have in mind doing with their constitution cannot be
other than a matter of indifference to the workers.

The greater the degree in which the control of economy
has been centralized and the greater the degree in which
Capital and State are merged into a unity, the more vigor­
ous must be the protest of the forgotten men and the more
sharply rages the struggle for the influential posts in
the governmental machine; though the same tasks and pos­sibilities are given to and imposed upon each of the com­peting groups, until this competitive struggle sinks out
of sight in the framework of the Totalitarian State. The
struggle among the political truckers for the State
positions becomes mixed up so much with the actual con­flicts of the various capitalist groups of interests that
none of the participants really knows any more what he is
actually saying.

The Roosevelt Administration, being hell-bent for re­election, promises each of the special groups what is of
use to the group, without regard for the fact that the
party thus becomes involved in irreconcilable contra­dictions. To the liberal elements it promises the continu­ation of the deceptive, class-consolidating policy; to the
farmers, freedom to organize and social legislation; to
the workers, the continuation of aid to agriculture; and
at the same time it calms the reactionary element with
the promise of keeping the taxes as low as possible, of
balancing the budget, of allowing business more elbow
room, etc. These promises are no sooner made than they
are tagged by the Republicans as Fascism or Communism, tho
this does not prevent the Republicans from going before
the voters with practically the same program in a slightly
what different form. For the competitors are clear on the
point that both, Democrats and Republicans, as in the
past, so also in the near future, can only perform the
same work; that in spite of all modifications determined
in conformity with party needs, in the final analysis
they are after all obliged to follow the economic-politi­
cal necessities which automatically promote the interests
of those whose interests are being promoted even today. As
concerns the workers, it's Tweedledee and Tweedledum; they
have no reason to be concerned about the question of which
of the competing parties stands sponsor for the capitalist
economy.

The chances of Roosevelt's reelection are very good. The
present Administration has some decisive capitalist groups
on its side, in spite of the strong capitalist propaganda
against individual phases of the Roosevelt policy. Roosevelt
still has behind him, without doubt, a large part of the
farming element and of the middle class, and certainly the
mass of the farmers. This decision of the Democrats
spurs the Republicans to undertaking against Roosevelt a
campaign of demagogy the like of which has rarely been
seen even in the corrupt political struggles of this Amer­ican
scene. From the general confusion this demagogy has
created a state of absolute idiocy. No one knows any more
to whom he is to vote, or left or right, except against Fascism
N against Fascists, Communists against Communism. Politics
has apparently reached the level of Gertrude Stein.
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But this is only apparent and represents, no doubt, a
transitory stage of the socio-economic development. The
truth seems rather to be that as yet the American scene
is lacking in real honest-to-god fascists, tho it has a
variety and profusion of half-fascists perhaps surpass­ing
of any other equal area of the globe. These here
in the U.S.A. who would seem to be the nearest of spiritual
kin to the fascists—such as the Ku Kluxers and other
haters and beaters of everybody and everything; "foreign"—
are after all mostly lacking in one very important element:
they lack the reforming, the real crusading zeal of
the foreign fascists. In other words, the nearest approach to
fascist material in this country is really too reactionary
to qualify as such. It has all the prejudices of the fascists,
but still one besides, and this one is fatal to the
spiritual unity of its makeup. Our pseudo-fascists, that is,
are still too strongly and strictly attached to the past
and everything by which it is symbolized—laissez-faire
capitalism, the Constitution, etc. They are not content
with preserving capitalism uberhaupts, but want to pre­
serve it in the one particular form to which they have already been accustomed. This is a purely petty-bourgeois phenomenon—a pseudo- or half-fascism—and limited, of course, to the more benighted strata even of the petty-bourgeoisie. It is looked upon with contempt by the more or less educated elements of this class; and it can hardly appeal to any great number of the workers, if only because these latter have suffered too much from capitalism in its present form. In short, the American "fascists" are still half-baked; they haven’t suffered enough to have their conservatism broken; they have fallen in with only the negative or the savage aspects of fascism. They have emotions and fetishes, but no thoughts worth mentioning and no ideals. They are oriented exclusively toward the past, and insofar as they have a vision of the future it is nothing more than a distorted image of the stage on which their forefathers strutted; they have yet suffered enough to have been well represented in contemporary public life by the present governor of Georgia, "O! Gene" Talmadge.

At the other pole we have half-fascists of a quite different sort who have taken over only the more intellectual or pretentious part of the fascist program; planned economy, "share the wealth", "Epic", incomes of $2,000 up per year for everyone who will work, confiscation of idle mills and factories, etc., etc. These people may be found in (or recently out of) all the political parties, inclusive of those adhering to one or the other of the Internationals, the with the possible exception of the G.O.P., which at least to all appearance is still living in the good old days of William McKinley, and doesn’t know or refuses to recognize that the world has ever moved since. The best and most typical representative of this category of half-fascists was no doubt the late Huey Long, who lacked, however, the fanaticism of a Hitler and the marxian (or labor) background of a Mussolini. But all in all, these people are probably doing more to promote the prospects of fascism in America than are the pure bigots of the first category, because they are more intelligent and tend to invest the popular reformist illusions with a halo of respectability.

Then, of course, there is still a third type of half-fascists, of which the Republican Party itself furnishes the most illuminating examples. They have really no respect for either half of the fascist hodge-podge; they are interested in fascism only as the lesser evil, and will wait for communism to develop before reconciling themselves to such concessions as "planned economy". They genuinely despise the mob emotions associated with fascism, but many of these people (Hearst, Hoover, et al) are themselves adepts in arousing these emotions for the protection of their own interests—appealing particularly to the prejudices of the petty-bourgeois rabble—and have to be reckoned with in case of a real contest.

But as yet there is no fusion of the types into a single individuality as makes the true fascist leader. And the circumstance that such a personality has not yet appeared on the American scene is only a further indication that the crisis here has not yet reached the critical point. Meanwhile the confusion will no doubt remain as great as at present; the incipient fascists will continue to fight among themselves, turn their crookedness and spiritual projects for forming the "Famer-Labor" party and make themselves more and more indistinguishable from the fascists and other bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois parties, and the pot will continue to call the kettle black.

Of one thing however, we need not entertain any doubt, and that is that fascism is here and is spreading. There is a spiritual and material affinity at least among the leaders of these various categories of still only half-fascists than might appear from their calling of names and their mutual in-ordinations and recriminations in the course of a presidential campaign. This is sufficiently indicated by the fact that Talmadge—that staunch upholder of the Constitution, who at least to all appearance is one of the strongest admirers of Roosevelt and his break with Roosevelt had nothing to do with any disregard of the Constitution. In reality, none of them cares a hang for the Constitution except insofar as it serves the interests of the American bourgeoisie in its struggle with the proletariat. The Republican Party itself furnishes the most illuminating examples. The difference is largely a matter of opinion as to which parts it is most advisable to disregard or to violate at the present stage of development. The real quarrel which most of the bourgeoisie has with Roosevelt is that he is too much inclined, in its view, to conciliation and the dispensation of relief for keeping down discontent. The bourgeoisie in general feels that such a policy involves a needless drain upon its income, that the unemployed are being "spoiled" and taught to expect too much, that at least for the present its slaves can be kept in subjection more economically by the army and the police, which are being paid for the purpose anyhow.

The Republican front is less unified than one would be led to think from the way it shouts. And the Democratic
Party, also, is innher disintegrated. The fact that the various administrations tend more and more to fuse with the ruling capitalist groups and are less and less susceptible of being regarded as the executive organ of all capitalists,—such a situation splits the old parties and leads to intensified efforts to found a new party.

The capitalist groups neglected by the Roosevelt Administration and which hitherto have backed the Democratic Party set up new organizations such as the "American Liberty League" in order to represent their interests better. In the Republican Party, the "young elements" turn against the reactionary traditions of the party in order to increase its power of competition. Groups of interests cut loose from both parties and establish contact with each other to maintain a skeleton organization as already exist., and is intended to lead to a new "third party". The viability of such a new organization is, however, hindered just as much by the present relations, which are headed for dictatorship, as its formation was hitherto precluded by the previous political system. So that ever and ever again there is a new attempt to harmonize the particular tendencies within the two-party system.

Liberalism, as the intellectual expression of competitive capitalism, is incapable of maintaining itself along any other path than the one by which it is doomed eventually to be destroyed. The finding itself economically in contradiction to the Roosevelt regime, Liberalism is politically condemned to support it. Conversely to the usual order of things, we here find the victim serving his hangman with the last meal before going to the gallows. By means of the liberalistic propaganda, the Roosevelt regime has succeeded in winning the great mass of the workers, so that in the coming elections also the gain of the parliamentary labor parties will be at most an insignificant one, if any. The outcome of the elections will show once more that the influence of the parliamentary labor movement upon American democracy is lighter than the jokes of Mae West. The trade-union leaders, who logically function within the framework of the capitalist parties, still find it very easy to mobilize the entire trade-union movement for Roosevelt, in spite of all the previous disappointments which his Administration has brought the workers. The last convention of the United Mine Workers of America went down deep in its pockets for the Roosevelt campaign fund and decided unanimously to vote for this best representative of industrial unionism. The secretary of the U.M. of A. proudly announced: "Let our vote for Roosevelt be our answer to the money bags of Wall Street." But they had decided only against the small and for the bigger money bags.

When big capitalists like Mellon, Haas, Morgan, Du Pont are dragged before investigating committees in order to disclose the secrets of politics and all conferences of the manufacturers and bankers protests are made against measures of the Roosevelt regime,—can the layman come to any other conclusion than that Roosevelt is actually carrying on in opposition to Capital? What the administration, in the interest of its re-election, has struck upon individual capitalist groups, and is compelled to favor others, that it has to draft tax programs that bring results, and that the menacing war makes it necessary to clean up the armament industry and to bring about a national coordination of the international credit policy,—such obvious things vanish behind the sensational interpretations put upon them by the press. People fail to see that it is precisely the strengthening of the capitalist and military positions, not the longing for peace and a sound national economy, that lies at the basis of the activity of these investigating committees.

However, it is not the propaganda for or against Roosevelt that will decide in the last instance the victory of the one or the other party. The fact that now was a start that under the Roosevelt Administration in holding up temporarily the economic decline, and in stabilizing the system for a time at a certain crisis level, assures the administration sufficient sympathy so that its re-election is highly probable. The time before the election is too brief to perceive in full view of the new worsening of the economic situation which is now under way an artificial prolongation of the present stagnation. The economic breathing spell attained by way of credit inflation and intensified technical rationalization can still be prolonged somewhat and enable Roosevelt to win the race again. But behind the credit inflation looms the unconcealed inflation of the currency, the complete expropriation of the middle class and intensified pauperization of the workers. The open inflation is less seductive in the United States than in most countries, owing to the high degree of amalgamation between debtors and creditors, it is nevertheless within the realm of the probabilities in view of the impossibility of sharp and sudden turns in the field of economy and politics. The danger of inflation is being played up stronger than ever by the opposition to Roosevelt. With or without inflation, however, the present economic policy is speculating on better times; even today it is living on the hopped-for profits of the future. If these fail to appear, the present program is bound to capsize and will be abandoned even as a phrase, Politics will then become as brutal as economics ever is, and the "Savior of the people" must then become an "Enemy of the people".

But all the election shouting can be of interest only to those whose thoughts are turned in the capitalistdirec-
tion. As regards the parliamentary labor movement, this is bound up with recognizing in principle the capitalist system and its State, and also with the hope of deriving from the parliamentary table a few paltry crumbs. "Leaders must eat"; that is the final ground for the parliamentaryism of the present-day labor movement. Even tho there are only a few parliamentary positions, still one can bring in more membership contributions with a parliamentary than with an anti-parliamentary program. Whichever way they may vote, the workers will always find in the last instance that they have only made their choice between parasites and exploiters. As for us, we attach no special importance to the question of who exploits us; the thing that we are concerned with is the doing away with all exploitation. And so we can only advise our class comrades not to vote. Or if they reject this proposal as too negative, and wish to conduct a more positive and more realistic policy,—well, of course, there is no one to prevent them from splitting in the face of the parliamentarians.
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THE MINERS’ STRIKE IN BELGIUM

The strike of the Belgium miners in May 1935 must be rated as one of the most significant struggles of the past ten years. These strikers employed tactics which had not been heard of before in the history of Belgian labor. For the first time large masses of workers refused to accept the leadership of trade unions as well as the advice of party politicians; instead, they insisted on conducting the strike themselves and allowed only members from their own ranks to represent them at the arbitration boards. For the first time, thus, the workers acted unitedly as a class in contradiction to party and trade union policies which sought to separate them into trades, crafts, etc., a policy as we have repeatedly pointed out—that is utterly wrong in face of the objective conditions. The birth of the self-initiative of these workers is all the more astounding because there existed no group which propagated these principles.

What factors were instrumental in turning the workers against their unions and towards new methods?

The Situation Before the Strike.

The "black country"—as the mining district in South Belgium is called—is poverty stricken. Unemployment is rampant. Since 1925 many mines have been closed and of the 35,000 miners formerly employed, only 20,000 worked at the time of the strike, and many of these were employed but part of the time. In other districts farther North, conditions are somewhat better; nowhere, however, does a miner work five days per week, and the wages are very low. These wages are not stationary; they fall or rise in accordance with the change of market prices for consumers’ goods. This "genuine" method is called the "flexible wage scale", and as wages are usually behind prices, it is estimated that the loss on the workers' side amounts to approximately 30%. The standard of living is so low that in most cases miners are compelled to live on a pittance of bread during their eight hours of hard and dangerous labor. The mines are in horrible condition; many have faulty or no safety devices at all, and the number of casualties is extremely high.

The trade unions and the Socialist Party found in the miners their strongest supporters. The Stalinists had and still have little influence. As the economic crisis deepened, the workers called for action and demanded the general strike, but the leadership declared that strikes at that time would mean suicide to the organization, Sporadic
strikes, however, broke out in many districts and in 1932 they gained such momentum that the union leaders were compelled to support the movement.

During and after these strikes, the Trotskyites gained great influence because of their persistent fight against the union bureaucracy, and although the miners remained members of the unions, the ideological influence of the Trotskyites was widely felt. Dissatisfaction with the trade union leadership grew and found expression in many demonstrations and demands for action. The leaders balked and, during the cabinet-crisis, went to the king, told him of the plight of the masses and persuaded him to form a Catholic-socialist cabinet. Five former socialists entered the government as secretaries of state among whom were Delattre, president of the miners' union, and Spaak, a former arch-enemy of the reformists. The masses who had lost confidence in the latter soon realized his treacherous role and relieved him of his job as editor of "Socialist Action". With ever increasing force, it dawned upon the miners that they could hope for nothing from their leaders and that they would have to rely upon their own power to circumvent further pauperization.

The Strike.

On May 1, 1935 thousands of workers followed the call of the socialist parties and the trade unions to celebrate May-Day. The huge street demonstrations were peaceful and no sign of unrest was noticeable. Suddenly, two days before May-Day, the miners went on strike. The mining company refused to comply with the demand. Thereupon 600 miners went out on strike, issuing a strike call which included the following points:

1. Occupation of the pit-heads
2. Spreading of the strike to other mines
3. The strike to be led by the strikers themselves, interference by trade unions and political parties not to be tolerated
4. Dismissal of the strike breakers
5. 10% wage increase
6. The trade unions to be informed of these demands

Twenty-four hours later the company yielded; the strike was over.

The news of this speedy success spread rapidly from mine to mine. Everywhere it was talked about; everywhere the miners felt that they too could do what the boys from the "Pont de Loup" had done. About a week later the great strike broke out. Food prices had been increased by 10% while the wages remained constant. The bitterness of the workers reached its height when it became known that the socialist Minister Delattre, had cancelled the additional pay for the care of children which usually had been granted by the conservative government of Thesau in 1932. The day after the publication of this new decree, 500 workers of the St. Barbara mine struck. Following the "Pont de Loup" example, they remained on the property of the company. The company refused to negotiate and advised the strikers to leave the property before midnight or they would call in the militia. The majority of the strikers disregarded the warning. At 12 o'clock lights were suddenly turned off and the militia attacked the unarmed workers. The battle raged until dawn before the miners yielded to the superior military force. Wholesale arrests followed. The strike seemed to be crushed, but on the following day 10,000 miners at Hennesau and Charleroi walked out in protest against the butchery at St. Barbara. A small number, however, if one remembers that there are approximately 30,000 miners in these districts. Yet the significance lies in the fact that the strike broke out spontaneously and that the strikers refused to be led by the official trade union leaders. The ruling class and its lackeys were very much disturbed by the development of the strike; that not first not more than 15 to 20% of the total workers on strike, and the government organs in collaboration with the trade unions labored feverishly to discredit it and bring it under control. They knew that a leaderless mass movement might attempt to crush the "sacred institutions of the capitalist state. A former member of the German Reichstag, Delbrueck, once said of the great election victory of the Social Democrats: "Such a victory could become dangerous if there were no leaders, but with leaders one can negotiate; they are humanoid like we are and they too cook their soup with water".

However, these masses had no leaders. The workers had consumed a real united front in their own ranks. They refused to be misled by parties and trade unions, and they ignored the usual procedure of trade unionism with each of the craft unions determining independently its own attitude in the past, the unorganized mass had not been called upon at all, and yet very often this same mass represents the factor that may determine success or failure of a strike.

In this strike, the workers succeeded in overcoming their organizational disability. They composed their resolutions jointly, ignoring the specific organizational attachment of the various individuals. Class unity superseded organizational discipline.

For the strikers this movement was essentially a struggle. They were searching for new forms in their struggle only because the old way of the unions had failed. And these new forms were found in two measures: organizationally
in the self-acting fighting-committees (workers' councils) whose actions were independent of all parties and unions, and, in action, thru the occupation of various mines. Of the 15 mines that were on strike on Thursday, May 16, six were occupied by the workers. Their unity was expressed in the common direction. Together they fought and together they determined to conclude the issue. The mines were occupied in order to prevent the continuation of work by strike breakers, and also because it was essential to preserve a united front which would disappear if individual strikers would go home and lose touch with the mass. The feeling of solidarity is much greater when all are continuously together. The occupation would also serve as a weapon against the mine owners as it was expected that troops would be called in. It was planned to damage the equipment if the workers would be attacked by the militia. This was carried out later but only to a small extent. Although the workers had a picket at the dynamite magazine whose contents might be used for damaging certain shafts—nothing was done in this respect.

When a mine was occupied, the gates were closed and a workers' defense committee was formed. Pickets were placed at the gates day and night preventing anyone to enter. The emergency work was carried out by the strikers themselves. The horses were regularly fed and the pumps continued to work to remove the water. The movement thus assumed a character entirely devoid of force. It was decided to take forcible action only when the troops applied force.

The Trade Unions Choke the Strike.

The administrative authorities as well as the trade unions tried in every possible way to crush the strike movement. The miners' federation demanded that its members resume work, thus becoming a strike breaking organization. The main council of the miners' union issued a proclamation to the miners in which it warned of communist agitators who put difficulties in the way of the five socialist secretaries of state that were making an effort to ameliorate the conditions of the working class. The proclamation declared that strikes at that time were justified only in exceptional cases, and then only if arbitration failed to resolve the difficulties. From the beginning, the miners' union opposed the sporadic strikes and pointed out in a manifesto that these strikes were "a breach of promise" and in opposition to the tactics pursued by the modern labor movement.

These tactics, to settle the conflict, met with no success. The only result (which was important to the ruling class and its servants, the trade unions) was that the great mass of miners did not yet participate in the strike. The bureaucracy of the trade unions now tried to employ different methods to break the strike, which, evidently, proved more successful. As was known, the demands of the miners were the only demand, and the movement was convinced that for a minimum wage of 30 fr. a day was almost general, while in addition in some mines an increase in wages of 5%, in others of 10% was demanded.

These varying demands were used very cleverly by the trade unions to settle the conflicts in various individual mines. In the Marchienne au Pont Mine the miners' leaders obtained the promise of the Mine Administration that the lowest wages would be improved. The strikers were satisfied with this settlement and decided to resume work on Friday. In the Daniel Mine the conflicts were settled in the same way. In the industrial center of Charleroi another way was tried, in addition to the above mentioned methods, to break the strike. The miners' union called for a congress on the 19th of May at the coal center of Charleroi only. It was ascertained that around Charleroi eight local strikes with 3,000 men involved were effective. The delegates defended the occupation of the mines and declared that this had not been influenced by communistic activities, but that "the miners were forced by misery to do so". Finally a resolution was passed which:

1. disapproved of the occupation of the mines by the miners
2. urged the miners to accept the old existing wage agreements
3. and stated that the national, mixed mine commission would be requested to arrange a meeting to discuss improving wages which are below 30 fr. a day

This resolution was accepted with a small majority; 17 locals were for it, 14 against it, and 5 abstained from voting. Various locals were not represented. It is important to note that the union employed here the "democracy" of a board of arbitration as a weapon against the strikers.

The State Participates.

The unions were not the only participants in stifling the strike movement. They had strong allies in the state authorities. What better purpose could the five socialist Ministers perform who had the armed force at their disposal? Monday, May 19th, it became known that 500 soldiers were on their way to the industrial center of Charleroi.
and this naturally aroused the deep anger of the miners. The strikers went to the mines and occupied a few more shafts. On Tuesday, May 20th, the news spread that the troops had actually arrived. When this became known, many hurried to the mines, and especially the women encouraged the men to hold out. The strikers allowed no one to enter the mines, not even the socialist and communist leaders.

The militia settled the struggle in their well-known way. Without losing time, they marched to the mines, encircled them and attacked the workers with tear gas, driving them out of the shafts. Fifteen men at Pont de Loup were unwilling to surrender. They climbed 200 meters down thru an air shaft to start a hunger strike. After being threatened that they would be gassed also, they were forced to give up. Within a short time the shafts were cleared and all workers were occupied by soldiers. However, this interference by the police did not end the conflict. The miners answered with an extension of the strike. The following day, Wednesday, work was laid down in 28 mines involving 13,000 workers. On Thursday, May 23, the strike movement spread further into the center of Charleroi and vicinity. Thirty-two of 53 mines were now on strike, affecting 18,000 men.

The interference of the armed force had obviously caused quite the opposite result to that planned by the socialist Ministers. Instead of suppressing the movement, it had spread to 18,000 workers and the strike was growing stronger every day. The other attempt by the socialist Government was made to reach the goal by means of "democracy". Reasons have apparently no influence on the miners, said the central organ of the Dutch Social Democracy, on May 23. "The advice of the union leaders are disregarded. The latter hope to reach an agreement at the meeting of the national union leaders and the five socialist Ministers, the union leaders and the armed forces were unable to choke the strike and thus submit the workers anew to the exploitation of capitalism, they resorted, as a last measure, to "democracy". The speculation on the influence which the workers supposedly have on the mine commission had the desired effect.

In the Mine Commission a compromise was reached with the promise that the lowest wages were to be improved. Furthermore, there should be a general increase in wages of 5% because the index of the food prices had been raised that much. As a "concession" of the coal barons, an immediate payment of 2-3% wage increase was obtained which, however, was to be deducted later from the 5% wage increase taking place on June 1. Finally, the socialist government announced thru Delattre that the decree about the deduction of the additional pay for children would be subject to a later revision.

The miners subsequently returned to their pits. "The strikers appear to have regained their arms", wrote the Social Democratic Press. "They listen again to the union leaders who appear in their meetings"

Local Charleroi of the miners' union resolved by 57% to accept the agreement, and the conflict was also satisfied. The five socialist Ministers and the trade unions had attained their aim - the stifling of the strike.

Conclusion.

This struggle disclosed to the Belgian miners the role that trade unions and social democracy play in the present period. It cleared up more clearly to the workers that social democracy and trade unions in case of a conflict between workers and the owning class take the side of capitalism, and that they will employ all methods in order to suppress a strike. At the same time this strike revealed the pronounced class antagonism. In order to avoid only a deduction in the additional pay for children and to assure themselves of as low a wage as 30 francs a day - meaning 120-150 fr. in a general working week of 4-5 days, in other words, just for the bare existence, the workers were forced to wage a fight against the State and five socialist Ministers with their armed forces and, in addition, even against their own trade unions.

The miners' strike of May 1935 is over, but the movement has not yet reached its end. 1935 was only the continuation of the strike movement in 1932 with subsequent smaller strikes. The reasons for the continued difficulties are still in existence and the situation is thus ripe for revolutionary propaganda. These workers found thru class instinct the right way to united action will now understand that the forms of struggle are not "accidental" but will be at the center of the coming class movements. The propaganda that is now required must emphasize the necessity for industrial unity and the importance of self-leadership on the part of the workers. Methods to be used in the struggle must be decided by the workers themselves and not be outside agencies which only lead labor in the interest of capitalism.
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BOOM WITH TWELVE MILLION UNEMPLOYED

The year 1935 witnessed a notable upswing of industrial production in a number of countries, and particularly in the United States. With the beginning of 1935, a downward movement again set in which in the U.S.A. lowered production by 10 to 15 percent and brought the number of unemployed to over 12 millions. The business optimism created by the upswing of 1935 is again on the decline.

As compared with the month of October 1934, the output of means of production in the U.S.A. for the same month of 1935 had increased by 92 percent, tho in the consumption-goods industries the increase amounted to only 4 percent. This increase in producers' goods is attributable to the replacement of fixed capital—a matter which had become necessary but to which no attention was given in the long years of crisis—and is likewise evidence of the intensified technical rationalization of the enterprises, as indicated by the fact that the number of unemployed and the production have increased simultaneously. There was no expansion of fixed capital, no important new investments. And since the beginning of 1936, the number of orders of machinery for the existing enterprises has again declined. The continuance of capital accumulation is accordingly out of the picture.

The rise in production was accompanied by an improvement in the way of profits. What M. C. Taylor has had to say on this point with reference to the situation in the United States Steel Corporation holds also for a number of other capitalist enterprises: "In the light of the depressed conditions which prevailed during the four years prior to 1935, in which profits fell short of an amount sufficient to cover full depreciation provisions and other general charges, the improved results should be found more encouraging. They demonstrate in no small way the effectiveness of intensive administration and economies successfully instituted thru the united efforts of the entire staff in an endeavor to bring about profitable results." Even tho the profits have risen, still the absence of new investments shows that a profitable basis for the further progressive accumulation is not present. So the light boom of 1935 is doomed to be nipped in the bud. The promising and much cited rise in the value of stocks, though temporary, is founded more upon the speculative hope of future earnings than a new expansion of fixed capital, no important new investments. And since the beginning of 1936, the number of orders of machinery for the existing enterprises has again declined. The continuance of capital accumulation is accordingly out of the picture.

THE "VICTORY" IN SPAIN

The revolutionary wave which has in Spain been alternately advancing and receding since 1930, the as a general trend growing stronger, has again led to a defeat of the reaction and to the victory of the "progressive" forces. After the deposing of Alfonso XIII in 1931, a republican government was formed in which the Socialists also were represented. This government, with Zamorra as prime minister, directed itself forthwith against the workers, under the well-approved slogan of "law and order." In the elections of November 1933, the parties of the Right received the majority; a government of the Center was formed which did away with the unessential reforms of the previous government and operated in the interest of all the country's reactionary elements. In 1934, Spain experienced a great wave of strikes which, however, proved of no avail. The movement for the defeat of the reaction culminated in the bloody suppressed October uprising. The lack of unity among the ruling classes themselves brings in its train one government crisis after the other. The elections of February 16th resulted in a victory for the newly formed "People's Block," composed of Republicans, Socialists and Communists. The governing functions were taken over by...
the left-republican bourgeoisie; the power is in the hands of people who are unwilling to use it in favor of the workers, and so are compelled to employ it against them. Azana and his cabinet represent the interests of bourgeois society and are enemies of the proletariat. They have made a few unessential concessions to the workers, such as the liberation of political prisoners (who, of course, can be arrested again tomorrow,) in order to calm the masses temporarily until the state power is sufficiently reorganized to prevent any real change of the workers' situation. In this connection they are being supported by all shades of socialists and communists. Workers are still being fed with bullets, and are called upon to observe law and order.

The "victory" in Spain is a victory of the labor fakers. The confidence still reposed in these persons by great masses of the workers will be dearly paid for. Nor will the poverty of the farming population be relieved, as this government is incapable of any essential reforms. But even the breaking up of the large estates, which is not at all likely, would leave the workers' situation unchanged, except for increasing the number of their enemies. It is quite impossible as yet to speak of a victory of the workers in Spain. A change of government can mean nothing to them, and that is the most that has yet come about. If the workers are actually to go farther, if they should begin to take seriously with the workers' own account, they would have to recognize forthwith that their present "friends" are their enemies. The people's-front government is resolved to club down just as a fascist dictatorship would do, if they should venture to overstep the bounds of the exploitation economy. The struggle of the Spanish workers on their own account has yet to begin; they are still fighting for others and for illusions. They will have to recognize their present "friends" as more dangerous than their enemies of yesterday. The scurvy rabble of the Communist Party "will support Azana's government in the measure in which it holds to its obligations and carries out the program of the People's Front". As we read in the Bundschau of February 27, 1936, Claridad, the social-democratic organ of Largo Caballero, writes: "We shall be on the side of the government to carry out with all necessary firmness the common program". What can really be the program of professional labor traitors as Caballero? So long as these people make politics in Spain, it is nonsense to speak of a victory there of the workers.

The People's Block of today will leave capitalist society intact. But if ever new uprisings will occur, in spite of the Block, for the present government has neither the nor the power to effect essential economic changes. Apart from the spontaneous factor at work in conditions of impoverishment and which leads to the creation of mass movements, it is also improbable that the Spanish Syndicalists will continue to leave the field of the labor movement so uncontested to the competing organizations of the Communists and Socialists. The weakness and disparity of the ruling classes themselves, the impossibility of preserving an imperialist development in Spain under the present conditions of the permanent world crisis, will sooner or later abolish the present pseudo-democracy in Spain and lead to a new bourgeois dictatorship, unless the working masses of Spain take up arms and proceed against the present people's-front government, begin to organize across the country with the expropriation of the owners, and exercise the power on their own account. That may come about in case the masses movements slip from the hands of the political truckers. We may then be presented with the prospect of something more hopeful in Spain than the usual defeat which the workers endure when they restrict themselves to questions of who or what party holds the reins of government.

---

Marx on Social Reform (Selected Essays, p. 131)

HOWEVER partial the industrial revolt may be, it conceals within itself a universal soul: political revolt may be never so universal, but it hides a narrow-minded spirit under the most colossal form. A social revolution may be considered from the standpoint of the whole because, even if it only occurs in a factory district, it is a protest against men against degraded life, because it proceeds from the standpoint of the real individual, because the community against whose separation from himself the individual reacts, is the real community, the civic community. The political soul of a revolution, on the other hand, consists in the endeavour of the classes without political influence to abolish their isolation from the community and from government. Their standpoint is that of the State, an abstract whole, which exists only in and through its separation from real life, which is unthinkable without the organized antagonism between the general idea and the individual existence of man. Consequently a revolution of political souls organizes a ruling clique in society, in accordance with the limited and doubly-cleft nature of these souls, at the cost of society. Every revolution dissolves the old society in so far it is social. Every revolution overthrows the old power; in so far it is political. Without a revolution, socialism cannot be enforced. It requires th's political act, so far as it has need of the process of destruction. But where its organizing activity begins, where its proper aim emerges, there socialism casts away the political hull.
In its revolutionary struggles, the working class needs organization. When great masses have to act as a unit, a mechanism is needed for understanding and discussion, for the making and issuing of decisions, and for the proclaiming of actions and aims.

This does not mean, of course, that all great actions and universal strikes are carried out with soldierlike discipline, after the decisions of a central board. Such cases will occur, it is true, but more often, thru their eager fighting spirit, their solidarity and passion, masses will break out in strikes to help their comrades, or to protest against some capitalist atrocity, with no general plan. Then such a strike will spread like a prairie fire all over the country.

In the first Russian revolution, the strike waves went up and down. Often the most successful were those that had not been decided in advance, while the strikes that had been proclaimed by the central committees often failed.

The strikers, once they are fighting, want mutual contact and understanding in order to unite in an organized force. Here a difficulty presents itself. Without strong organization, without joining forces and binding their will in one solid body, without uniting their action in one common deed, they cannot win against the strong organization of capitalist power. But when thousands and millions of workers are united in one body, this can only be managed by functionaries acting as representatives of the members. And we have seen that these officials become masters of the organization, with interests different from the revolutionary interests of the workers.

How can the working class, in revolutionary fights, unite its force into a big organization without falling into the pit of officialdom? The answer is given by putting this question: if all that the workers do is to pay their fees and to obey when their leaders order them out and order them in, are they themselves then really fighting their fight for freedom?

Fighting for freedom is not letting your leaders think for you and decide, and following obediently behind them, or from time to time scolding them. Fighting for freedom is partaking to the full of one's capacity, thinking and deciding for oneself, taking all the responsibilities as a self-relying individual amidst equal comrades. It is true that to think for oneself, to think out what is true and right, with a head dulled by fatigue, is the hardest, but it is true and right, with a head dulled by fatigue, is the hardest, but if all that the workers do is to pay their fees and to obey when their leaders order them out and order them in, are they themselves then really fighting their fight for freedom?

In the Russian revolution when strikes broke out irregularly in the factories, the strikers chose delegates which, for the whole town or for an industry or railway over the whole state or province, assembled to bring unity into the fight. They had at once to discuss political matters and to assume all the responsibilities as a self-relying individual amidst equal comrades. It is true that to think for oneself, to think out what is true and right, with a head dulled by fatigue, is the hardest, but it is the only way to freedom. To be liberated by others, whose leadership is the essential part of the liberation, means the getting of new masters instead of the old ones.
primitive government when the Czarist power was paralyzed, when officials and officers did not know what to do left to the field to them. Thus these Soviets became the permanent center of the revolution; they were constituted by delegates of all the factories, striking or working. They could not think of becoming an independent power. The members were often changed and sometimes the whole Soviet was arrested and had to be replaced by new delegates. Moreover they knew that their force was rooted in the workers' will to strike or not to strike; often their calls were not followed when they did not concur with the workers' instinctive feelings of power or weakness, of passion or prudence. So the Soviet system proved to be the appropriate form of organization for a revolutionary working class. In 1917 it was at once adopted in Russia and everywhere working class as a self-organized province to the workers' councils, their communal boards, their new courts of justice, illegal at the time, usurping simply the functions of the powerless functionaries of royalty. While their delegates in Paris discussed and made the new constitution, the actual constitution was made all over the country.

In a universal strike the functions of these committees are enlarged. Now delegates of all the factories and plants have to discuss and to decide about all the conditions of the fight; they will try to regulate into consciously devised actions all the fighting power of the workers; they must see how they will react upon the governments' measures, the capitalists' organizations, or the capitols' and workers' and soldiers' Soviets came into being and were the driving force of the revolution.

The complementary proof was given in Germany. In 1918, after the breakdown of the military power, workers' and soldiers' Soviets in imitation of Russia were founded. But the German workers, educated in party and union discipline, full of social-democratic ideas of republic and reform as the next political aims, chose their party- and union-officials as delegates into these Soviets. When fighting and acting themselves, they acted and fought in the right way, but from lack of selfconfidence they chose leaders filled with capitalistic ideas and these always spoiled matters. It is natural that a Such congresses then resolved to abdicate for a new parliament, to be chosen as soon as possible.

Here it became evident that the council system is the appropriate form of organization only for a revolutionary working class. If the workers do not intend to go on with the revolution, they have no use for Soviets. If the workers are not far enough advanced yet to see the way of revolution, if they are satisfied with the leaders doing all the work of preaching and mediating and bargaining for reforms within capitalism, then parliaments and party- and union-congresses, called workers parliaments because they work after the same principle — are all they need. If, however, they fight with all their energy for revolution, if with intense eagerness and passion they take part in every event, if they think over and decide for themselves all details of fighting because they have to do the fighting, then workers' councils are the organization they need.

This implies that workers' councils cannot be formed by revolutionary groups. Such groups can only propagate the idea by explaining to their fellow workers the necessity of council-organization, when the working class self-defends and the Soviets are the form of organization only for fighting masses, for the working class as a whole, not for revolutionary groups. They originate and grow up along with the first action of a revolutionary character. With the development of revolution, their importance and their functions increase. At first they may appear as simple strike committees, in opposition to the labor leaders when the strikes go beyond the intentions of the leaders, and rebel against the unions and their leaders.

When the revolution develops to such power that the State power is seriously affected, then the workers' councils have to assume political functions. In a political revolution, this is their first and chief function. They are the central bodies of the workers' power; they have to take all measures to weaken and defeat the adversary. Like a power at war, they have to stand guard over the whole country, controlling the efforts of the capitalist class to collect and restore their forces and to subdue the workers. They have to look after a number of public affairs which otherwise were state affairs: public health, public security, and the uninterrupted course of social life. They have to take care of the production itself; the most important and difficult task and concern of the working class in revolution.

A social revolution in history never began as a simple change of political rulers who then, after having acquired political power, carried out the necessary social changes by means of new laws. Already, before and during the fight, the rising class built up its new social organs as new sprouting branches within the dead husk of the former organism. In the French revolution, the new capitalist class, the citizens, the business men, the artisans, built up in each town and village their communal boards, their new courts of justice, illegal at the time, usurping simply the functions of the powerless functionaries of royalty. While their delegates in Paris discussed and made the new constitution, the actual constitution was made all over the country.
by the citizens holding their political meetings, building up their political organs afterwards legalized by law.

In the same way during the proletarian revolution, the new rising class creates its new forms of organization which step by step in the process of revolution supersedes the old State organization. The workers' councils, as the new form of political organization, take the place of parliamentarism, the political form of capitalist rule.

2.

Parliamentary democracy is considered by capitalist theorists as well as by social-democrats as the perfect democracy, according to justice and equality. In reality, it is only a disguise for capitalist domination, and contrary to justice and equality. It is the council system that is the true workers' democracy.

Parliamentary democracy is foul democracy. The people are allowed to vote once in four or five years and to choose their delegates; woe to them if they do not choose the right man. Only at the polls the voters can exert their power; thereafter they are powerless. The chosen delegates are now the rulers of the people; they make laws and constitute governments, and the people have to obey. Usually, by the election mechanism, only the big capitalist parties win and with their newspapers, their papers, their noisy advertising, have a chance to win. Real trustees of discontented groups seldom have a chance to win some few seats.

In the Soviet system, each delegate can be repealed at any moment. Not only do the workers continually remain in touch with the delegate, discussing and deciding for themselves, but the delegate is only a temporary messenger to the council assemblies. Capitalist politicians declare this "characterless" role of the delegate, in that he may have to speak against his personal opinion. They forget that just because there are no fixed delegates, only those will be sent whose opinions conform to those of the workers.

The principle of parliamentary representation is that the delegate in parliament shall act and vote according to his own conscience and conviction. If on some question he should ask the opinion of his voters, it is only due to his own prudence. Not the people, but he on his own responsibility has to decide. The principle of the Soviet system is just the reverse; the delegates only express the opinions of the workers.

In the elections for parliament, the citizens are grouped according to voting districts and counties; that is to say according to their dwelling place. Persons of different trades or classes, having nothing in common, accidentally living near one another, are combined into an artificial group which has to be represented by one delegate.

In the councils, the workers are represented in their natural groups, according to factories, shops and plants. The workers of one factory or one big plant form a unit collectively organizing along with their collective work. In revolutionary epochs, they are in immediate contact to interchange opinions; they live under the same conditions and have the same interests. They must act together; the factory is the unit which has to strike or to work, and its workers must decide what they collectively have to do. So the organization and delegation of workers in factories and workshops is the necessary form.

It is at the same time the principle of representation of the communist order growing up in the revolution. Production is the basis of society, or, more rightly, it is the contents, the essence of society; hence the order of production is at the same time the order of society. Factories are the working units, the cells of which the organism of society consists. The main task of the political organs, which mean nothing else but the organs managing the totality of society, concerns the productive work of society. Hence it goes without saying that the working people, in their councils, discuss these matters and choose their delegates, collected in their production-units.

We should not believe, though, that parliamentarism, as the political form of capitalism, was not founded on production. Always the political organization is adapted to the character of production as the basis of society. Representation, according to dwelling place, belongs to the system of petty capitalist production, where each man is supposed to be the possessor of his own small business. Then there is a mutual connection between all these businessmen at one place, dealing with one another, living as neighbors, knowing one another and therefore sending one common delegate to parliament. This was the basis of parliamentarism. We have seen that later on this parliamentary delegation-system proved to be the right system for representing the growing and changing class interests within capitalism.

At the same time it is clear now why the delegates in parliament had to take political power in their hands. Their political task was only a small part of the task of society. The most important part, the productive work, was the personal task of all the separate producers, the citizens as business men; it required nearly all their energy and care. When every individual took care of his own small lot, then society as their totality went right. The general regulations by law, necessary conditions, doubtless, but of minor extent, could
be left to the care of a special group or trade, the politicians. With communist production the reverse is true. Here the all important thing, the collective productive work, is the task of society as a whole; it concerns all the workers collectively. Their personal work does not claim their whole energy and care; their mind is turned to the collective task of society. The general regulation of this collective work cannot be left to a special group of persons; it is the vital interest of the whole working people.

There is another difference between parliamentarism and the soviet system. In parliamentary democracy, one vote is given to every adult man and sometimes woman on the strength of their supreme, inborn right of belonging to mankind, as is so beautifully expressed in celebration speeches. In the soviets, on the other hand, only the workers are represented. Can the council system then be said to be truly democratic if it excludes the other classes of society?

The council system embodies the dictatorship of the proletarian. Marx and Engels, more than half a century ago, explained that the social revolution was to lead to the dictatorship of the working class as the next political form and that this was essential in order to bring about the necessary changes in society. Socialists, thinking in terms of parliamentary representation only, tried to excuse or to criticize the violation of democracy and the injustice of arbitrarily excluding persons from the polls because they belong to certain classes. Now we see how the development of the proletarian class struggle in a natural way produces the organs of this dictatorship, the soviets.

It is certainly no violation of justice that the councils, as the fighting centers of a revolutionary working class, do not include representatives of the opposing class. And thereafter the matter is not different. In a rising communist society there is no place for capitalistic; they have to disappear and they will disappear. Whoever takes part in the collective work is a member of the collectivity and takes part in the decisions. Persons, however, who stand outside the process of collective production, are, by the structure of the council system, automatically excluded from influence upon it. Whatever remains of the former exploiters and robbers has no vote in the regulation of a production in which they take no part.

There are other classes in society that do not directly belong to the two chief opposite classes: small farmers, independent artisans, intellectuals. In the revolutionary fight they are on the same side, but on the whole they are not very important, because they have less fighting power. Mostly their forms of organization and their aims are different. To make friends with them or to neutralize them, if this is possible without impeding the proper aims or to fight them resolutely if necessary, to decide upon the way of dealing with them with equity and firmness, will be the concern, often a matter of difficult tactics, of the fighting working class. In the production-system, insofar as their work is useful and necessary, they will find their place and they will exert their influence after the principle that whoever does the work has a chief vote in regulating the work.

More than half a century ago, Engels said that thru the proletarian revolution the State would disappear; instead of the ruling over men would come the managing of affairs. This was said at a time when there could not be any clear idea about how the working class would come into power. Now we see the truth of this statement confirmed. In the process of revolution, the old State Power will be destroyed, and the organs that take its place, the workers’ councils, for the time being, will certainly have important political functions still to repress the remnants of capitalist power. Their political function of governing, however, will be gradually turned into nothing but the economic function of managing the collective process of production of goods for the needs of society.

---

J. H.

---

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION of the nineteenth century can not draw its poetry from the past, it can draw that only from the future. It cannot start upon its work before it has stricken off all superstition concerning the past. Former revolutions required historic reminiscences in order to intoxicate themselves with their own issues. The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead in order to reach its issue. With the former, the phrase surpasses the substance; with this one, the substance surpasses the phrase.

---Proletarian revolutions criticise themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course; come back to what seems to have been accomplished, in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth, and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects—until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: "Hi! Rhodius, his salut!"

Marx; The Eighteenth Brumaire; p.14.

Conze's elementary introduction to dialectical materialism is well designed to meet a long-felt need in the labor movement for a popular and yet scientific presentation of the Marxist method of thinking. Even if his book does not offer much that is new theoretically, except in the choice of the examples, still it is of great value for the choice of workers, especially because of its exemplary clear and simple language.

After emphasizing the necessity of scientific method for the control of nature and society, Conze explains the main postulates of the materialist dialectic: the necessity of concrete thinking, regard for the unity of opposites, the viewing of all things as in process of motion, and the recognition of the contradictions by which all motion is determined. Conze's interpretation of these propositions is based on expositions from the contemporary political and economic scene and is fully adapted to the general understanding. Special attention is here devoted to the contested leader-mass problem, and Conze represents the view that however low the degree of consciousness involved, the mass is after all capable of self-guarding its interests. The acceptance of this assumption would make it easier to understand the historical development.

By way of illustrating the proposition of contradiction, Conze selects oppositions like that between capitalist production and social consumption, though without making plain that this contradiction is in need of further clarification by means of the one between accumulation and the need for profit. Conze also refers to the contradiction affecting the labor movement, that between reformism and socialism; his view is that mass organizations are of necessity reformist, and socialist organizations of necessity sectarian. At the same time, however, Conze considers collectively revolutionary actions as possible only in case they are theoretically grasped in advance. In this way, his exposition itself becomes involved in contradictions; for, on the one hand, it ascribes to the masses a correct mode of action in spite of inadequate theoretical recognition, and, on the other, it denies the possibility of success to any action which is not theoretically grasped. Even though Conze, more than other authors, may attribute great importance to the mass, still after all he holds fast to that position which makes the historical movement dependent on the development of the socialist ideology. On this basis, in considering the unity of opposites and in illustrating

the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-organization of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze's frequently literal carrying over of dialectical postulates onto the various problems culminates in the assertion that "scientific thought knows no certainty, but only varying degrees of probability, to be cocksure is to be unscientific." This statement is at the same time its own devaluation, for, assuming that Conze's thought is "scientific," one cannot be "certain" either that "scientific thought knows no certainty," but the limits which Conze set for himself do not permit a more exhaustive criticism. An interpretation of these limits of his book is the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-organization of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze's frequently literal carrying over of dialectical postulates onto the various problems culminates in the assertion that "scientific thought knows no certainty, but only varying degrees of probability, to be cocksure is to be unscientific." This statement is at the same time its own devaluation, for, assuming that Conze's thought is "scientific," one cannot be "certain" either that "scientific thought knows no certainty," but the limits which Conze set for himself do not permit a more exhaustive criticism. An interpretation of these limits of his book is the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-organization of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze, more than other authors, may attribute great importance to the mass, still after all he holds fast to that position which makes the historical movement dependent on the development of the socialist ideology. On this basis, in considering the unity of opposites and in illustrating

the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-organization of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze, more than other authors, may attribute great importance to the mass, still after all he holds fast to that position which makes the historical movement dependent on the development of the socialist ideology. On this basis, in considering the unity of opposites and in illustrating
tortion, bribery, terror, death. The causes, development and end of the strike, the role of the neutral legal agencies, the attitude of the workers, are pointed out by Uphoff in all essential details, supported by documentary evidence and illuminated from the most varied points of view. His study is a valuable contribution for purposes of social research.
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apparatus in opposition to the workers, must of neces-
sity not only maintain the inequality of the various
occupational groups arising thru the division of labor,
but even for a time increasingly promote it. This safety
measure is the more necessary—even though not always
possible—the more the governing authority becomes cen-
tralized.

III

Marx and Engels themselves were of middle-class ori-
gin; and the same holds of the founders of the extra-marxist
labor movement. It was only in course of the growth of
the socialist labor movement that more and more labor
leaders arose from the ranks of the proletariat. Still
more, however, the intelligencia which was regarded as
the ideological exponent of Socialism, among the Social-
ists as later also among the Bolsheviks. As they saw it,
members of the well-to-do, educated classes arrived at
the insight that true social progress was to be sought
in the labor movement, and they put themselves at its
service. This recognition on their part—the "revolu-
tionary consciousness"—they then carried over onto the
masses. These latter took up with the ideas which had
been popularized for them, a matter which was the easier
as reality furnished continuous confirmation of the cor-
rectness of the socialist theories. Slowly but surely,
the socialist ideology was thus disseminated, and it
seemed to be only a matter of a relatively brief space
of time until the preponderant majority of the popula-
tion would think, vote and act as socialists. Socialism
was just a matter of educating or influencing the mas-
ses, a question with which there was practically bound
up the conquest of reforms. One bit of ideal and prac-
tical socialism after the other was attained, until fin-
ally the "truth" would be wholly triumphant.

To this growing Socialism, the growth of the bureau-
cracy was quite a matter-of-course. This growth of
the bureaucracy was also, however, at the same time the in-
crease of its power and sphere of authority over and
against the workers. It formed the "State" within the
labor movement, rewarded and punished as it saw fit,
and from being a "servant" of the organization became
its master. The masses existed for the bureaucracy; the
workers had merely nurtured for themselves new parasites.

Waclaw Machajski, whose theories are at the basis of
Max Nomad's thinking, had quite early recognized in
the growing bureaucracy of the labor movement an ele-
ment hostile to the worker's interests. He realized that
the marxian dictum, that the "liberation of the working
class can only be its own work", holds literally,
that no one either would or could solve their problems
for the workers. This clarity of Machajski's was unfortu-
nately blurred through the influence which the social-
democratic ideas had acquired in himself. The aspira-
tions and hopes of the labor bureaucracy and of the intel-
lectuals in the movement had thrown him off the track.
These latter as well as Machajski himself con-
ceived the course of history, the transition from capi-
talism to socialism in exactly the same manner. To the
reformist bureaucracy, the growth of the social-demo-
cratic and trade-union ideology and practice was at the
same time the increase of the influence and power of
that bureaucracy, from which it concluded that the fur-
ther development would make a mere child's game of the
taking over of the State and the reconstruction of
the economy; and Machajski fully shared this opinion,
though, to be sure, with different feelings. What the
former yearned for and on which they congratulated them-
sele, Machajski feared; but both attitudes looked for-
ward to the same development. While to the Social Demo-
cracy, furthermore, the social question was solved with
the taking over of the governmental authority, to
Machajski the class struggle still went on until the at-
tainment of complete economic equality, which, permitting
of equal educational possibilities, would give rise to the
gradual disappearance of the opposition between work-
ers and intellectuals, and not until that time would a
true socialist society be assured.

The Bolsheviks who were enabled, on the basis of favor-
able circumstances, to seize the political power in
Russia, if not along social-democratic paths, yet with
social-democratic ideology, and by whom the state capi-
talism which alone is possible there is passed off first
as a transitional stage to socialism and today as com-
pleted socialism, seemed to Machajski and his followers
to furnish the most magnificent confirmation of the cor-
rectness of their doctrine. Of course, they were then
obliged to assert, in common with the Bolsheviks, that
the russian state capitalism was actually in conformity
with Socialism as conceived by the Marxists. They had
to support the bolshevist falsification in order to find
their own argument confirmed. Just as Machajski's ideas
arose from the pretensions of the social-reformist bur-
earthorship of the armed workers and not the extension of the
bureaucratic State such as has occurred in Russia.
The first principle of marxian socialism demands the abolition of wage labor. Where wage labor prevails, there functions exploitation; the one is inconceivable without the other. Reproduction under such conditions can only be the reproduction of exploitation. Russian wage labor, which is brought to full bloom by the Bolsheviki for the first time and which made it necessary to have recourse to the classifying wage labor, is thus absolutely unfit for the reproduction of the various labor functions, is to Marxism identical with capitalist economy. The dictatorial of the proletariat cannot be conceived as a party dictatorship without abandoning Marxism. And in spite of the impossibility of identifying Marxism with Russian state-capitalism, the impossible equalization is thoroughly involved in Nomad's "factual demonstration".

A great number of workers, even without being aware of Machajski's ideas, have thru the force of facts come to somewhat similar conclusions. The new, marxist labor movement which is already taking form and which has broken with the legalism of the former one and with the party ideology, is quite in accord with Machajski and Nomad in judging the role of the previous labor bureaucracy and of the Russian state bureaucracy. If refuses, however, to identify the original Marxism, in spite of the contained bourgeois elements, with the state-capitalist dreams of the social-democratic functionaries and with the state-capitalist Russian reality. The revolutionary character of Marxism reveals itself more and more in the contemporary declining capitalism in which the revolution becomes the only remaining practically possible task of the proletariat. Though it is theoretically impossible to identify the marxist doctrines with the falsifying interpretations of the social-democratic or Bolshevik epigoni of all shades, yet even if such a thing were possible it would still furnish no proof of the correctness of Machajski's position. It would at most compel the present-day revolutionists to extend their fight against reformism and its culmination in state capitalism onto Marx himself.

However, the desire for objectivity, not dogmatic reverence, compels us to come out against Nomad in his present endeavors to trace the reigning paganism back to Marx himself, and to discover the roots of the ambition of the bureaucracy and of the technocratically limited intellectuals precisely in Marxism. Still, insofar as concerns the demonstrable factual material produced by Nomad, we applaud him gratefully, even though we explain the material in a different manner and come to other conclusions. We too see in the more or less conscious state-capitalist striving of the leaders of the old labor movement and intelligenzia, and likewise of the Russian state bureaucracy, new attempts to maintain class rule, attempts which must be combated by the working class. But, in contrast to Nomad, we see precisely in Marxism the best weapon in the struggle against these tendencies. The fact that reformism and the Russian bureaucracy are throwing overboard the last remnants of marxist thinking, even as a complaisant phraseology, does not oblige us to remain inactive in the training and nursing new ideologies which are plagiarisms of the capitalist ones, should surely in itself suffice to show what a chasm exists between Marxism and the advocates of state capitalism. (1).

The fact that inconsequential marxist phrases, torn from their context, remain incorporated with the Russian ideology is no more to be wondered at than the fact that even the Hitler movement was compelled to operate with socialist phrases in order to win a mass basis. When Nomad in his arguments against Marxism refers to the Bolsheviki, he must first demonstrate the identity of Marxism and Bolshevism; a thing, however, which he has not yet done and which, for that matter is impossible, and becomes constantly more impossible since the Russians are more and more openly abandoning Marxism, even as empty phraseology.

Nomad may have recourse to the argument that he takes as Marxism what today goes by that name, Just as Christianity cannot be defended with a reference to the early Christians or Jesus himself, so likewise we are not in a position, Nomad once argued, to appeal to the original Marxism, to the purity of its youth, to its early promise; the original containing in the bud what today, in the movement calling itself marxist, has come to full bloom. Apart from the circumstance that the analogy itself is a bit lame, even its acceptance does not dispense with the necessity of demonstrating that Marxism actually and of necessity finds its limit in the present-day pseudo-marxist movement and its state-capitalist aspirations. In order to combat Marxism, Nomad must also attack that marxist current which, like himself, is cut off from the proletariat. (1). In an article in Scribner's Magazine (June 1934) Nomad mentions the "state-capitalist" plans of Bismarck and states that Bismarck sought to assure himself of Marx himself, and to discover the roots of the ambition of the bureaucracy and of the technocratically limited intellectuals precisely in Marxism. Still, insofar as concerns the demonstrable factual material produced by Nomad, we applaud him gratefully, even though we explain the material in a different manner and come to other conclusions. We too see in the more or less conscious state-capitalist striving of the leaders of

(1)
in opposition to bureaucracies and state capitalism and which stands for complete economic equality without delay and without for that reason being in opposition to the marxist doctrine. That, however, he has not yet done, for in fact he needs a corrupted marxism for his own argument. All that Nomad has so far used as a basis for his critical consideration of marxism are, insofar as materially relevant to marx himself, and no false utterance of marx with reference to long-forgotten situations and which by this time are of no signifi-

The materialist dialectic, the doctrine of value and surplus value, the theory of accumulation, historical materialism, the social average labor hour as the social average labor hour as the social average labor hour as the social average labor hour as the so-

position between Capital and Labor, and which can be overcome only in the classless society, we have here a new historical possibility: the rule of the intellectuals, or "capitalism without capitalists," to quote the title of one of Nomad's magazine articles. The capital-

ist system, however, is characterized, among other things, by the fact that it cannot be consciously directed by society or even by a certain class; that, rather, the exchange relation of commodity and surplus value production determines all social motion without regard to the will of human beings. It is not the capitalist who controls the laws of the market, but the actions of the capitalists as well as of the other classes are forced upon them by these laws. However, there is no need here for going further into these complica-

tions; it suffices to emphasize that just as Capital is incapable of governing its own movement, and just as the movement of the proletariat is dependent on factors which the proletariat itself does not determine, so likewise the intellectuals are not in a position consciously to conduct a policy by which they are aided in acquiring social mastery. Their ambitions are of no im-

portance. The matter to be investigated is: whether the compulsory movement of the middle class and intellectuals can at all come about in the direction feared by Nomad. Apart from the russian example, there has been a sharpened competitive struggle of the various organizational talents, parasites and political grocer boys for the maintenance of their positions. Not being in the same measure as the proletariat compelled to solidarity, more thrown upon the resource of developing their personal flexibility in the struggle for a livelihood, they have fewer possibilities of coming out as a class than have either the workers or monopolized Cap-

tal. The leaning on this or that class, according to the situation of the moment, and if possible under the personal sway of some individual,—that is most in accord with their direct interests. They are compelled to change their horses frequently, until they have realized that as a matter of fact they have nothing to do but ride. Hence the double-facedness of this group: it can go along with Stalin and also with Musso-

liniti. It can drink a toast to the world revolution, and also for the king of England. But one thing it cannot do: it cannot proceed independently,—it cannot do Nomad the pleasure of finding his predictions confirmed.

IV

It is interesting to note that Nomad does not clearly delimit his concept of the intellectuals. Frequently he speaks of the middle class in general, then again of the intellectual professions, at another time of these latter in connexion with the state bureaucracy, and—

(2) The "white-collar slaves" receiving starvation wages and brought together in enormous offices, frequently together with the industrial workers, are by no means regarded as of what they may think of themselves, to be entered in the group of Nomad's intellectuals. They are proletarians in white shirts, like the tool makers or mechanics; for the white shirt of these latter also does not free them from the stigma of the worker, though they frequently have higher incomes and better schooling than the great mass of the white-collar proletarians.
then again of the administrative and technical officials holding important posts in the productive process. This conceptual elasticity of Nomad's has furnished good ground for one of his critics to remark that "the dictatorship of the intellectuals is as unthinkable as the dictatorship of the traveling salesman" (3).

From the very beginning of capitalism, according to Nomad, there developed the independent striving of the intellectuals. In the poverty which accompanied the early years of the rise of capitalism and which also struck and radicalized the intellectuals, their aims were somewhat identical with those of the proletariat. But with the growth of their social influence, their instilling their ideas away from those of the workers, until we find them with the present-day presumption of being able to rule society (4). Here, then, Nomad is speaking of those elements of the middle class which are engaged in the intellectual professions, and moreover of only an infinitesimal minority, that is, of that part of the intellectuals which concerns itself with social problems and of which, again, only a ridiculously small minority developed in the way that Nomad ascribes to the entire intellectual stratum.

The majority of the intellectuals has always gone along with capitalism and still today goes along with the ruling class, works; for this latter in the sense that the workers do. The middle class itself—among which are to be counted, in addition to the better-paid elements in industry and trade, also the still remaining autonomous professions, the independent merchants, a part of the coupon-clippers, the peasants, etc.—was never in a position to bind up its interests with those of the proletariat, in spite of the fact that it was slowly squeezed out by the capitalist development. Furthermore, the broad mass of the middle class stands on no higher level intellectually than the present-day working class. The circumstances that, seen from the revolutionary standpoint, on the basis of the general economic-political backwardness, there have been political joinings of forces between petty-bourgeois and workers does not affect the fact that a real union of interests was and is precluded, since the workers as the "heir" of Capital are as a class neither interested in nor capable of possessing "inheritance" thru the support of the middle class. This latter finds itself today in an accelerated process of decline; it cannot reestablish itself either under Fascism or under Bolshevism (5).

And the undeniable fact that the middle class is going under compels Nomad not to ascribe to it as a whole, but only to a part, the intellectuals,—or as it is also commonly expressed, the "new middle class,"—the design and possibility of acquiring the acquiring social mastery in the wake of capitalism. Machajski's concept of the intellectuals which contrasted all intellectual work with manual, and in its practical application related exclusively to the state bureaucracy, is here, by Nomad, after the fashion of the social-democratic and technocratic mode of thought, related mainly to the intellectuals engaged in the process of production, the managers, engineers and technicians, to whom the innumerable more or less privileged intellectual salaried employees are subordinated.

Nomad thinks of these persons as the new rising bourgeoisie. Their occupancy of the industrial "command posts" is conceived as representing economic power; and, in fact, the at present particularly favorable treatment of the Russian "specialists" seems to demonstrate that the functions of these intellectuals in the labor process carry with them certain privileges. At any rate, it was not until quite late that this group of intellectuals acquired in Russia that esteem which it now enjoys. At the beginning of the Russian Revolution, they were still by no means "Friends of the Negroes" but were combated most bloodily together with the bourgeoisie. Nor in the fascist countries either, in spite of its occupying all the important technical posts, has the material and social situation of this stratum of intellectuals, or of the intellectuals in general, been improved, but rather worsened. The intellectuals as a compact group were not to be had either for the fascist or for the bolshevist overturn; they were neither the initiators nor the beneficiaries of these movements. It was monopoly capitalism itself and the great middle-class stupidity that helped fascism to power, just as it was the hordes of the great masses of peasants that enabled the seizure of power by the Bolshevists. The Russian intellectuals are dominated by the Russian bureaucracy just as in other countries they are dominated by Capital. They can live under either set of conditions.

(3) Jerome, in "The Communist", April 1933.

(4) Nomad, "Rebels and Renegades", Conclusion.

(5) Millions of the middle class have been completely proletarized by the present crisis. Quite in contradication to the superficial cry about the increased importance of the "new middle class", this new middle class is itself no more than an indication of the general pauperization. The same laws by which the "middle class" was created are now engaged in destroying it and thereby also its importance. By way of illustration of this tendency, reference may be made to L. Corey's "The Crisis of the Middle Class," — 25 —
only by hiring themselves out. No trace of a rule by intellectuals is discoverable under either system. The intellectuals are nowhere identical with the State.

In his book entitled "Rebels and Renegades", Nomad speaks of the "unmistakable purpose" of the fascist intellectuals: "to gain as much power as possible, both by helping the capitalists to cow the workers, and occasionally also by forcing the capitalists to make concessions to other classes of the population." (page 404). Here, then, he is speaking exclusively of the fascist state bureaucracy, which rules over the intellectuals and if necessary suppresses them just as it does the workers, and both in the interest and at the order of monopoly capital. And it appears that Nomad regards this state bureaucracy as standing "above the classes" as otherwise of course it could hardly force Capital to make concessions. Whether such a thing, however, is at all objectively possible, not to mention the fact that nothing of the sort has so far happened, is a question which Nomad leaves unexamined; here again he is content with the mere assertion. If the second part of this fascist tactic, as Nomad sees it, were practically possible, Fascism would never have come to power. It was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal. Objectively, Fascism can only suppress the workers and also the middle class; it is not in a position to turn against Capital as well. It is accordingly also incapable of safeguarding the interests of the intellectuals or of being an expression of intellectualist rule. This state bureaucracy is something quite different from the "new social stratum" of managers, organizers, technicians, etc., of which Nomad speaks and which, as he sees it, are becoming the masters of society, by virtue of all functions of a technical and commercial sort which originally were performed by the capitalists themselves. (6).

In Nomad's writings, the bureaucratic apparatus appears as an instrument of intellectualist rule. Such a situation, however, does not exist either in Russia or under Fascism or in the American "New Deal". One must surely have an enormous fantasy in order to see in the silly antics of the "new dealers" anything more than demagogy in the interest of the ruling monopoly capital; or to conclude from the higher wages of the Russian intellectuals that they have the disposal over Stalin's apparatus or from the state aid for German dentists to infer that the fascist apparatus is the valet of the intellectuals; or to find in Mussolini's African enterprise the boldness of the professors and the inventive spirit of the engineers.

Like Hilferding and Lenin, who were too much inclined to regard the process of capital concentration as an actual process of socialism, in spite of the fact that it is not until after the proletarian revolution that the process of concentration is capable of economically realizing the socialism which has taken place, so also Nomad sees this process of concentration even today as actual socialism. As a matter of fact, so long as the capital relation exists, this process of concentration, being determined by the need for profit and accumulation, can only increase the capitalist contradictions. The more the control over economy is centralized, the more the economy convulsed, the more the exploitation be intensified and the greater must become the revolutionary ferment. Hilferding's idea that Capital is tending in the direction of a "general cartel", Lenin's conception of a socialism organized after the model of the German post-office system, is also at the basis of Nomad's idea. A capitalist economy concentrated in the state bureaucracy is only monopoly capitalism carried to the extreme. There is no capitalism without capitalists, as conceived by Nomad. There is no fascist country without capitalists; and the Russian bureaucracy is at the same time the highest expression of capitalist functions. These bureaucracies are the exploiters of the labor of the Russian proletarians and intellectuals. If today they determine the high salaries of the Russian specialists, they also have the power and are later compelled to lower these salaries again. Even if one is not able to demonstrate to them "in black and white" that these salaries are on the one hand the result of the productive labor of these specialists, and on the other hand the necessary means for the reproduction of the labor of the capitalists, that these salaries are not consumed by the necessary rate of accumulation. Centralistic control of the means of production is capitalistic control. The means of production in the hands of the producers, by which the technically necessary centalism is not precluded but rendered imperative,-- that is Communism. So long, under modern conditions, as a special group of people has the sole right of disposal over production, this special group must be rated as capitalistic. In Russia, this special group is not the intellectuals, but the state bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals. But even the highest
russian planning commission is subordinate to the state bureaucracy. The one thing left to Nomad in order to rescue his thesis of the intellectualist economy would be the complete identification of the intellectuals with the state bureaucracy. Such a procedure, however, would be equivalent to a confusion of concepts and of realities. Even though the state bureaucracy is largely recruited from the middle classes or from feudal remnants (in Russia, in part also from upstart workers, and to a less extent in fascist countries), still in private-capitalist countries it exercises the power only for the ruling capitalist strata. It cannot by way of reforms become an autonomous, socially determining power, since such reforms would be identical with the destruction of Capital. If it comes to an autonomous state power, it can do this at best only as in Russia, along revolutionary paths. The existence of the present-day russian bureaucracy presupposed the expropriation of the former capitalists. The expropriation of Capital in backward countries can lead, within the framework of world capitalism, only to state capitalism. In highly developed capitalist countries, however, any revolution is of necessity a worker's revolution. It can not find its limits in state capitalism, since this is incapable of setting aside even temporarily the causes by which the revolution was brought about. If the workers have rebelled against capitalism, so they must also of necessity rebel against the state capitalism which likewise is incapable of improving their situation.

The revolution of the workers is of necessity the permanent revolution until every capitalistist relation is set aside. It is only in the wake of a workers' revolution that a complete state capitalism in highly developed countries is conceivable; but this apparent possibility is at the same time precluded because for such countries it would be equivalent to a step backward which isbound to make of any attempt at state capitalism a quickly passing adventure. Since here the complete state capitalism is objectively not possible, any fascist revolution is bound to stop with the complete subordination of the State to the interests of monopoly capital. The next step, the expropriation of capital, is fatal also to any other form of capitalist exploitation. The State as State, not the intellectualist State, has today in capitalist countries the political instruments of power in its hands. The State has more economic authority, more influence upon the economy in democratic countries than in fascist countries, because in the fascist countries monopoly capital was compelled to proceed more aggressively against all other capitals and strata of the population in order to maintain the capitalist system at all. Here, Capital and State tend more and more to merge with each other; that is, Capital directs the State just as it does its own office employees. It is only in Russia that the State is the owner of the means of production. Furthermore, to repeat—there is no more trace of intellectualist domination than in the capitalist countries.

The only assertion that Nomad is justified in making on this point is that the Russian state bureaucracy rules in Russia. We might consider this: whether similar conditions may take form in other countries; that is, whether Bolshevik revolutions are possible in industrially developed countries, or whether the truth is not rather that here the last possible capitalist modification has been accomplished with fascist monopoly capitalism.

It is commonly assumed that the backwardness of Russia is responsible for the difficulties and the round-about course of its "socialism." We assert that by virtue of these difficulties and this backwardness socialism within the framework of world capitalism is quite precluded, and that a leap from semi-feudal conditions into socialism is possible only under world-revolutionary conditions. Still, we assert at the same time that it is precisely the backwardness of the Russian economy which is the secret of the Bolshevik success and of the carrying thru of the Russian state capitalism, that without this backwardness neither would have been possible.

The state-capitalist chatter of Bismarck's to which Nomad has referred, the state-capitalist foundations of Turkey, the state-capitalist tendencies coming to light more clearly in Italy than in Germany, the Bolshevik character of the Chinese revolution,—these things speak a clear language. They denote, that is, that a capitalistic development in backward countries within the existing imperialistic milieu is possible only as a hot-house growth, that it cannot take the "normal" course of capitalist development. A national capitalist unfoldment more or less independent of international monopolist-imperialistic capital is possible only with the greatest attainable concentration and centralization of all economic and political instruments of power; the thing that for "normal" capitalist development appears as a result is here a necessary presupposition. If the greatest possible concentration of capitals and the unification of imperialistic endeavor is a necessary matter-of-course for all capitalist countries within the framework of international competition, it must today be much more necessary for those backward countries struggling much harder for their existence. If Russia, for example, did not wish to share the fate of the semi-colonies, if it wanted to become a world power on its own account, or
even to assure its independence, it was not free to take the normal path of capitalist development. Russian capitalism in that case could not, like the English, German or American capitalism, whose development proceeded over centuries or several generations, arrive at concentration by way of competition, but was obliged to overlap by political means the laissez-faire period. Not only was Russia obliged to do this, but was also able to do so, because she was able to begin with those productive methods with which the progressive unfolding of capital in highly developed countries had ended.

When the Bolsheviks came to power, they had no intention of expropriating industrial capital. They demanded no more than control of production. By way of concentration, foreign trade monopoly, transport monopoly, etc., they thought they could direct the capitalist movement by means of the state authority. The expropriation of the capitalists by the workers without the consent of the Bolsheviks, the resistance of the capitalists speculating upon a defeat of the Bolsheviks, forced the party to take up the nationalization of all industry. The state, i.e., the bureaucracy of the Bolshevist Party, thus became the total capitalist. The slow disruption of all extra-bureaucratic centers of power, of the open and concealed capitalist opposition and the emasculation of the Soviets soon provided it with the possibility of fulfilling the capitalist functions as well as the possibilities of suppression. Practically, however, this was possible only because of the relative weakness of capital, and hence of the proletariat, as well as the backwardness of the peasant masses who were not in a position themselves to represent their interests permanently through taking over the powers of government. The Bolsheviks maintained themselves in power by means of a systematic playing off of the workers' interests against those of the peasants, and vice versa. The weakness of all the various classes enabled and rendered necessary a governing bureaucracy which, thru skillful tasking and balancing of the various interests, could make itself more and more autonomous. The repetition of this process in other countries presupposes similar situations, which, however, are not present in any capitalistically developed country.

The Russian "neo-feudal" situation is bound up with backward conditions, and as a matter of fact it is only in backward countries that similar endeavors are present, while in highly developed countries the bolshevist influence has slowly receded and is today almost completely eliminated. If, as Nomad fears, the Russian example should be repeated in capitalist countries, an historical regression would have to be possible. And it is probably for this reason that Nomad says, in the previously mentioned article in Scribner's, that state capitalism "may be brought into existence in the wake of a fascist victory accompanied by a cultural plunge into the dark ages" (p. 441). Apart from the fancifulness of the idea that no other than the intellectuals should lead us into cultural barbarism, i.e., into a state of affairs which necessarily makes the intellectuals superfluous, the fate of state-capitalist "dreamers" like Schliessler and Rohm in Germany has surely shown that neither the German capitalists nor the German intellectuals are inclined or in a position to turn history backward and bring about a state-capitalist economy. State capitalism is not an indication of new capitalist life, but a sign of its weakness. These tendencies stand at the beginning and at the end of capitalism, at the two weak points of its development. State capitalism is not a higher stage of the capitalist expansion, but only one of the many manifestations of capitalism, which in all its manifestations must go under. For all these manifestations contain in themselves the contradiction between productive forces and production relations.

V.

With the development of the division of labor as a means to, and expression of, the increasing social forces of production, labor was rendered both simpler and more difficult. At the same time that skilled labor was acquiring greater importance in the social process of production, it simplified the labor process as well; and the more concern was devoted to this latter consideration, the greater was the demand for skilled labor, in spite and even because of all the specialization, the importance of skilled labor has increased.

The division of labor as accelerated by capitalism has constantly deepened the clef between intellectual labor and manual. This contradiction is visible not only in production, but in all the spheres of social life. Intellectual activity learned to overlook the close connection with the practical activity of society; theory and practice, which in reality are inseparable, were looked upon as separate both by theoreticians and practitioners. The intellectuals reproduced themselves as intellectuals, the workers as workers; the apparent autonomy of each group was increasingly recognized as a fact. The thought that there would always be intellectuals appeared quite as obvious as the thought that there must also always be people on hand to do the dirty work.

Practice appears here as a product of theory, the both can only exist together; and this false appearance en-
abled the theoreticians to regard themselves as the salt of the earth, while they locked upon the workers as constituting nothing more than the material with which they worked. The intellectuals saw themselves as intellectual and social centers of society; a group which, to be sure, was conditioned by Capital, but Capital also appeared to them merely as an intellectual creation.

Capitalism developed the productive forces of society, in enormous measure. This development is the secret of the progress in science and hence also of the increasing importance of the intellectuals. Now that capitalism is in course of stagnation, its science also is bound to stagnate; with the decline of capitalism is bound up also the decline of its science and thereby of its intellectuals. It is only because the development of the productive forces is not dependant on any one particular form of society that the intellectuals as well as science may be said to stand "above the classes". In a new society science loses—and with it the intellectuals lose—those characteristics which were valid only for capitalist society.

One cannot judge from the attitude of the present-day intellectuals as to the attitude of those people by whom the intellectual functions will be performed tomorrow. Nor can the present human egoism, which necessarily has to assert itself individually, be regarded as the manner in which egoism is to be expressed for all eternity; there is also an egoism which can find satisfaction only in work in common. But if the ideological attitude of the present-day intellectuals throws no light on the further development, still a great number of insights can be won through consideration of their economic necessities and the change of the economic relations themselves.

Within the capitalist decline, a part of the intellectuals also is bound to go under. The competition among them is growing more intense; they are losing the possibility of reproducing themselves; their economic situation grows worse of necessity. The reaction to this state of affairs—a reaction strengthened by way of the intensified competitive struggle for the vanishing positions—can only be the overrating of their own importance. One does not shield himself against death by committing suicide, but by the strengthening of one's vital energies. The narrower the intellectual functions become, the more persistently will they attempt to demonstrate to society the necessity of their existence. They have to become reactionary in order to live, and in this way are themselves obliged to contribute to still further undermining the social position which they have hitherto occupied.

If the capitalistic intellectual is not in a position to go forward, because capitalism is going under, so also the intellectuals cease to be the exponents of science. If the proletarian class alone is in a position to drive forward the social forces of production along revolutionary paths, it has thereby also become the bearer of science, and the intellectuals are obliged to operate within the framework of the communist system. With the setting aside of the class relations, there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions. The reproduction of the functionally different labor powers is no longer individually determined, but socially.

Without economic equality, there is no communist society. This equality must not only be actually possible, it must also be the driving distinctions in the evaluation of society, and until that time communism is quite out of the question. But if communism is bound up with the presence of equality, then it is also beyond doubt that this equality will be actualized; for the social forces of production are impelling to communism, and this impulsion is the historically determining factor.

The distinctions between skilled and simple labor can be abolished or modified only through improvement of the general labor level. The changeable estimation of the various labor qualifications has obliterated the fact that the distinction between skilled and unskilled labor was thereby made less and less sharp; that the distinction between simple labor and simple labor has become skilled workers, notwithstanding that their labor is rated as primitive; it is miles removed from the primitive labor of the period of manufacture.

Apart from exceptions the number of which is constantly growing less and which socially do not count, the demands placed on that element of the population performing intellectual functions are no higher than those placed on the mass of the workers; they are merely different. The division of labor has also affected in very large measure the intellectual functions, without lowering the level of the intellectuals themselves. Even today the great mass of the intellectuals represents approximately the average intelligence. The fact that in certain industries a single manipulation constitutes the worker's entire activity does not place him outside the society for which the manipulation by no means represents the state of labor technique. The general qualifications have improved and have brought with them an unmistakable tendency to standardization. Still more rapidly than the intellectuals were able to cultivate their special qualities there came about an elevation of training as a whole. This process may be held up temporarily, but after all it is destined again
again to assert itself. A development in the opposite
direction, the permanent proletarian helotism, would
preclude the possibility of communism, because the
possibility of capitalism—in fact, any possibility
whatever of social life, since retrogression means
death.

The intellectuals have no economic functions. Capitalist
Economy is not finally subject to human will, but is
cessation "extra-human"; commodity fetishism rules. The
intellectuals have only technical and ideological func-
tions to perform for capitalism; their capacities stand
in no real connection with the social economy. They have
no more to offer communism than have the workers. They
know no more about the social laws of motion than do
the workers. The latter, when they are interested in a social
development, wish to bring it about from the side of conscious-
ness. But there is no social consciousness, and so in
their theories they arrive no farther than at state capi-
talism, which compels to dictatorship over the workers.
They want to organize society in the same way that one
organizes a factory, a monopoly, a university; that is,
in precisely the same manner that organizing is done
even today.

Nor do the workers know much more. They need only to
know that they themselves are not the masters in the
social projects conceived by the intellectuals. If they
do not know it, they cannot help learning it; for their
material disinterest, however often they may learn it,
abolition to others, can never by others be even so much
mitigated. There remains to the workers in the last
instance nothing but to take charge, themselves, of the
social organization. The thing that to them alone is
possible is also at the same time the only way out of
poverty and crisis.

The capitalist decline compels capitalistic terrorism.
If capital can no longer progressively grow, it is ob-
ligated, in order to maintain itself, to proceed to the
absolute impoverishment of the great masses of the pop-
ulation, and this makes the permanent terrorism neces-
sary. The terrorism precludes political activity on
the part of the less pauperized elements of the popula-
tion; the future lies in the insurrections of the most
impooverished. A great mass of actual poverty leads
to spontaneous uprisings, which, by reason of the exis-
ting consciousness, can also have only spontaneously
formed leaderships. The necessarily spontaneous char-
acter of the insurrections as well as their scope,
which must be an enormous one in order to make the
insurrections at all possible, restrict the participation
in them of the intellectuals not yet proletarized. The
revolutionary mass is left to itself.

It can either be defeated in order later to break forth
when, and if it can not be exterminated, or it can win
the victory over Capital and take possession of the
means of production. Under the circumstances described,
the workers are assembled in masses only in the indus-
trial enterprises. The industrial enterprise is the
starting point of their insurrections and the natural
basis of their dictatorship and efforts at social re-
organization. The capital and its production or have
no one under them, for they were the lowest stratum of
society. They will be obliged, in the interest of a
frictionless process of production subject to their
control, to have recourse to equal "remuneration". Un-
equal "remuneration" is always an indication that the
workers are not interested in a social change. If they
are the only persons who can take up with this
equal remuneration as a social necessity, and they will
be obliged to devise economic methods to the end that
this equality may be assured. For a communist society,
there is only one measure of estimation, the natural
one. Just as the machines are looked upon only as mach-
ines for the production of use objects, so also the necessary "measure
of value" for the production of use objects be a natural
one—the labor time. The social character of labor com-
pels to the acceptance of the average labor time as the
computing unit and as the general social measure of
value. The social average labor hour precludes economic
inequality. There is no communism without such a social-
ly conducted. There is no release from working-
class distress without communism. The struggle will be
waged until the socialization is actually carried out
by way of society. With equal "remuneration" is bound
up the social reproduction of labor power. Each form of
labor is open to everyone; the particular function which
a person performs in the social labor is hence-
forth actually just a matter of the person's individual
capacity. This fact, entering into the individual's con-
sciousness, is the assurance of a relatively friction-
less acceptance of the division of labor. The shortening
of labor time, henceforth possible, enables the whole
labor problem in general to become one of secondary im-
portance; people will learn to take the performance of
their social function as a matter of course in the same
way that at the present time they brush their teeth.

But we are not so much interested here in what will be
done under the new society; we are here concerned mere-
ly with emphasizing that the present-day working class
is quite in a position, without and if necessary against
the intellectuals, to make their revolution and to build
up the new society. This state of things is in itself a
sufficient guarantee that the intellectuals, in their
own vital interest, will take their places in the new society and under the conditions of this society. This is not the place for going further into the laws of motion of a communist society; it might be stated, however, that if Nomad had concerned himself more with these laws, he would have realized that the whole problem of the intellectuals is one of subordinate importance,—that the matter of much greater moment is to make it clear to the working class that even today it is in a position to build a real communist society and that any difficulties which may be occasioned by the intellectuals may be dealt with in the framework of the proletarian dictatorship.

P. M.
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The period of progressive capitalist development is historically passed. The decline period of capitalism is characterized by ever greater contradictions of economy, by war, economic and military conflicts, by ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the working class. This is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. The working class, for the emancipation of itself and for the transformation of society, must make its own revolution, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential outgrowth of the labor movement. We therefore commend to the worker movement the political line of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to liberate themselves from the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' council! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE DEFEAT IN FRANCE.

There are defeats which are victories, and victories behind which lurks defeat. The victory of the "Popular Front" in France and the victory of the strikers are victories only in form. Behind the triumphal shout of the bureaucratic labor movement is concealed the fact that the revolutionary energy of the French proletariat has been wasted to no purpose. As a matter of fact, the French workers have suffered the first decisive defeat in the struggle against Capital.

France was drawn into the world crisis relatively late. Since 1933, however, the economic conditions have constantly grown worse. The index of production (on the basis of 100 for the year 1929) amounted to 76.7 in 1933; 71 in 1934; 67.4 in 1935; and 70.2 in 1936 (January-February). This stagnation is identical with the increasing impoverishment of the workers. In March 1936 the number of registered unemployed already amounted to 465,000. The deflationist policy of the government reduced wages and salaries more rapidly than domestic prices. The situation of the proletariat has become less and less tolerable and for a long while has resulted in an intensification of ill-humor which has now been discharged in the great wave of strikes.
Circumstances of foreign policy led to the conclusion of the franco-russian military pact. The nearness of the war danger made it necessary to speed up the ideological isolation of the masses. To the extent of the fact that french Fascism lacked a mass basis, owing to the relative retardation of the economic crisis in France, the french bourgeoisie was compelled to cast its eyes upon the labor parties. It seemed politically not inapropriate, or for the moment unavoidable, in the opinion of the bourgeoisie, to engage the labor organizations directly for its own purposes and to hold their fascist forces in reserve. At any rate, it did nothing to prevent or make imposible the parliamentary victory of the "Popular Front".

Because of the alliance with Russia, anti-Bolshevism was unpopular. The attitude of the french "communists", who in supporting the People's Front came out for a "strong, free and happy" France, the transformation of the Third International into the best defender of capitalist interests, and the momentary war value of the slogan of struggle of "democracy" against fascist countries,—these things raised the agitational value of the anti-fascist slogans of the popular-front parties and stood in the way of the fascist propaganda. The united-front enthusiasm—that is, the fact that the Communist Party made itself the tail end of the Social Democracy—was likewise a propagandistic asset, which led to such repressive repressions of the communists by the French army. The communist parliamentarians gave their approval to increased military expenditures; their demands were in many cases still more reactionary than those of the Social Democracy, since the "communists" are still more interested than the socialists in the strengthening of the french fatherland. The communists now have two fatherlands to defend, while the socialists still like to content themselves with only one. And so the communists had more at stake than the socialists in a popular movement as broad as possible, and which went the whole length of the new labor parties to defend, while the socialists still like to content themselves with only one. And so the communists had more at stake than the socialists in a popular movement as broad as possible, and which went the whole length of the new labor parties to defend. As regards the social democrats, they want to govern only for their own bourgeoisie.

The labor parties have won in France with a fascist program. They were still more national than the fascists, and not by taking to the streets, but by attacking "200 families"—that is, the stock holders of the Bank of France—and otherwise to stealing from Roosevelt's NRA anything available, was not very far removed from the fascist swindle in this respect. All that is nothing for any worker to get excited about, for such a program and such feats involve nothing in any way original. In the present circumstances, the whole of the old labor movement is compelled, if it wants to maintain its power, to take up fascist slogans and to compete with the fascists for the honor of being able to govern for Capital.

Under these conditions the union between SP and CP is at the same time nothing more than a business connection. The SP was ready to aid in supporting, by the side of its own state capitalism, also that of the Russians. The struggle against Fascism is actually and loyally being conducted by these groups, so far as the thing is possible to the valets of Capital. In the first place, this "anti-fascist" struggle serves merely to veil the eventual conflict between imperialist groups of powers, the program of french against german capital, for so long as the french bourgeoisie is obliged to fear german capital, the labor movement must be opposed to german fascism. There is also the fact that these labor leaders are conducting their anti-fascist struggle in their own interests; one bureaucracy is fighting against another bureaucracy. But at the same time, they conduct their struggle against Fascism constantly in the interest of Capital, which is capable of existing under the most various forms of government.

The french socialists with 146 deputies in the new Chamber have taken over the government for french capital. They are supported by the bourgeoisie-democratic "Radical Socialists" and covered in very large measure by the communists with 72 deputies and by a number of small splinter groups, without for the present participating in the government. The program of the new government is, like the electoral program, directed first against Fascism; which is only natural, as every government has to shake off the competition. Furthermore, it combats the war danger, and here too, of course, as in all other countries, thru the strengthening of the military capacities, for only one who is heavily armed can live in peace. Within the framework of the armament policy, the government's demands for nationalization of the armament industry are likewise quite natural, just as all the other "planned-economy factors" of the "socialization program" here acquire their deeper meaning. Practically, however, they are of less significance than they pretend: the war economy would of course automatically render necessary the centralization of power to maintain itself, to take up fascist slogans and to compete with the fascists for the honor of being able to govern for Capital.

A number of other trick demands is represented by the
new government; for example, it proposes to combat the influence of big capital upon politics, press and public finances. Such phrases are designed to please the petty bourgeoisie, but the reality which they conceal is something quite different. The people who set this demand on the order of the day are practically condemned to be the executive organ of big capital, and their role is accordingly reduced to that of voluntarily renouncing something quite different. The acts of both classes are forced upon them through the unregulated capitalist market mechanism. It is the task of the government, by means of force and cunning, to keep these two opposed tendencies within bounds which assure the perpetuity of exploitation society.

If the workers succeed in holding their position against Capital, the latter is obliged to oppress so much the more other weaker strata of society, the farmers, the middle class and the smaller capitals. The workers' resistance to pauperization can only lead to promoting the general pauperization. In this sense, the workers' resistance, without being capable of doing away with impoverishment, is of enormous revolutionary importance. It sharpens all the capitalist contradictions, and compels to constantly more accelerated impoverishment of ever broader strata. At a certain point of the development, the burden of impoverishment can no longer be divided at all among the various social strata, and the leveling process of impoverishment has come to a close. Then is reached the absolute end of all reformist policy. Until that time, the burdens of the permanent crisis may frequently still be shifted from one stratum to the other. As the depthening of the crisis would lead to the setting aside of the reforms. In a word: under capitalism in decline, reformism becomes objectively impossible. Anyone who contests this is a charlatan and has all the facts against him. One has only to glance at the fate of social reforms in the other countries. Serious struggle against impoverishment—a struggle to be conducted only outside of parliaments—could at most compel Capital, if it wants to evade a decisive struggle with the workers, to change the methods of impoverishment; even Capital cannot affect the process of impoverishment. It is possible, for example, to the end of robbing and more sharply exploiting the masses, to make use of inflationist instead of deflationist methods; instead of cutting wages, the prices can be correspondingly raised. One and the same goal can be reached directly or indirectly, by straight or crooked paths. The working day can be shortened, and at the same time the thing can be made profitable by making the labor process more intense.

However, the incapacity of Capital to better the situation of the workers is also its problem. This problem may indeed cause the "labor leaders", in their desire to understand both sides, many a headache, but the working class remains unphased. As little as Capital can voluntarily renounce an ever sharpened exploitation of the proletariat, so little can the proletariat desist from uninterrupted struggle against impoverishment. Neither class moves as a result of understanding of its own or the general situation, but the acts of both classes are forced upon them through the unregulated capitalist market mechanism. It is the task of the government, by means of force and cunning, to keep these two opposed tendencies within bounds which assure the perpetuity of exploitation society.
the overthrow of capitalist society is not in harmony with the interests of the labor organizations at work today, nor with those of the Blum government.

The time is past in which the fight for reforms could be conducted in any but a revolutionary way. But with this, reform also ceases to be the goal of its champions. The workers may think that they are fighting for the reform; if they wish, however, to put them thru, they are obliged to overthrow Capital. Once this is done, however, the reform no longer matters, for society itself is then mastered. And so the professional reformists have no choice but to turn against reforms. Their propaganda in favor of reforms becomes a swindle; practically, the propagandists themselves are fighting against them.

Any real change of the workers' situation under the present conditions, and increasingly also in France, means eventually civil war. In such a war, all capitalist interests, hence also the present-day labor parties, will automatically line up against the revolutionary workers. The only activity which in the meantime remains to the reformists is deception: they promise without themselves intending that the promises shall be kept. In this way the workers can for longer or shorter periods be held in leash, and in the meantime the reformists get, rather than the same length of time, tolerated by the bourgeoisie. No group is today capable of representing more than its direct and immediate interests. No one can adopt a policy for long in advance. A policy often has the appearance of being planned, but that is not really so; it is only that in this case, quite accidentally, direct interests coincide with some which have a farther reach. With every step which Capital takes in order to satisfy its direct interests, it makes itself, from the historical standpoint, at the same time more impossible. But it cannot do otherwise; if it refrained from taking the step because it realized the eventual consequences, it would still go under. And so it can live only for the moment. And the matter is similar as regards the labor organization. The realization that it is impossible to deceive indefinitely, and so that at last they will be driven out, does not affect the momentary compulsion to deceive in order to exist at all.

The Popular Front, as well as the Blum government, can only deceive the masses, and will drive them more and more away from itself and into the arms of the fascists. The large middle class existing in France, and which would support Fascism, will lend still more impulsion to the accelerated fascization. In the process of disappointment awaiting the masses, class solidarity is at the same time more and more disintegrated.

The workers are then just as willing to take a chance with the fascists as they had done unsuccessfully with the radicals. Those latter were then not in a position to incite the masses to resistance against the fascists; they have served their time.

The concrete experience of all that was had in Germany. The same process is being repeated today in France; for the old labor movement refuses to learn, refuses to draw from the German experience the corresponding conclusions for France. It is bound to capitalism, and so is obliged, if it wants to live, to prepare the way for Fascism, even tho this latter will finally be its death.

The popular-front government can do no damage to the French bourgeoisie. Its only damage will be to the workers. The popular-front government is the government of French Capital. There is no fear, as a Catholic Academician writes in Figaro, that Leon Blum will be the master, but rather that he will not be master enough. If the Blum government fails to hold the French workers in check, if it fails to raise the profitability of Capital, if it fails to govern sufficiently against the people, then it will be thrown out. The new government has to demonstrate that it is the best bulwark against the French workers. When it proceeds against the workers, it merely defends its own existence. Anyone who is for the popular-front government is against Capital interests, hence also the present-day labor parties, and the Fascist movements. The workers may think that they are fighting a war against Fascism, but it will be thrown out. The new government has to demonstrate that it is the best bulwark against the French workers. And so it can live only for the moment. And the matter is similar as regards the labor organization. The realization that it is impossible to deceive indefinitely, and so that at last they will be driven out, does not affect the momentary compulsion to deceive in order to exist at all.

Long before the accession of the Blum government, strike sentiment prevailed among the French workers. Encouraged by the victory of the Popular Front, certain that the new government was not in a position to bring the soldiers into action against them forthwith, the workers began their long-delayed strike. As a matter of fact, the Blum government was not in a position to come out openly against the strikers, as likewise the trade-union organizations were forced to accept the strike under the pressure of mass sentiment. The government considered it best to wait and leave the stragling of the strike to the professional labor leaders. The communists made themselves phraseologically even "the spearhead of the strikers", the only in order to blunt its point. The real leaders among the strikers, themselves, the leaders were for the most part also the conscious and unconscious strike-bringers. The strike movement also helped the government somewhat in finding a parliamentary home for its NRA-swindle, and thus increased its prestige, for the government succeeded at the same time in making the strike look futile. Parliamentary action was directed against the strike, which it restricted in its development and deprived of its aggressive character. Instead
of bread, there were new laws which, apart from the ink, cost nothing. Laws which, even if they are literally complied with, are incapable of making any essential change in the situation of the proletariat. Frequently the strike seemed to get out of the hands of the labor leaders, it was hard to master and control because of its extension. This was at the same time its centralization, but without the experienced central committee, so that the strike had great force behind it. The syndicalist elements of the labor movement had also little reason to care for the apprehensions of the government, and their self-initiative made control still more difficult and at the same time prevented a violent intervention on the part of the government. The scope of the strike might have spoiled the career of the government at the very beginning, if it had come to a test of strength with the strikers. The best course was to harangue the strikers and throttle the strike by way of sympathy. The government forces gradually succeeded in breaking up the strike front and so in bringing the strike to a dreary end. The popular-front government thus had behind it its first betrayal of the workers; for the gains of the strike are paper ones, not real. The government's deception was praised by the communists as "cool-headedness and self-control of the workers." Enthusiastically they wrote: "The flood is mastering itself."

The remarkable thing about the strike was the tactic employed by the workers, that of remaining in the enterprises. As the first large-scale violation of the ideology of private property, this fact is of incalculable value to the entire working class. The occupancy of the enterprises leads on quite naturally to the direction of strikes by the workers themselves. The possibility of influence from the outside becomes more difficult; the spirit of solidarity grows stronger. From this point to the councils there is only a short step. The fact that the workers are going more and more on their own initiative to occupying the enterprises will also compel the old labor organizations more and more to combat strikes which they are unable to control. The militancy of the workers unveiled at the same time the treacherous character of the old labor movement. The old labor movement and the popular-front government will be compelled in their own interests to proceed against the workers in such a vile manner that at the same time they will hasten the process of digging their own grave.

Once the power of the strike was broken, the Blum government proceeded promptly to turn from the friendly phrase and take up the brutal suppression of the workers. The government began its struggle against "Right and left." Newspapers of the left CP-Opposition and other groups not in agreement with the ruling labor parties were forbidden, strikers arrested and thrown into jail. Laws are being prepared which are designed to hit all enemies of the present government, hence also the revolutionary workers turning against the betrayal perpetrated by the Blum government.

However, the masses of the workers are still pursuing the false hopes which they have set on the Popular Front and their government. They will be bitterly disappointed. Once the government has become more firmly consolidated, if they should try again with their own weapon, the strike, to represent their interests, the Blum government will not be in a position to answer the call for bread with paper laws; for the laws cannot be made twice, and in spite of the laws the masses will slowly famish more and more. They will learn to thumb their noses at all constitutions and laws and, in the lack of sufficient class force, which today is being still more disintegrated by the old labor movement, they will flock to Fascism. Anyone who wants to fight against Fascism must today fight against Blum and the Popular Front. He must pronounce the truth that the French "victory" is in reality the beginning of a whole series of defeats. The workers are on the wrong path; with Blum and Thorez, they are marching straight into Fascism.

NOTICE
Max Nomad's reply to the article "Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?", appearing in the last issue of the C.C., did not arrive early enough to be included in this issue. It will appear in the August issue of the C.C. The next issue will contain also an extensive report from Palestine under the title: THE LAND OF PROMISE and other interesting articles.
THE ROLE OF FASCISM

The chief characteristic of fascism is that of organizing the petty capitalist and middle class with their narrow-minded spirit of private business into a mass organization, strong enough to check and beat the proletarian organizations. This class, squeezed in between the capitalist and the working class, unable to fight capitalism, is always ready to turn against the workers' class struggle. It hates big capital and puts forth anti-capitalistic slogans, it is a tool in the hands of capitalism, which pays and directs its political action towards the subduing of the workers.

Its ideas and theories are directed chiefly against the class struggle, against the workers feeling and acting as a separate class. Against this, it brings forward a strong nationalistic feeling, the idea of the unity of the nation against foreign nations. In this nation workers have their place, not as a separate class, but combined with the employers as industrial and agrarian groups of production. Representatives of these groups form advisory boards for the government. This is called the Corporative State, founded on direct representation of the economic grouping of society, on capitalist labor. It is opposed to the parliamentary system for which fascism has hardly any use and which it denounces as a power of disruption, a mischievous preaching of internal dissension.

Parliamentarism is the expression of supremacy of the people, the citizens, and of the dependence of the government. Fascism puts the State above the citizens. The State, as organization of the nation, is the superior objective to which the citizens are subordinate. Not democracy, not the people's right, but authority, the people's duties stand first. It places the party chief at the head of the State, as a dictator, to rule with his party companions without interference from parliamentary delegates.

It is clear that this form of government corresponds to the needs of modern capitalism. In a highly developed capitalist economy power is not rooted, as it was in the beginning, in a numerous class of independent producers, but in a small group of big capitalists. Their interests can be served better by influencing a small body of absolute rulers, and their operations seem more safely secured if all opposition of the workers and all public criticism is kept down with an iron fist. Hence a tendency is visible in all countries to increase the power of the central government and of the chief hands of the State. Tho this is also sometimes called fascism, it makes some difference whether parliamentary control is maintained, or an open dictatorial rule is established, founded upon the terrorism of a mighty party organization.

In Germany an analogous development of the national-socialist movement took place somewhat later. The revolution of 1918 had brought socialism into power but this power was made use of to protect capitalism. The socialists in the government let the capitalists operate as they liked. The petty capitalist classes seeing their antagonists on both sides now united and socialist officials involved in foul capitalist affairs considered socialist state concern and capitalist speculation as one common principle of corruption of an international gang of grafters. It opposed to them the honest small business of petty capitalists and the conservative old-time farmers. Young intellectuals of the universities who found their former monopoly of public offices infringed upon by detested socialist leaders and former officers jobless thru the diminution of the army, organized the first groups of national-socialists.

They were eager nationalists because they belonged to the capitalist middle classes and were opposed to the internationalism of the ruling social-democracy. They called themselves socialist, because their petty-capitalistic feeling was hostile to big business and big finance. They were strongly anti-Semitic, too. Firstly, because Jewish capital played an important role in Germany especially in the large stores, which stores caused the ruin of the small shopkeepers. Secondly, because numerous Jewish intellectuals flooded the universities and the learned professions and by their keener wits often -- e.g. as lawyers and physicians -- left their German competitors behind them.

Financially these national-socialists were backed by many big capitalist concerns, especially by the armament industry which felt its interests endangered by the increasing disarmament conferences. They formed the illegal fighting groups of capitalism against rising Bolshevism. Then came the world crisis, aggravating the conditions in Germany exhausted as it was by the settlement and the peace treaty indemnities. The revolt of the desperate middle classes raised the National-Socialist Party to the position of the mightiest party and enabled it to seize the political power and to make its leader the dictator of Germany.
Seemingly this dictatorship of middle class ideas is directed against big capitalism as well as against the working class movement. It is clear, however, that a petty capitalist program of a return to former times of small business cannot be carried out. It soon became evident in Germany that big capitalism and the land-owning aristocracy still hold the real masters behind the ruling National-Socialist Party. In reality this party acts as an instrument of capitalism to fight and destroy the workers’ organization.

So strong was the power of the new slogans that they drew even a large number of workers with them, who joined the National-Socialist Party. The workers had learned to follow their leaders, but these leaders having disappointed them, were beaten by the stronger leaders. The splendour and the spiritual power of the socialist and communist ideals had waned. National-socialism promised the workers a better socialism, by class-peace instead of by class-war. If offered them their appropriate place in the nation as members of the united people not as a separate class.

Due to the victory of Fascism, or its equivalent, in certain countries, the working classes in these countries have been thrown back in their systematic upward strife for liberation. Their organizations have been dispersed, the case of the trade unions, put directly under the command of capitalist state officials. The workers' papers have been suppressed, free speech prohibited, socialist and communist propaganda forbidden and punished with imprisonment, concentration camps or long incarceration. In the enforced uniformity of opinion there is no room for revolutionary teachings. The way of regular progress towards proletarian power in the development of insight and organization by means of propaganda and discussions, the way to revolution and freedom, is blocked by the concrete wall of reaction.

So it appears on the surface. But, looking deeper into the problem, it only means that for the workers the smooth and peaceful way of growing to power is blocked. We said before that the right of free speech, the right of organizing, the right of propaganda and of forming political parties, were necessary for capitalism. It means that they are necessary to ensure a regular working of capitalist production and capitalist development. It means, the class antagonisms must at last explode in heavy uprisings and violent revolutionary movements. The capitalist class has to decide whether it prefers this way.

The capitalist system in the heart. It knows that the diminished production is unable to feed the whole working class and at the same time to leave sufficient profits. It is resolved not to bear the losses itself. It realizes that the workers, starved by unemployment, must rise and will rise in revolts. And it tries to foreclose them by forting its own position, by forcing the workers to dispose into one strong unity, by putting the state power in strong armor, by tying the workers to this state by means of strong fetters, by robbing them of their old means of defense, their socialist spokesmen and their organizations. This is the reason why in these last years fascism became powerful.

Capitalism at one time seemed to be on to the best way of fooling the workers by means of sham-democracy and sham-reforms. Now it is turning the other way, to heavy oppression. This must drive the workers to resistance and to determined class fighting. Why does capitalism do so? Not of its own free will, but compelled by material, economic forces inherent in its innermost nature; by the heavy crisis which endangers its profits and arouses its fears for revolution.

Triumphant fascism boasts that it has blocked the way to communism forever. Its claim for this is because it has crushed the workers' movement. What it really destroyed were the old forms of the trade unions. It destroyed the illusions, the old socialist beliefs, the socialist and communist parties — all obsolete things hampering progress. It destroyed at the same time the old party divisions which incited workers against workers, it thereby has restored their natural class unity.

Parties are groups of common opinion; organizations are dependent on membership—both of these are secondary accidents. Class is the primary reality founded in the nature of capitalism itself. By tradition the workers considered political opinion and organization membership as the real distinctions between workers and capitalists. They were thinking and feeling in terms of parties and unions—and by tradition may continue to do so for some time. Now they are constrained to think and feel in terms of class. Without any walls of partition, they stand one beside the other and they see that they are all comrades, subject to the same capitalist exploitation. No party discipline can call them to action; they will have to think out and make their own action when the burden of Fascist capitalism makes itself too heavily felt. The mist of opposing party opinions, of political slogans, of union narrowness, which dimmed the natural class consciousness, has been destroyed. Sharp and relentless the reality of capitalism confronts them, and to fight it they have only themselves, their class.
unity to rely upon.

The political parties of the working class--we speak of Germany and Italy--have disappeared; only the leaders in exile continue to speak as if they were the parties. This does not mean that they have disappeared forever. If there should come an uprising of the working class, they will come back and present themselves again as leaders. They must be vanquished for the second time, now by the workers, by conscious recognition that they are obsolete.

This does not mean that there will be no more parties in the future, that their role is finished. New parties will arise undoubtedly in revolutionary periods to express in new situations the unavoidable differences of tactical opinions within the working class. Parties in this sense are necessary elements in social development. The working class cannot be given ready-made opinions and platforms from some Dictator Party which claims to do the thinking work for it, and forbids independent opinion. The working class has to think out and to find out the way for itself. Then opinions as to what is and what must be done will differ because their lives--the in the main rather alike--were different in particulars. Groups of common opinion will be formed to discuss and to propagate their ideas, to fight the scientists of the capitalist class, to wage the spiritual contest with other groups. This is the way of self-education for the working class.

Parties in this sense may be called the scouting groups in the capitalist jungle. They have to investigate the ways, to study science and circumstances, to discuss these in mutual debate, to lay their ideas, their explanations, their advice before their fellow workers. In this way they are the necessary instruments to build up the intellectual power of the working class.

Their task is not to act instead of the workers, to do the real fighting work for the workers and to drag the class behind them. They will not have the power to put themselves in the place of the class, Class unity, class action will be paramount, party opinion subordinate.

II

There are points of similarity between fascist Italy and Germany, and bolshevist Russia. They are ruled by dictators, the chiefs of dictator parties--the Communist Party in Russia, the Fascist Party in Italy, the National-Socialist Party in Germany. These parties are large, strongly organized groups which by their zeal and enthusiasm, their devotion to the cause, by their discipline and energy are able to dominate state and country, and to enforce upon it the stamp of one hard, big unity.

This is a similarity in form; the contents are different. In Russia state capitalism builds up the productive forces; private capital is not tolerated. In Italy and Germany, the state and the ruling party are intimately connected with private large-scale capitalism. But here also a better economic organization is included in the fascist aims.

Big business always means a certain organization of production, transport and banking in the hands of a small number of directing individuals. And these comparatively few persons have control and power over the mass of lesser capitalists. Political rulers were already connected with these big capitalists before. Now the fascist program proclaims it to be the task of state power to direct and regulate the economic force. The increase of nationalism in all countries, and the preparing for world war, as expressed in the slogan of autarchy, i.e., the complete reliance of a state upon its own resources, imposes upon the political leaders a close cooperation with the leaders of industry. If in the old capitalism the state was a necessary instrument of industry, now industry becomes a necessary instrument of the state, too. Ruling the state and ruling industry is being merged into one. Imposing regulation upon private business now means that by the fascist power the bulk of the lesser capitalists are subjected still more completely to big business.

To be sure, in fascist capitalism the ruling class clings to the principle of private enterprise, if not for others, then at least for themselves. The silent contest of big capitalists, monopolists, bankers, for supremacy and profit goes on behind the scenes. If, however, the economic crisis lasts, then the increasing misery, the rebellions of workers or middle classes will compel the rulers to more efficient regulations of economic life. Already now, capitalist economists look to Russia and study its economics as a possible model, and as a way out. "Planned Economics" is the talk of politicians in many countries. A development of European and American capitalism in the direction of and into some form of state capitalism may offer itself as a means to prevent or to thwart or to turn back a proletarian revolution. This will be called socialism then. If we compare it to the last program, the "Plan" of the Belgian Social-Democratic party for regulating capitalism, the difference is not fundamental. The Belgian plan, indeed, may be called an attempt to compete with fascism in a salvation-action for capitalism.
If now we compare these three parties, the Social-Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the Fascist Party, we find that they have their chief aim in common. They want to dominate and rule the working class. Of course in order to save the workers, to make them happy, to make them free. They all say so.

Their means, their platforms are different; they are competitors, and each abuses the others calling them counter-revolutionaries or criminals.

Social-democracy makes an appeal to democracy; the workers shall choose their masters by vote. The Communist Party resorts to revolution; the workers shall rise at the call of the C.P., overthrow capitalist rule and put the C.P. into office. The fascists make an appeal to national feelings and petty-capitalist instincts. They all aspire to some form of state capitalism or state socialism where the working class is commanded and exploited by the state, by the community of leaders, directors, officials, the managers of production.

Their common basis is the opinion that the working masses are unable to conduct their own affairs. The incapable and stupid many, as they believe, must be led and educated by the capable few.

When the working class fights for its real freedom, in order to take the direction of the production, the rule of society into its own hands, it will find all these parties opposed to it.

-J.H.-
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LUXEMBURG vs. LENIN

While Lenin's position on the national question (1) was on the one hand determined by the social-democratic standpoint of pre-war time, which he had not completely overcome, and on the other appeared to him as a means of setting up and consolidating bolshevist mastery in Russia and its eventual extension on a world-wide scale, for Rosa Luxemburg it had no other meaning than that of a false policy which would be dearly paid for.

In contradistinction to Lenin, for whom, quite in keeping with his general position, organization and the conquest of power for the Party was the necessary pre-supposition for the victory of Socialism, Rosa Luxemburg's glance was directed to the class needs of the proletariat. Furthermore, while Lenin's theory and practice were tied up mainly with the backward conditions of Russia, Rosa Luxemburg constantly took as her starting point the more highly developed capitalist countries and hence was incapable of seeing in the "historical mission" of the working class a party-and-leadership problem. She laid more weight upon the spontaneous mass movements and the self-initiative of the workers than upon the growth of the organization and the quality of the leaders. Thus she differed fundamentally from Lenin in her appraisal of the factor of spontaneity in history and hence also as regards the role of organization in the class struggle. Before entering into these differences, however, we should like to contrast briefly the views of Luxemburg and Lenin on the Marxian theory of accumulation, since this question is very closely bound up with all the others.

The Collapse of Capitalism.

In her campaign against the Revisionists, Rosa Luxemburg had already emphasized that the labor movement must be prepared to face the question of revolution, not that of reform, since capitalism is inevitably heading toward collapse. In opposition to Revisionism, which strove to impute to capitalism an endless duration, she maintained that "with the assumption that capitalist accumulation has no economic limit, socialism loses its granite..." (1) The first part of this article appeared in the Modern Monthly, September 1935.

---
Fascists or Communists as the case might be—in its ambition to monopolize all the good jobs, is ready to exterminate the other group.

True, the interests of the workers, as the "hermetic" class, may eventually compel them to practice solidarity against all their exploiters, while the oligarchical tendencies within each exploiting or potentially exploiting group make for continuous dissension among them. But in this respect, the various quarrelling clans of power—hungry intellectuals are no different from those of all the other exploiting classes, past or present, whether capitalists or land-holders.

Do I have to dwell upon such "inaccuracies" to put it mildly—as the one where P.M. says that "the intellectuals have no economic functions" (p. 34)? It is simply amazing how anybody can say such a thing in the present phase of capitalism, when the capitalist, in most cases, has become a pure parasite, fulfilling merely the "function" of owning and consuming, while the intellectuals are in charge of all the aspects of economic and technical management, political administration and cultural leadership of the entire capitalist system.

II—FASCISM AND BOLSHEVISM

The aspirations and appetites of the intellectual "outs" can find their expression and satisfaction in various "ideologies", in "proletarian" Marxism, in the aristocratic Parthenian of the Italian Fascists, or in the race gospel of the Nazis. Just as the capitalist bourgeoisie under different circumstances can embrace the Voltairean iconoclasm of the French Republic, or the medieval emperor-god worship of a militarist semi-absolutism, Japanese style.

The fascists in power are not just flunkeys of the capitalists, as P.M. seems to believe; they seem to believe in touching harmony with Trotsky ("The Social Structure of the Soviet State"). They are their major partners; they are swallowing up an ever growing share of the nation's wealth; and while in some countries they are now greatly favoring their munition magnates, their taxes and assessments are impoverishing the bourgeoisie as a whole in order to feed an enormous bureaucratic machine. That machine does not stand "above the classes" (#—see bottom of next page); it is both a "protector" of the rich and their blackmailing parasites at the same time; largely comparable to the Praetorians of the Roman Empire, who, while permitting the property-owners to exist, actually were the masters of the country and lived at the expense of all the other classes of the population. Of, if another example is still necessary, there is the Japanese situation, in which not only rules the country politically and robs it by taxation, as do the Fascists in Italy, but has also taken over the economic management and exploitation of most of the country's resources—not for the Japanese millionaires on the island Empire, but for the army, that is, for itself. They are certainly not the flunkeys of the Chinese-Manchu capitalists, nor of the Japanese millionaires whose most prominent representatives they are in the habit of "bumping off" from time to time...

Undoubtedly the fascist state bureaucracy also rules over other groups of intellectuals. But what of it? The large feudalists also ruled over the smaller nobles, just as the financial sharks do over the smaller capitalists, and the higher clergy over their minor brethren. Under the oligarchical principle inherent to all systems of domination, a minority within each rule to some ways gets the best morsels with the additional seasoning of the greatest display of power.

P.M. asserts that fascism "would never have come to power" if it were at all possible that the fascists could turn on the capitalists. Has he never heard of mercenaries of various sorts, Mamelukes, Praetorians, Mamelukes, Praetorians, of all times and all countries, who would become the masters of those who hired them? Do I have to remind him of the fact that there is an openly anti-capitalist wing within the Italian fascist party which recommends "the Road to Moscow"; i.e. the expropriation of the capitalists; and that in the opinion of those familiar with the situation, Mussolini, if driven to a corner, will not hesitate to turn Bolshevik, if by so doing he can save the rule of his party—the party of the most determined and energetic

(#) The Fascists of Italy have repeatedly forced the capitalists to increase wages, to shorten hours and even to take on numbers of unemployed workers. They did it at moments when they thought it necessary by some "anti-capitalist" gesture to win the allegiance of the workers; or, as in the case of the unemployed, for the purpose of reducing their fiscal expenses, preferring, as they did, to use the funds coming into the needs of the bureaucracy. If P.M. says that such a thing is "objectively not possible" and that "nothing of the sort has so far happened", he simply chooses to deny facts which in their time were generally reported in the newspapers.
section of the intelligentsia. (#)

If a large part of the intellectuals in various countries, instead of turning socialist or communist, joins the fascist ranks, it does so largely for the same reason for which many workers likewise don the black or brown shirt. No doubt, the influence of reactionary ideology plays a certain part in the process. But it is largely their impatience, their desire for a short cut to power, that is the reason why the success of the new gospel. Many of the fascist intellectuals would join the Communist movement, if they saw that it had any chances, or at least intentions of winning immediately. For by now it has become obvious to most observers that the leading Communists of the non-fascist countries have ceased to be revolutionary at all; that ever since 1923 they have the ordinary Russian patriots abroad, actually opposed to any revolutionary steps that might disturb the international status quo in which the U.S.S.R. has been interested for many years. Like the socialists of pre-war times the Communists - meaning of course the official leadership - have become a party of anti-capitalist protest and not of anti-capitalist revolt.

Over and over again P.M. repeats the Stalinist thesis that Fascism is just the expression of the needs of monopoly capital "in order to maintain the capitalist system at all." A glance at what actually happened - and why it happened - in Italy and Germany, the main fascist countries, would show that it simply is not so. It was not the necessity of saving the capitalist system - either from the proletarian menace or from its internal weakness - that brought about fascism in Italy. The first menace had been taken care of by the socialists themselves, when the jitters experienced by the bourgeoisie during the near-revolution of 1920 induced the capitalists to enter that alliance with Mussolini's bands which they later regretted when it was too late. For whatever the fascists gave them by cowering the workers, they took from the capitalists by their various direct or indirect exactions for the maintenance of the government machine. Italian capitalism and its profits would have survived without Mussolini as well.

Nor does Germany serve as a confirmation of the official communist thesis which P.M. so readily accepts. This is not the place for repeating all the circumstances which hoisted Hitler into power. Only dogmatic blindness, judging according to set formulas, could assert that the Weimar Republic, or a combination of Weimarism with Briining's or Schleicher's semi-constitutionalism, would not have just as well done the job of saving German capitalism.

In either case - and this likewise includes a number of smaller states of the more or less undeveloped Balkan or Latin-American type - it was the existence of capitalism that was at stake. In many of the countries with fascist, military-fascist or near-fascist dictatorships there is practically no modern capitalism at all, and even no big landed property either; practically all the exploitation being done in what one could call the old Chinese method described by Wittfogel: taxation of the small property holders for the sake of a parasitic bureaucratic and military apparatus. It is for the possession of the soft jobs in the civil service and in the officers' caste that struggles are waged there between the various groups of "outs" and "ins". In the industrially more developed countries fascist tendencies are the result of cooperation between specific groups of capitalists who see in fascism a greater guarantee for the increase of their profits, and certain ruined and therefore adventurous sections of the new middle classes. In these countries the existence of capitalism itself is not affected, whether these machinations are successful or not.

The Stalinists' insistence upon the thesis about fascism-and-monopoly-capitalism is obvious enough. For years they have been repeating that the Trotskyists are the "advance-guard of counter-revolutionary intervention" (no joking); until two years ago they have made hundreds of thousands of their "bourgeoisie". The Stalinists assert that the Trotskyists are "social-fascists", or, as Stalin put it "twin-brothers of fascism." So this was just another "magnificent arsenal of abuse that is always calculated to hide the real issues." Heinz Neumann, a leading German Communist who, after the catastrophe of 1933, for awhile engaged in independent thinking, finally began to mutter something about the dictatorship of the "lumpenproletariat" he actually meant the decase intellectuals and semi-intellecutals. He was severely called down and punished by his masters in Moscow; for if the German semi-intellectual "dom-and-outers" were able to seize power and to hold it as major partners of the German capitalists, then some people might become suspicious that it was a similar group of decase intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who seized all the power in Russia and has been holding it until now.
under the guise of a "proletarian dictatorship".

P.M. docilely accepts the Bolshevik thesis as to fascist identity with finance capital. And as if to make up for this suspicious harmony of opinions, he supplements it with another theory according to which the house built by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin is nothing but a form of capitalism, subject to the same laws of motion as any other capitalist system. He consistently speaks of "State Capitalism", a term that many writers, including the undersigned as well, have loosely applied to the Russian system.

Now to be theoretically exact, it is not admissible to apply the old terminology to the new Russian reality. An economic system whose means of production are socially owned is called "bureaucratized" which is the same, no longer falls under the category of capitalism. It is "capitalism" only inasmuch as "capitalism" is accepted as identical with "exploitation". But the two terms are not identical. Capitalism, of course, necessarily involves exploitation; but there were forms of exploitation which could not be called capitalist. (#)

According to the best Marxist authorities which P.M. certainly recognizes, capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner; and the Russian State, that is, the bureaucracy, is only one sole firm, so to speak. At the end of his book Das Akkumulations-und Kartell-Gesetz, the well-known Marxist Professor Henryk Grossmann analyzes the idea whether capitalism could eventually assume the form of a "General-Kartell", i.e., of a One-Big-Trust system. He denies this possibility and declares that, once matters have gotten to that point, capitalism will not exist any longer and its place will have been taken "either by a plain system of domination (Grossmann uses the expression "offenes Herrschaftsverhaltnis" which it is difficult to translate literally - M.J.) as in the Middle Ages (which may mean only the relation of the feudal lord to his serfs) or a socialist commonwealth (sozialistische Gemeinwirtschaft)."

As a good old Socialist, with sympathies for the U.S., B.R., Grossmann was reluctant to dwell in greater detail upon this alternative. He apparently felt that he was on dangerous ground for, as far as the present writer is concerned, personal conversation with him, the professor refuses to commit himself as to the character of the Russian social system and calls it vaguely a "proletarian state". Had he disregarded these personal sympathies, he would have had to state that what followed upon the elimination of private capitalism in Russia was a combination of both "socialism" and "Herrschaftsverhaltnis".

For, paradoxical as it may sound to some readers, exploitation is just as much possible under socialism as under any other previous social system. If one were to indulge in prophesying one could make a guess that the coming forms of human exploitation, as foreshadowed by Russia's system of government ownership and inequality of incomes, will simply be called socialism, and that in the ears of the underdog this word will assume the same connotation of master-and-slave relationship as feudalism and capitalism.

Theoretically speaking, the essence of socialism has always been merely government ownership of the means of production, even if that substance is sometimes presented more attractively as an "association of free and equal producers," a term that is as vague as so many other traditional socialist slogans. In other words, socialism means primarily a change in the form of production, or in the ownership of means of production. If the question of distribution has always been considered as a secondary matter, after the first and most important task of socialization had been carried out, practically all socialist theorists take it for granted that immediately after the socialist revolution, during "the first phase of communism", to use an expression of Marx, there would be no equality of incomes. (#) It is only under "the higher phase of communism", after God knows how many generations or centuries, that the principle of "from the  

(#1) There are a number of passages in Marx's Critique of the Gotha Program dealing with the distribution during "the first phase of communism". These passages have been generally interpreted by all writers to the effect that during the period in question there would be inequality of compensation. Among these writers are included such independent and dissimilar thinkers as Georges Sorel, in his "Decomposition du Marxisme" and Sidney Hook in "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx", neither of whom could be accused of being an apologist of the Stalin system whose official Marx-scholars use the same passages for justifying the inequalities of the Russian regime.
each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" would be applied. (It is hard to assume that a genius of the sharp intelligence of a Marx should not have seen thru the haziness, not to say deceitfulness, of this formula. For who is to determine a man's "needs"? None other apparently than the bureaucrats, the same men who in present-day Russia determine that a high class manager "needs" or, let us say "deserves", several thousand rubles a month, while for an ordinary laborer or other plain worker, one hundred or one hundred fifty a month is sufficient.)

P.M. uses the old liturgical phrase of the "contradiction between the productive forces and the production relations" for his wishful contention that "capitalism...in all its manifestations must go under."

Well, if he means that the private capitalist system is doomed, I have no quarrel with his statement; but the "state capitalism" Russian model which he includes among these manifestations, is in "capitalism" such as envisaged by Marxist criticism. It is a system of planned economy to which the Marxist concepts are not applicable; and its disappearance, or more correctly, its evolution towards a more equalitarian (and libertarian) form of socialism will be subject to altogether different laws, as to which there are no indications in the writings of the Teacher.

Another example of P.M.'s "wishful thinking" is his contention that a system, such as exists in Russia, would be impossible "in industrial countries". Aside from the fact that present day Russia is already a highly industrialized country, it would lead too far afield to follow his entire argumentation. Suffice it to quote his conclusion which establishes the fallacy of his reasoning. He says that "in highly developed capitalist countries...any revolution is of necessity a workers' revolution (because)...state capitalism...likewise is incapable of improving their situation" (my emphasis - M.N.)

The very opposite is true. Even that one per cent of planned economy, or state capitalism, or paternalism, if you wish, which was instituted by the New Dealers, has undoubtedly improved the situation of large sections of the working class and won the sympathies of the masses for President Roosevelt. Only sectarianism can assert that if some unforeseen event should give the power to a combination of, let us say, left-wing New Dealers, Socialists and pink Communists, they would not open the closed plants and so increase the country's productivity as to have enough for raising substantially the general standard of living of the masses. No doubt they would maintain a sharp division between the wages paid to the worker and the salaries of the managers and directors; but the sudden improvement of the lower levels would certainly add to the stability of the new "state capitalist" system.

That system will not last forever, of course. It will certainly be modified by further struggles of the workers intent upon obtaining a larger share in the distribution of the national income. But to say that the establishment of such a system is altogether "impossible" in the western countries, or that it could be only a passing adventure, is about as wise as the predictions about the impending fall of the Soviet regime which he have heard for the last eighteen years.

III - "COUNCILS" AND SOVIETS

There is a certain very definite purpose behind all this frantic and contradictory pleading. It is not merely the desire to defend the purity and the correctness of the Marxist scheme of things with its two-dimensional pattern of "capitalist" and "proletarian", that knew of no intellectuals as the possible inheritors of capitalist exploitation, and whose non-descript "petty-bourgeoisie" was bound to become a part of the "proletariat."

P.M. is the representative of a new revolutionary current that is out to regenerate Marxism after its defilement at the hands of the Socialists and the Communists. That new current - its followers call themselves "Council Communists" - also hopes to win over the masses still under the sway of the Teacher's unworthy disciples. It sees in the Workers' Councils the instrument for destroying the capitalist system and for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, the Council Communists realize that a criticism of the intelligentsia as the ruling class of the coming period of a socialized form of economy, is directed not only against the Socialists and the Communists, but against their own ambitions for power as well.

They will, of course, violently contest this considering that they do not constitute a party; that they include practically no intellectuals, and that their conception of the proletarian revolution is not that of the Bolshevik party dictatorship but the truly Marxist idea of a real dictatorship of the working masses.
Well, we have heard these things before. The modern French post-War syndicalists - those who remained revolutionists and have joined neither the S.P. nor the C.P. - have now adopted the slogan of "All power to the Trade Unions", as opposed to Communist party dictatorship. Those who can add two and two together have repeatedly pointed out to them that at bottom this was only another form of Bolshevism, for, considering the role and position of the great majority of the working masses, "All power to the Trade Unions" could mean only "All Power to the Trade Union Bureaucrats"; in other words, the dictatorship of the educated upset ex-workers at the head of the trade unions, such as the Hendersons, the Jouhaux, the R. Greens, the Legiens or Tomsky, all of whom in their bloody struggles with class politicians and even cabinet members, differing in nothing from the "regular" intellectuals. A social system whose economic and political center were to be the French General Federation of Labor, would be in everything, except the terminology, identical with that established by the declassed intellectuals and ex-workers of the Russian Communist Party. The same criticism has likewise been applied to the Spanish anarchists of the present day, who are, gradually, though still shamefacedly, coming around to the idea of a revolutionary government by their own organization.

And how about the "Councils"? In the April, 1936 issue of the Council Correspondence there was an article about the Workers' Councils which certainly is revealing. "In the process of revolution" - the author says on page 27 - the old State power will be destroyed, and the organs that take its place, the workers' councils, for the time being, will certainly have important political functions still to repress the remains of capitalist power. Their political function of governing, however, will be gradually turned into nothing but the economic function of managing the collective process of production of goods for the needs of society".

Were the Russian Soviets - and "Soviet" means nothing else but "Council" - not holding out the same promise of "withering away" of the State? Who, pray, will carry out these "important political functions" to repress the remains of capitalist power? The masses? Or will it not be rather a special, well-armed body of truly proletarian Cheka-men, under the guidance of well-educated ex-workers, the most ardent militants of the "Council" idea? Where is the guarantee that these men, once entrusted with "important political functions to repress the remains of capitalist power" will not repress the workers as well, by deceiving and disarming them gradually, the way it was done by the just as reckless and honest Bolshevik Soviet militants? And will the sum total of all these official council militants not constitute a party, whether they adopt that name or not? And will that party not be interested in establishing a privileged bureaucracy living on the fat of the land just as was done by the Russian bureaucracy? Do the Council Communists mean to say that their pure Marxist principles will prevent them from doing so? Do they actually believe that any class or group that has become a privileged stratum - and a victorious group, by seizing the government machine, usually develops into a privileged class - will abide by its pre-victory "principles" which were opposed to exploitation?

P.M.'s reply is very simple. "The means of production" he says "in the hands of the producer - by which the technically necessary centralism is not precluded but rendered imperative - that is communism." No - that is not "communism"; that is just sheer phrase-mongering. The "necessary centralism" actually does away with "the means of production in the hands of the producers", i.e., of the factory councils, if I correctly get P.M.'s meaning. That "necessary centralism" is nothing but our good old Bolshevik state bureaucracy which under P.M.'s "real" proletarian dictatorship will simply be disguised under another name. Moreover, are not the "factory councils" themself composed as they are of the most energetic and the most intelligent and educated individuals - merely the basic embryonal unit of the new "proletarian" aristocracy that invariably rises above the masses, a process that is as old and as melancholy as the history of all human mass struggles since the beginning of time?

In an effort to show how, according to the conception of the Council Communists, the whole social fabric is practically in the hands of the workers themselves, P. M. wrote that the "enterprise is the starting point of their (the workers') insurrection, the basis of their dictatorship and efforts at social reorganization". And what about the millions of the unemployed - sometimes one-third of the population - who will have to be taken care of? Before they get "the means of production in their hands" and can "start" anything at their own pace, that is, the State bureaucracy, that will have to tackle the problem of reorganizing the industries, of opening the idle factories and of distributing work to the unemployed. And will the State bureaucracy, once it had acquired such enormous power, voluntarily give up the source of that power?
There is a very suspicious passage on page 33 of P.M. article. He says there quite correctly that "without economic equality there is no communist society." (I take it that under "economic equality" he means plainly equal pay for a "day's" work whether it be dishwashing or teaching astronomy.) Then he adds: "This equality must not only be actually possible; it must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society, and until that time communism is quite out of the question."

What does this mean? Does P.M. intend to say that if in a highly industrial country like Germany, England, or the United States the workers were to rise at present, seize the industries and install "their own" dictatorship in the form of Workers' Councils, the question might arise that equality of incomes would not be quite practicable immediately? Not that I believe that such full equality could be established immediately "on the morrow after the revolution" as the usual phrase goes. But if that complete economic equality of incomes cannot be established immediately, what will be the difference, except in personnel, between the "real" dictatorship of the proletariat, as advocated by the Council Communists, and the system of exploitation now established by the Russian Communists?

There is another suspicious sentence on the very same page. P.M. says that "with the setting aside of the class relations (P.M. apparently means the abolition of classes, N.H.) there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions." If these words have any significance, then they can mean only one thing: that there will be different income levels, but that these differences will not be very "sharp". Now, who is to determine what is or what is not a "sharp distinction"? It will be apparent to the Central Office of the Workers' Councils or whatever other name the Government will assume, and will that Government, that is, the politico-technical office-holders, not be interested in establishing the same distinctions that would be introduced by any other privileged body?

P.M. apparently felt that the educational rift - which is a class rift - separating intellectual and manual workers, would militate against the establishment of complete economic equality right after the inauguration of the "proletarian dictatorship." So he dismisses this difficulty by saying that there are no "sharp distinctions", in fact, that there are practically no distinctions at all.

He actually has the temerity to say that "the mass of the workers have become skilled workers"; (N) And that "the demand placed on that element of the population performing intellectual functions are as numerous as those placed on the mass of the workers." Assertions which are on par with the old demagogical flatteries of Kautsky, Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht about the intellectual superiority of the workers over the bourgeoisie. The material kernel behind these flatteries being merely the perfectly justified conviction of the socialist leaders that they were just as able to run the country as their political opponents from the capitalist camp. In the same way P.M. identifies an infinitesimal minority of labor aristocrats - the potential intellectuals and future bosses - with the "working class" at large. It is the old, old story of the leaders demanding power not for themselves but for the masses which are so educated, so skilled, so intelligent that they will be able to run the government and the industries all by themselves.

Having thus somewhat vaguely indicated that there may be some distinctions in income levels even after the establishment of the "proletarian dictatorship," P.M. feels impelled to assuage somewhat the misgivings as to the truly equalitarian character of his revolution. "If communism," he says, "is bound up with the presence of equality, then it is also beyond doubt that this equality will be actualized, for the social forces of production are impelling to communism and this impulsion is the historically determining factor." In other words, don't worry; some day the "social forces of production" will convince the Council Communists - or should I say Workers' Councils? - in charge of the new system, that the time has come to abolish Workers' Councils or whatever other name the Government will assume. And will that Government, that is, the politico-technical office-holders, not be interested in establishing the same distinctions that would be introduced by any other privileged body?

(?) Taking it for granted that in harmful occupations such as working in mines, sewers, etc., the day will be shorter than in other industries or professions.

(?) It would be a waste of time to engage in the refutation of such an assertion, for the operations of the great majority of modern industrial workers can be learned in a few days or weeks; and if it is "skillful work," then a peanut peddler is a businessman and an ambulant scissors-grinder a manufacturer.
of the Hebrew prophets, and also in some of the utopian dreams of Charles Fourier. But this time they are being served with a sauce of "scientific socialism".

Do I have to discuss the statement (p.34) that "there remains for the workers nothing but to take charge of the social organization"? Where are the workers who are able to "take charge of the social organization"? Even if all workers were "class-conscious" they could not tackle the job because ninety-nine out of a hundred understand absolutely nothing of the complicated business of running a highly involved social system of the machine age.

No, it is obviously not the "workers" whom P.M. means by this sentence; it is, I repeat, that infinitesimal minority of workers, such as P.M. and his friends, who have acquired a certain amount of education and who have become intellectuals in fact - even if they are still compelled to work at the menial. As soon as the rising of the workers shakes the foundations of capitalism, these "workers" will naturally leave their benches and do what every organized revolutionary leadership is bound to do: establish their own dictatorship as was done by the Bolsheviks, and like them, enjoy the advantages of their victory.

Do I have to insist upon the obvious Marxian truth that the thoughts and the intentions of this new revolutionary leadership will not be determined by logical or theoretical considerations, but by the role they will play in the "social production process" - after they will have arrived at the top of the social system and become a new privileged group jointly with the other intellectual workers who will be under their orders?

P.M. is altogether amazing when he says that "the necessarily spontaneous character of the insurrections... restricts the participation in them of the intellectuals not yet proletarianized." Not yet proletarianized! As if the trouble were merely with the bourgeois intellectuals, and not with the tragic antagonism between the interests of the underdog and its leadership as such. In fact, it is not the bourgeois intellectuals, but those who are "proletarianized", the declassed, the down-and-outers, those who are often poorer than the workers themselves, who as a rule become the leaders of the workers, and who, so far, have always betrayed them. (It is understood that this refers to the groups as such without any reflections upon the personal sincerity of particular individuals.)

Having thus left the door open for the "proletarianized" intellectuals, P.M. says on page 35 that "the present-day working class is quite in a position, without and if necessary, against the intellectuals, to make their revolution and to build up the new society." In other words, he wants a revolutionary movement headed by self-taught workers or ex-workers like himself, intellectuals playing a subordinate role. All the previous experience with the self-taught workers who make up the trade union bureaucracy of the whole world, and constitute a substantial part - if not the majority - of Russia's new bourgeoisie or nobility, has left him unimpressed.

With a simplicity that is touching he declares that "the whole problem of the intellectuals is one of subordinate importance." And that "any difficulties which may be occasioned by the intellectuals (after the revolution) may be dealt with in the framework of the proletarian dictatorship." In other words, if the Marxist college-boys of the C.P. will interfere with the Marxist ex-workers of the C.C., our real proletarian G.P.U. will show them what's what.

IV. THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

My critic repeatedly mentioned the name of my friend and teacher Waclaw Machajski, thus making it appear as though my opinions were in every respect identical with those of the author of the Intellectual Worker. Now, as P.M.'s presentation of some of our views was not quite beyond reproach, I am quoting a few passages from my book Rebels and Renegades which in condensed form give the gist of Machajski's opinions:

"In Machajski's conception, the socialist theories of the nineteenth century expressed the interests of the intellectual workers - not those of the working class, in which he placed the manual workers only. The mental workers, he argued, were a rising privileged class, fighting for a place in the sun against the old privileged classes, the landed owners and capitalists. Higher education was their specific "capital" - the source of their actual or potential higher incomes. Political democracy (or a revolutionary dictatorship, according to circumstances) was the first, and State Capitalism (used here for the reasons explained in the third footnote of Chapter II of this article) the next, step to their domination. To achieve these objects they needed the support of the manual workers. The confidence of the latter they won by helping them
in their early struggles for better wages and by dangling before them the socialist ideal of equality. That socialist beyond was meant only as propaganda, as a sort of proletarian religion — not as an object of struggle for the living generation. The socialism which the radical intelligentsia really aspired to was nothing but State Capitalism (#); a system of government ownership, under which private capitalists would have yielded place to office-holders, managers, engineers; the coming form of exploitation in which the intellectual workers receiving higher salaries than those paid for manual labor, would constitute the new and only ruling class, absorbing into their ranks the former capitalists and the self-taught ex-workers.

"As a champion of the manual workers, particularly the unskilled and the unemployed, he advocated revolutionary mass struggle for higher wages and government provision for the unemployed, as the only issue of actual interest to the working class. The leadership of that struggle he visualized in the hands of an international secret organization of revolutionists. Engaged exclusively in unifying, and in extending the scope of, the spontaneous uprisings of the manual workers and of the unemployed, this organization would dictate the law to the governments, using the weapon of "world-wide strikes". In other words, it would force the privileged classes and their governments to provide either work or support for the unemployed and to grant sweeping increases in the wages of the manual workers. Elimination of private capitalist profits, automatic transition to State Capitalism, and finally equalization of the incomes of the manual workers with those of the new rulers would be the progressive steps of the revolutionary mass struggle. Equality of income would secure to all an equal opportunity for higher education and thus would do away with all class divisions. The function of government having ceased to be the privilege of an educated minority, the State as an instrument of oppression and exploitation would disappear. Marx considered that exploitation ceased with the disappearance of the private capitalists. In Machajski's opinion the Marxian scheme of eliminating capitalists but maintaining higher rewards for mental than for manual labor would 'substitute for the capitalists a class of hereditary soft-handed intellectuals who would perpetuate the slavery of the manual workers and of their offspring'.

Now, much as I agree with many of Machajski's ideas, I think he is not consistent when he holds that his international secret organization of professional revolutionists, acting, so to speak, as the energizers of the spontaneous mass revolts, would actually usher in that classless millennium in which all exploitation would be eliminated once and for all. Supposing that every revolutionary situation were actually to place his organization in the forefront of the class struggle, enabling it to bring any existing government to its knees and to force it into making sweeping economic concessions to the masses - what would then prevent that organization from seizing power? What would prevent it from consolidating its rule in the same manner as was done by the Bolsheviki, and from perpetuating the same economic inequalities which are now so apparent in Soviet Russia? Its original equalitarian principles? But principles are like promises. They hold good before the seizure of power, and are always disregarded after they have served their purpose.

In other words, the objection which I am raising against Machajski's conception of the "final" revolution is the same that holds with regard to any other revolutionary school, whether its followers call themselves Bolsheviki, anarchists, syndicalists or Council Communists. If they really adopt revolutionary measures for the overthrow of the existing system they can do nothing else but what was done by the Bolsheviki: seize power, organize a revolutionary government even though they may give it another name, defend it against the reactionaries at first, and then consolidate it against the masses as well in the interest of a better paid new aristocracy of office-holders, technicians, and other members of the educated layers of society.

P.M. concludes that my position practically amounts to the old, old popular dictum "Thus it had been, thus it is, and thus it will remain"; in other words, that — as the saying has it — I consign the poor to statistics and to eternal slavery. My critic's indignation at my "skepticism" would be more convincing if in his mind the idea of working class emancipation were not identical with his own group's accession to power.

As a matter of fact, my "skepticism" is the very opposite of submission to fate. On the contrary, it implies permanent revolt against any status quo-capitalist exploitation of today, as well as socialist inequality of tomorrow. It is directed both against the property-owning oppressors of today and the job-holding

(#) The words State Capitalism were used here for the reasons explained in the third footnote of Chapter II of this article.
"liberators" of tomorrow; against the middle class of yesterday which used the workers in its struggle against feudal tyranny; and against the new middle class of today which uses them against the capitalist bourgeoisie; against the college-trained apologists of the coming form of slavery, and against their competitors from the ranks of the self-educated ex-workers.

The basic tenets of my "skepticism" could be summarized as follows:

1. The composition of the labor movements involves an inevitable partnership of mass and leadership; a partnership which, though to a certain extent beneficial to the masses, invariably results in a tragic conflict between the interests of the elite and those of the following.

2. These leading elites, being more educated than the masses, are essentially aristocratic in character, no matter whether they profess to be democratic, anarchist, socialist-communist, syndicalist or fascist.

3. Like all aristocratic groups, these elites are inevitably Machiavellian or amoral in their policies; keeping up their own "morality" with all sorts of philosophical justifications (rationalizations) and re-sorting constantly to a conscious or unconscious deception of the masses. All their considerations recede behind the one central purpose of obtaining and maintaining all power and its resulting benefits for their specific revolutionary or counter-revolutionary group.

4. Sooner or later all of these movements evolve certain religious features, the analogy with the material growth and spiritual decay of many of the great religions being particularly striking.

5. Just as in its struggles of a century ago, the bourgeoisie aroused the masses against the remnants of feudalism and in the process unwittingly contributed to an improvement of the position of the workers to the industrial era, the malcontent intellectuals, by organizing the workers against the capitalists are likewise indirectly contributing to a further elevation of the social status of the downtrodden.

6. There is an ever recurring competition for power between the various groups of the educated malcontents in charge of these mass movements. That competition for power, with the help, and at the expense of the uneducated masses engaged in physical work, is at the same time a guaranty against stagnation and the perpetuation of the status quo.

7. After the elimination of the capitalist owners, there follows inevitably a period of internecine contests between various groups of intellectuals and educated ex-workers for predominance within the government machine - the Trotsky-Stalin complex - caused by the oligarchical tendencies prevailing within each ruling class. The urge to win forces the rebellious rivals to appeal to the dissatisfaction of the manual workers and to assist them in obtaining a larger share of the national income. This process is accompanied by the rise of the most educated and the most intelligent elements among the manual workers themselves, joining either of the contending groups or making their own bid for power.

8. These three- or four-cornered struggles for power, joined in occasionally by disinterested idealists championing the cause of the underdog, constitute the elements of the permanent revolution which will unceasingly work for the continuous rise in the material and educational standard of the working masses - even though aristocratic tendencies making for oligarchical rule and the more privileged status of those wielding the most efficient combination of knowledge, intelligence and ruthlessness, may persist in one form or another.

9. For those who are not out for power or personal advantage, and whose sentiments are with the horny-handed underdog, there is only one thing to do: To give up the idea that there could be any specific organization of "really proletarian" rebels, which is more "honest" or more "consistent" than all the other parties or groups. For every organization wants only one thing: power; that is privilege, for itself and for its more active members. Those who are eager for a good fight may further the cause of the workers by joining any revolutionary or trade union organization which in one way or another is opposed to the existing system. Each of these organizations, in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours and jobs, or relief for the unemployed. Within any of these organizations a disinterested working class rebel can do his useful work by pushing forward any working class struggle for better conditions, and by denouncing the leaders if for one reason or another they may be suspected of restraining the masses or of selling them out. Any large-scale wage struggle, any large-scale campaign of the unemployed for jobs, is fraught with the potentialities of a general uprising of the masses, of the expropriation of the capitalists, and of the establishment of a planned socialist econo-
my, with its further struggles for more and always
more, continuously reducing the disparities between
the material and educational level of the bureaucrati­
cic masters and that of the slaves of physical labor.

This is my conception of the Permanent Revolution. It
is permanent, and it knows of no millenium in which
full harmony has been achieved once for all eternity.

The final revolution may be left to those who dream
merely of their own elevation over the masses.

- Max Nomad -

A New C.C. Pamphlet:
What COMMUNISM Really Is
The Social Average Labor Time as the Basis
of Communist Production and
Distribution
Order At Once: Council Correspondence
1237 N. California Ave, Chicago, Ill.
Price: 10 cents

The next issue of the Council Correspondence will
bring:

THE CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN
GERMAN IMPERIALISM
and other important articles.

Soon to be published:
OUTLINE of MARX'S CAPITAL

-- 42 --

THE PARTY AND THE WORKING CLASS.

The first traces of a new labor movement are just be­
coming visible. The old movement is organized in par­
ties. The belief in parties is the main reason for
the impotence of the working class; therefore we avoid
forming a new party - not because we are too few, but
because a party is an organization that aims to lead
and control the working class.

In opposition to this, we maintain the working class
can rise to victory only when it independently at­
tacks its problems and decides its own fate. The work­
ners should not unquestioningly accept the slogans of
others, nor of our own groups, but must think, act
and decide for themselves. This conception is in sharp
contradiction to the tradition of the party as the
most important means of educating the proletariat.
Therefore many, though repudiating the Socialist and
Communist parties, resist and oppose us. This is part­
ly due to their traditional concepts; after viewing
the class struggle as a struggle of parties, it be­
comes difficult to consider it as purely the struggle
of the working class, as a class struggle. But partly
this concept is based on the idea that the party never­
theless plays an essential and important part in the
struggle of the proletariat. Let us investigate this
latter idea more closely.

Essentially, the party is a grouping according to
views, conceptions; the classes are groupings accord­
ing to economic interests. Class membership is deter­
mained by one's part in the process of production;
party membership is the joining of persons who agree
in their conceptions of the social problems. Formerly
it was thought this contradiction would disappear in
the class party, the "workers' party." During the rise
of the Social-Democracy, it seemed that it would
gradually embrace the whole working class, partly as
members, partly as supporters. Because Marxian theory
declared that similar interests beget similar view­
points and aims, the contradiction between party and
class was expected gradually to disappear. History
proved otherwise. The Social-Democracy remained a
minority, other working class groups organized against
it, sections split away from it, and its own character
changed. Its own program was revised or reinterpreted.

The evolution of society does not proceed along a
smooth even line, but in conflicts and contradictions.
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With the intensification of the workers' struggle, the might of the enemy also increases and besets the workers with renewed doubts and fears as to which road is the best. And every doubt brings on splits, contradictions, and fractional battles within the labor movement. It is futile to bewail these conflicts and splits as harmful in dividing and weakening the working class. The working class is not weak because it is split up - it is split up because it is weak. Because the enemy is powerful and the old methods of warfare prove unavailing, the working class must seek new methods. Its task will not become clear as the result of enlightenment from above, it must discover it thru hard work, thru thought and conflict of opinions. It must find its own way; therefore the internal struggles. It must relinquish old ideas and illusions and adopt new ones, and because this is difficult, therefore the magnitude and severity of the splits.

Nor can we delude ourselves into believing that this period of party and ideological strife is only temporary and will make way to renewed harmony. True, in the course of the class struggle there are occasions when all forces unite on a great achievable objective and the revolution is carried on with the might of a united working class. But after that, as after every victory, arises the question: what is next? And even if the working class is victorious, it is always confronted by the most difficult task of subduing the enemy further, reorganizing production, creating new order. It is impossible that all workers, all strata and groups, with their oft-times still divergent interests should, at this stage, agree on all matters and be ready for united rapid and decisive further action. They will find the true course only after the sharpest controversies and conflicts and only thus will achieve clarity.

If in this situation, persons with the same fundamental conceptions unite for the discussion of practical steps and seek clarification thru discussions, and propagandize their conclusions, such groups might be called parties, but they would be parties in an entirely different sense from those of today. Action, the actual struggle, is the task of the working masses themselves in their entirety, in their natural groupings as factory and millhands, or other natural productive groups, because history and economy have placed them in the position where they must and they can fight the working class struggle. It would be insane if the supporters of one party were to go on strike, while those of another continue to work. But both tendencies will defend their position on strike or no strike in the factory meetings, thus fording an opportunity to arrive at a well-founded decision. The struggle is so great, the enemy so powerful that only the masses as a whole can achieve a victory - the result of the material and moral power of action, unity and enthusiasm, but also the result of the mental force of thought, of clarity. In this lies the great importance of such parties or groups based on opinions, that they bring clarity in their conflicts, discussions and propaganda. They are the organs of the self-enlightenment of the working class by means of which the workers find their way to freedom.

Naturally such parties are not static and unchangeable. Every new situation, every new problem will find minds diverging and uniting in new groups with new programs. They have a fluctuating character and constantly readjust themselves to new situations.

Compared to such groups, the present workers' parties have an entirely different character, for they have a different objective; they want to seize power for themselves. They aim not at being an aid to the workers, but for emancipation, to rule it themselves and proclaim that constitutes the emancipation of the proletariat. The Social Democracy which rose in the era of parliamentarism conceives of this rule as a parliamentary government. The Communist Party carries the idea of party rule thru to its furthest extreme in the party dictatorship.

Such parties, in distinction to the groups described above, must be rigid structures with clear lines of demarcation thru membership card, statutes, party discipline and admission and expulsion procedures. For they are instruments of power, fight for power, bridle their members by force and constantly seek to extend the scope of their power. It is not their task to develop the initiative of the workers; rather do they aim at training loyal and unquestioning members of their faith. While the working class in its struggle for power and victory needs unlimited intellectual freedom, the party rule must suppress all opinions except its own. In "democratic" parties, the suppression is veiled; in the dictatorship parties, it is open, brutal suppression.

Many workers already realize that the rule of the Socialist or Communist party will be but the concealed form of the rule of a bourgeoisie class in which the exploitation and suppression of the working class remains. Instead of these parties, they urge the formation of a "revolutionary party" that will really aim at the rule of the workers and the realization of
communism. Not a party in the new sense of those described above, but a party as those of today, that fights for power as the vanguard of the organization of conscious, revolutionary minority that seizes power in order to use it for the emancipation of the class.

We claim there is an internal contradiction in the term: "revolutionary party". Such a party cannot be revolutionary. It is no more revolutionary than the creators of the third Reich. When we speak of revolution, we naturally speak of the proletarian revolution, the seizure of power by the working class itself.

The "revolutionary party" is based on the idea that the working class needs a group of leaders who vanquish the bourgeoisie for the workers and to construct a new government - (note that the working class is not yet considered fit to reorganize and regulate production). But is not this as it should be? As the working class does not yet seem capable of revolution, is it not necessary that the revolutionary party make the revolution for it? And is this not true as long as the masses willingly endure capitalism?

Against this, we raise the question: what forces can such a party raise for the revolution? How is it able to defeat the capitalist class? Only if the masses stand behind it. Only if the masses rise and mass attacks, mass struggle, and mass strikes, overthrow the old regime. Without the action of the masses, there can be no revolution.

Two things can follow. The masses remain in action, they do not go home and leave the government to the new party. They organize their power in factory and workshop, prepare for the further conflict to the complete defeat of capital; thru the workers' councils they establish a firm union to take over the complete direction of all society - in other words, they prove they are not as incapable of revolution as it seemed. Of necessity, then, conflicts will arise with the party which itself wants to take over power and which sees only disorder and anarchy in the self-action of the working class. Possibly the workers will develop their movement and sweep out the party, with the help of bourgeois elements defeats the workers. In either case, the party is an obstacle to the revolution, because it wants to be more than a means of propaganda and enlightenment; because it feels itself called upon to lead and rule as a party.

On the other hand the masses may follow the party faith, and leave to it the further direction of affairs. They follow the slogans from above, have confidence in the party, and its organization (as in our time) to realize communism and go back home and to work. Immediately the bourgeoisie exerts its whole class power the roots of which are unbroken; its financial forces, its great intellectual resources, and its economic power in factories and great enterprises. Against this the government party is too weak. Only through irritation, concessions and yielding can it maintain itself. The excuse is given then, that more can not be secured at the moment, that it is insanity for the workers to try to force impossible demands. Thus the party, defeated of class power becomes the instrument for maintaining bourgeois power.

We stated before that the term "revolutionary party" was contradictory in the proletarian sense. We can state it otherwise: In the term "revolutionary Party" "revolutionary" always means a bourgeois revolution. Always, when the masses overthrow a government and the party, make the revolution for it? And is this not true as long as the masses willingly endure capitalism?

Those who speak of "revolutionary parties" draw incomplete, limited conclusions from history. When the Socialist and Communist parties became organs of bourgeois rule for the perpetuation of exploitation, these well meaning people merely concluded that they would have to do better. They cannot realize that the failure of these parties is due to the fundamental conflict between the self-emancipation of the working class through the party, and the pacifying the partying the party by a new sympathetic ruling clique. They think they are the revolutionary vanguard because they see the masses indifferent and inactive. But the masses are inactive only because they cannot yet comprehend the essence of the struggle and the unity of class interests, although they instinctively sense the great power of the enemy and the enormity of their task. Once condition force them into action they will attack the task of self-organization and the conquest of the economic power of capital.
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The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater consciousness of economy, to new imperious and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment of the workers. This is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the climax of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

The Civil War in Spain

I

To obtain an adequate idea of the present situation in Spain, one must take into account the previous development. Regarded from the capitalist standpoint, Spain has remained a backward country. The semi-feudal conditions still prevailing are due to a number of factors, among which might be mentioned: the geographical position which almost makes the peninsula rather a part of Africa than of Europe; the hot climate which hinders the development of agricultural productivity; and the mountainous character of the country which stands in the way of communication and has maintained provincialism. The final causes of the Spanish backwardness, however, are to be found less in these natural impediments than in others of a social and political nature.

It would be necessary to go far back into the history of Spain in order to point out how the feudal property relations were capable of impeding her capitalist development. In spite of the wars by which the country was ravaged thru-out the centuries, the christian rulers, after the expulsion of the Moors, came into a rich inheritance. In the Middle Ages, christian-feudal
Spain ranked as the wealthiest and most powerful country of Europe. This wealth was still further increased thru the colonial expeditions to Central and South America enabling the formation of a great parasitical ruler class whose luxurious living was not bound up with the development of the productive forces in Spain, but whose interests were rather best secured thru the suppression of new upward-struggling classes which are formed thru the increasing social forces of production. The holding down of all progressive forces in Spain by way of the feudal nobility and the Church constitutes one of the bloodiest chapters of human history.

The elements interested in a bourgeois revolution were unable to oppose successfully the vast power of feudalism, with the development of capitalism in the rest of Europe, Spanish pre-eminence was superseded and the economic and political decline set in. Central and South America freed themselves from Spanish rule; finally the United States appropriated Cuba and the Philippines; and Spain was now left with only her home territory and sank to a second-rate power.

But the development of the productive forces can at most be restricted, not completely prevented. Feudalism itself must become "progressive" if it suppresses the progressive classes. The partial capitalization of Spain could be opposed only under pain of her disappearance as an independent nation; and so in spite of the feudalistic political rule, Spain could not close herself off against the development of capitalism. But this capitalization, bearing the marks of feudal restrictions, brought with it a number of economic and political contradictions which signified for the great masses of the population an immediate poverty, and which furthermore stood in the way of capitalist profitability and determined the revolutionary uprisings and class conflicts of the last hundred years. The weakness of Spanish capital forced upon it a policy of compromise with the landed proprietors and the Church: a condition by which Spain has been characterized down to the present time and which, altho it secured the exploiting society against the exploited people, at the same time formed the basis of continual social friction which more and more irresistibly pressed for violent solutions.

For the last forty years the industrial bourgeoisie, with the development of its strength thus impeded, has been attempting in its own interest to drive back the feudal-conservative forces. Capital importation, by which more than ten percent of all Spanish industry was brought into the hands of foreign capitalists, supported on the one hand the capitalist struggle against feudalism, while on the other it was prejudicial to the interests of Spanish capital. This union of forces in the division of the surplus value was often conducted with great vigor, but had always ended, owing to the unbroken power of the Spanish Junkers, in new compromises marked by the tariff policy so that the Spanish population became the most impoverished and thereby also the most unproductive of Western Europe. High custom duties on farm products assure their private interests and dispense them from putting agriculture on a capitalistic basis. The high prices of farm products make necessary, in turn, industrial tariffs in order just to maintain the profitability of capital. Both policies impede the development of the domestic market and, consequently, the light productivity, productivity to compete on the world market. In the long run, this state of affairs is untenable; still, the constellation of the class forces has hitherto not permitted anything other than this situation of general relative stagnation.

Spain has about 23 million inhabitants. The density of population is very slight. The contrast between poor and rich is incredibly great. Landed proprietors with enormous domains are offset by a mass of land-poor or quite propertyless peasants and farm workers. Tho more than half the population is engaged in farming, still the productivity is so slight that the importation of foodstuffs remains a necessity. Only 40 percent of the soil is cultivated, and even that is poorly utilized. The means of production are shockingly primitive; the wooden plow drawn by oxen being still the rule. The land owners lease the soil on terms which scarcely permit the tenants, notwithstanding the hardest labor, to eke out more than a bare existence. Under the prevailing conditions, the improvement of the productivity of the soil is neither desired nor possible. The shortness of the lease agreement and the hardness of the terms cannot produce any initiative directed to increased production. The proprietors themselves have no great interest in the promotion of productivity since it is only the scarcity of farm products by which their monopolistic position can be secured. They are most keenly interested in preventing the penetration of capitalist competition in agriculture, and foreign
competition is warded off by means of the protective
tariff policy. The independent farmers suffer from
lack of land and capital; they are not in a position
to equip themselves with modern means of production
nor to employ them. For the most part, they are
wretched self-providers to whom the market is of no
concern and whose situation is not much better than
that of the two million agricultural wage workers.
Only a radical agrarian revolution could solve the
problems of the agricultural elements, just as it
would also provide the necessary impetus for the fur­
ther capitalist development. But that requires more
courage and strength than is yet possessed by the
spanish bourgeoisie.

To the 20 to 30 thousand landed proprietors belong
two-thirds of all the soil. Some of them are at the
same time industrial owners, just as many industrial­
ists; inversely, are at the same time large land own­
ers: a circumstance which partially wipes out the
distinctions between the bourgeoisie and the feudal in­
terests. The Catholic Church is not only the largest
land owner of Spain, but also has influenced in indus­
try and upon the banks; and this likewise weakens the
position of the authentic modern bourgeoisie, The strug­
gle against the Church in Spain is for this reason es­
pecially a struggle against an owning and directly
exploiting institution, and must be conducted the more
bitterly as the Church has hitherto possessed a consid­
erably more influential position in industry, in intel­
lectuals, in the army and the bureaucracy, the actual wielders of power,
and insight into its real needs, the spanish proletar­
iat is quite on a level with that of the other capi­
talist countries. It is true that, owing to spanish
peculiarities, this working population has also its
special characteristics and problems, but the general
backwardness of the country has no more been able to
prevent the development of a revolutionary proletariat
than the establishment of modern industrial enter­
prises and capitalist methods of exploitation. The
spanish industrial workers no longer see salvation in
capitalism; the conscious part of them is looking for
truly proletarian, communist solutions.

In addition to the humble bourgeoisie, the vacillat­
ing and divided middle class, the land-hungry peasant
mass and the farm workers, there is also directed
against the present conditions of the two million millions embraced in the industrial proletariat, The
bourgeoisie does not dare, however, to make use of all
these elements in a decisive thrust against feudalism.
Like the impoverished farm workers, the industrial
proletariat also is forced by its poverty to revol­
utionizing. In this matter of revolutionary initiative
and insight into its real needs, the spanish proletar­
iat is quite on a level with that of the other capi­
talist countries. It is true that, owing to spanish
peculiarities, this working population has also its
special characteristics and problems, but the general
backwardness of the country has no more been able to
prevent the development of a revolutionary proletariat
than the establishment of modern industrial enter­
prises and capitalist methods of exploitation. The
spanish industrial workers no longer see salvation in
capitalism; the conscious part of them is looking for
truly proletarian, communist solutions.

Thus the spanish bourgeoisie is faced with a dilemma: it fears the reaction as well as the revolution, and
dreams of an improvement in the speed of its railway
trains, which are the slowest in Europe, It is compul­
sion to defend not only the interests of capitalism,
but of property in general, and will oppose any move­
ment which would be liable to forge beyond the ideals
of the bourgeoisie-democratic exploitation society. The
proletariat, which already has its own revolutionary
goals, will perhaps, in case of a radical agrarian
revolution occurring simultaneously, combine with the
expropriation of the land-owners that of the capital-
ists, hence also the fear of the agrarian revolution on the part of the bourgeoisie; its reforms in this particular were not so much intended to further that revolution as to hold it up. A workers' and peasants' revolution may lead to a state capitalism which will do away also with present-day private property. However necessary for the bourgeoisie the struggle against feudalism really is, the danger is equally great that such a struggle, if conducted seriously, would lead to a state capitalism of the Russian type in which the old owners are displaced in the interest of a new, collective exploiting class in the guise of the State. In such circumstances, the sharing of the rulership with feudalism is for the bourgeoisie a lesser evil; but this "sharing" makes it necessary for the bourgeoisie to be drawn along in the wake of the large landed proprietorship which is its fortune and misfortune at the same time.

Even tho the parliamentary labor parties today renounce the struggle for state capitalism and content themselves with the government positions at the disposal of the bourgeoisie, the question already arises whether it will be possible for the workers to divert the large landed proprietorship which is its fortune into a mere change of exploiters. Just as under the present conditions a movement aiming at the democratic republic is capable of ending up in the proletarian revolution, so is it also possible that the labor organizations which come out for the democratic republic or even for state capitalism will be overrun by the revolutionary masses. In such circumstances the bourgeoisie is not inclined to fight feudalism unless the latter leaves it no choice, and is accordingly ever ready to break off the conflict with the most favorable compromise. In such conditions, the proletariat cannot take up for the interests of the bourgeoisie, or subordinate itself to bourgeois leadership, except under certain pain of being struck down later on.

II

The Spanish class conflicts led, in 1931, to the fall of the monarchy and to the establishment of a bourgeois-democratic regime. The "agrarian reform" bound up with this political change was inadequate, and incapable of meeting the needs of the country population. The indemnities to be paid to the land-owners for relinquished domains were set so high that the burden upon the peasants was not at all mitigated. In many localities the peasants took possession of the large estates; but even the expropriations were in part later legalized by the government, still at the same time the peasants were subjected to new burdens which were no more bearable than the old lease obligations. The Zamora republic was not inclined to proceed against the interests of the land-owners, as also in the political field it did not suppress the reaction. The reactionary forces assembled again and organized further advances. The fascist "Acción Popular" of Gil Robles unfolded a far-flung propaganda which, by way of skillful demagogy, was able to win influence even among the impoverished and deluded peasants. In view of the continuing social unrest, brought about thru the isolated but ever recurring manifestations of the workers and of a part of the farm population, the bourgeoisie once more formed a closer union with the reactionary forces. The elections of 1933 had again put the reactionaries in charge of the government, which now proceeded more harshly against the workers and the rebellious peasants. The restless humor of the country was reflected in the rapid alternation of the governments: from Azana to Lerroux and Martinez Barrio, and then to Lerroux and Gil Robles. The uprising in Asturias in October 1934 formed the climax of the proletarian endeavors to make use of the revolutionary currents for proletarian ends and to strike the decisive blow at the reaction. The uprising of the workers and peasants was suppressed, tho the attempt to establish social peace was still by no means successful. The acute revolutionary situation led to a number of government crises in conformity with the reorientations of the different classes and groups, and which pointed to new and greater conflicts to come. The elections at the beginning of this year witnessed a new coalition of the liberal bourgeoisie with the parliamentary labor parties and led to the forming of the "Popular Front Government."

This new government promised to put thru a series of reforms, such as are advocated by liberalism in general, and a better agrarian reform with partial land distribution. Azana declared on February 20th that "the government wants to govern in accordance with the laws, desires no dangerous innovations and comes out as a government of the moderates in favor of social peace and order." Even tho the parliamentary labor parties were in sympathy with this moderation, it was not very tasteful to the workers and peasants. These latter, taking their stand on the promise of the new government, wanted to put them into effect. The peasants arbitrarily expropriated some of the land; the strike struggles of the workers for higher wages and better working condition no longer stopped. On the streets, workers and fascists engaged in bloody conflicts; the social peace and the capitalist order continued to be endangered.
The reaction was far from regarding itself as beaten by the electoral victory of the liberal forces. The less so as, notwithstanding the fact that the elections had given the popular-front parties most of the seats in Parliament, the majority of the votes had been cast for the rightist organizations. That is to say, the Spanish electoral procedure had made it possible for the "leftists" to obtain 265 out of the 473 seats in Parliament, over against the 4,356,559 votes cast for them, the 5,051,955 of the rightists. The popular-front government, which of course was made up only of bourgeois-utilitarian and semi-utilitarian elements, was unable to govern, as would have been necessary, either against the workers or against the reaction; for the state machinery had remained in the hands of the rightists. The workers attempted to broaden the movement against the reaction into one against exploitation in general: a situation which left the government no choice but to look for new compromise solutions, which, however, were neither able to restrain the workers nor to prevent the fascist movement from assembling its forces for a new thrust. Down to the fascist uprising of the army in July 1936, there was one workers' strike after another. The government was not in a position, even when it did not dare, put an end to this movement. At the same time it did not dare to purge the administrative system and the military apparatus of the reactionary elements, for in the first place it might have to bring this apparatus into action against the workers, and secondly, it was afraid of offering the reaction any provocation. The prostration of the liberal bourgeoisie was at the same time the strengthening of the reactionary elements: fascism was making ready for the decisive blow. Shortly before the outbreak of the military uprising, LaBattalla (Barcelona) wrote: "After three months of life, the present Cortes is done for. The Cortes, reduced to this "chess" in juridical problems, petty trifles, while down below are hunger, want, anxiety, intense uneasiness, and the fewer of revolution. Our government is sterile and artificial. Sterile because it is incapable of producing anything useful, because it performs fancy tricks on a loose rope in its desire to avoid revolution while the new exists consciously to a revolutionary movement. The State apparatus does what it pleases, its decisions are not determined in any way whatsoever by the government. The State machinery is in permanent insurrection against the government. The Popular Front, finds itself facing the laboring people, which, it obstinately refuses its order to mark time at the moment when it is plainly necessary to move fast. And enfolding all is the formidable economic crisis, which is getting worse every day. The reactionary forces of the country have recovered their voices and are attacking energetically. They are attacking in the Parliament, on the streets, in the Councils of the Administration, in the pul­ pits, in the national and foreign press, in the very organization of the State."

Shortly thereafter occurred, in alliance with the fascist formations and the Church, the uprising of the army against the government. The government's fear of taking vigorous steps against the old governing apparatus, its efforts to hold back the workers, the restriction of its own actions to that of a moderate democratic-capitalist policy and the support of this temporizing policy at the hands of the parliamentary labor parties—all that had provided the reactionaries with time and opportunity to prepare the rebellion thoroughly. The condition of permanent social tension and the lack of clarity with respect to the actual constellation of the class forces was to be ended by way of the fascist dictatorship. All of which is an indication that the time for a well-ordered, nicely democratic, liberal and progressive capitalism is past. The incapacity of Spanish capitalism to set up its own dictatorship and impose its own will upon the others. The incapacity of the parliamentary labor parties, its inability to guarantee that the masses would continue to submit to being suppressed and exploited; the danger that the bourgeoisie, in its own interest and for the sake of maintaining the exploitation society generally, would sacrifice, half willingly or from force of circumstances, a part of the feudal interests; these considerations furnished occasion for the reaction, even before the population had been subjected to an adequate dose of demagogy, to attempt to establish by force its "law and order." Spanish capital was unable to be about this "business" quick enough for the reaction which took the temporizing as a sign of weakness. And if the government was not in a position to create order against the workers, it was also not in a position to proceed against the bringers of order on the side of the reaction. The fascist attack is as little directed against capitalism as capital was interested in the abolition of the land owners' privileges. The reaction simply realized that any concession which the bourgeois government made to the workers had to be made at the expense of the reactionary elements. What was given to the poor peasants and to the workers had to be taken away from the land owners and the Church, if capital itself was not to be prejudiced. The reaction, however, is of the opinion that neither the peasants nor the workers need to be given anything but hunger and bullets, and so it set about to create the necessary
"order" for itself and for capitalism. It further acted by order of that part of capital which is more interested in the maintenance of the existing conditions, than in a more progressive further development of capitalism. In Spain, also, a part of big capital is not disinclined to make common cause with the Junkers against all other strata of the population and against smaller capitals. And if the feudal reaction makes "order" for the entire exploiting society, it can thereby also, within this order, retain the predominance which it has hitherto enjoyed and which was already in danger of crumbling, or at least share the power with capital under much more favorable conditions for itself.

The liberalistic government was given no opportunity to capitulate. The fascist attack, by reason of its extent and fierceness, precluded any seeking after compromise solutions. It was not directed against Capital, but only against a governmental tendency and against a government which by its previous policy seemed liable to become the prisoner of the labor movement and which was left with no choice but to defend itself against the fascist opposition. The fascists, considering the weakness of the government, counted upon a quick victory; they under-estimated the power of resistance of the workers, who joined together for a decisive counter-attack.

The army, to which the fascist organizations were linked, rebelled in almost all parts of the peninsula, but with few exceptions was quickly suppressed in those areas having a strong labor movement. From Morocco, the Spanish Foreign Legion and the Moors were set in motion. In these areas which were not forthwith taken over by the fascists, the Shock Police and the Civil Guard remained in large part loyal to the government of Madrid. The legal government retained the loyalty also of the larger part of the fleet and of the air forces. The government was compelled to form a workers' militia. In this connection it hesitated, and still for a long while sought to prevent the predominance of the militia over the regular soldiery; but the initiative of the workers placed it before the accomplished fact that the militia had become the principal military formation. During the first few weeks of the struggle, the government, speculating upon future compromises, sought to restrict the workers as far as possible to bourgeois-military measures, and in those localities which were temporarily secured against fascism, it tried to continue the bourgeois order unchanged. This attitude, which was designed to prevent the defensive struggle from turning into a radical workers' revolution, greatly impeded the anti-fascist counter-attack and promoted the military successes of the officer caste. It was not until all hopes of compromise were recognized as an illusion, and the workers began to relax their union with the government as well as to get out more and more from under the control of the parliamentary labor parties, --it was only then that the defense was pushed with greater vigor from the side of the government also.

As moderate as was the Popular-Front government prior to the uprising, with equal moderation it wanted the uprising suppressed. And the labor parties belonging to the Popular-Front declared themselves in sympathy with this moderation. The fighting workers, however, who felt all too keenly on their own bodies, the lack of moderation among the fascists, could not acquire much taste for this harmonistic "anti-fascism." They were obliged, under pain of being struck dead, themselves to become immoderate. It is one thing to be shot, and another to issue directives from a distance. A news reporter of the Communist Party, engaged in glorifying Azana, wrote in the Rundschau of August 13th: "Azana takes us to the window of his private office. It is in the former royal palace. The chain of the Sierra Guadarrama stands forth blue in the distance. "There is the front!" he says and adds, laughing, 'and one can often see from here the smoke of the cannon."

Even tho the popular-Front parties were agreed that the policies should continue to be shaped by people who only see the smoke of the cannon in the distance, and for whom the workers are now to die just as previously they had worked for them, still the self-initiative of the workers soon created a quite different situation and made of the political defensive struggle against fascism the beginning of a real social revolution.

Like the Social Democracy throughout the world, so also that of Spain is not interested in socialism. It is true that fascism means its death, but then, too, it would be strangled by communism. And so the social democrats are obliged either to restrict themselves to performing valet services for the democratic bourgeoisie, so long as this latter can afford democracy, or else to become bolsheviks and take up for a kind of state capitalism. Otherwise there only remains for them to go the way of Severing and Doriot. Still, in the present conditions, the Spanish Social Democracy, even with the support of the Spanish Stalinists, is lacking in strength and will to release and put over a movement having its goal in state capitalism. The reasons for this are of an international as well as national nature. It is questionable, for instance,
whether the international bourgeoisie would not, thru intervention, help to put a speedy end to a Spanish state capitalism, since the thorough state capitalism is bound up with complete expropriation of the present capitalists and so, even tho not for the workers, yet for the present bourgeoisie, is the same as communism. As things now stand in Spain, there is a possibility that, thru the self-initiative of the workers in the present-day revolution aiming at state capitalism, the expropriation of private capital will be thoroughly accomplished. A state capitalism in the Italian sense (which doesn't really deserve the name), by which the interests of private property are not abolished but coordinated and which would be at the service of the economically strongest elements of Spain, is certainly aimed at by the fascists themselves. The Social Democracy, even with the best will in the world, would surely be left out of the competition. In view of the inner Spanish situation, a state capitalism controlled by the Socialist-Stalinists is unlikely as so for the simple reason that the anarcho-syndicalist labor movement would itself probably seize the power with the help of the Social-Democratic left wing of the bourgeoisie. And so the Social Democracy remains true to its traditions and continues to restrict itself to forming the left wing of the bourgeoisie. Every step to the left which the socialists made later on was forced by the manifestations of the armed workers; the "partial socialization" which the socialists began, or which they permitted to develop, was a temporary concession to the workers in order to avoid the crumbling of the front against fascism; for the striking down of fascism is also a condition precedent to the bare existence of the social democrats, and since a victorious fascism would cut their throats as well, they will also, in case the workers should succeed in expropriating the whole of capital, be reconciled to a form of state capitalism, and later place themselves at the head of such a movement in order to make it as mild as possible. So long, however, as the workers refrain from taking up the expropriation of capital on their own initiative, the Social Democracy will stick to the maintenance of capitalist democracy, or perhaps even, in the interest of this democracy, undertake a pseudo-socialization, as was done by the German social democrats after the collapse of the empire and after the Kapp Putsch. If the fascists should fail to win the power, and if for any reason the capitalist intervention should not materialize, there still is also the possibility that the Social Democracy, in the name of the Spanish and of world capitalism and by means of the government power, if such should come into its hands, will itself create that "order" which today is the concern of the fascists.

The Spanish Communist Party, which as late as 1934 had about 6,000 members but which in the meantime has multiplied somewhat, has given up every policy of its own, other than that of further attenuating the workers' struggle. Like the Social Democracy, it wants nothing more than to defend capitalist democracy against fascism. On July 29, Dolores Ibarruri broadcast in Madrid for the Communist Party of Spain the declaration that "the struggle of ideas of democratic, liberal and republican Spain, Spain is now passing thru her bourgeoisie-democratic revolution, and we communists are its vanguard." The general secretary of the Communist Party, Jose Diaz, declared, as reported by the Rundschau of August 27: "It is not a question here of setting up the dictatorv of the proletariat and of the workers, but who thinks he sees the social revolution on every street corner is no revolutionary. A revolutionary must know what he is fighting for at the given historical moment."

III

In Spain, as throughout the world, the weakness of the present-day labor movement is manifested among other things in its organizational and ideological fragmentation. Class unity and unity of action cannot be brought about merely by way of ideology, but only thru the force of circumstances, which drives the workers themselves to form organizations, into a unified front against the common enemy. This is being conclusively demonstrated today in Spain. The fascist assailant does not and cannot make a distinction as to which of the existing labor organizations is the more radical, which of them is for the Spanish and of world capitalism and by means of the government power, if such should come into its hands, will itself create that "order" which today is the concern of the fascists. But the workers should not be allowed the time or opportunity to go their own special ways, and it is idle to ask whether the Spanish workers under the present conditions should fight against fascism and for bourgeois democracy or not. So far as the workers are concerned, regardless of the organization to which they belong or of their ideological position, regardless of whether they take up for bourgeoisie-democratic, state-capitalist, anarcho-syndicalist or communist goals, they are obliged to.
fight against fascism if they want not only to ward off the further worsening of their wretched position, but even to remain alive. The differences among the fascists also must be forced into the background until the common enemy, the workers and rebellious peasants, with their momentary bourgeois comrades of the coalition, are struck down. The circumstance that the struggle against fascism is not a hundred-percent greater on either side does not affect the fact that it has nevertheless been brought about so far as possible in the present conditions. The force of circumstances has greater weight than the will of the various organizational talents; the general necessities overtop the specific. Still, after the close of the present struggle, it will be still possible to achieve a result which even in case the civil war is long drawn out, the present unity will again fall apart. And even tho a fascist dictatorship in Spain may make unreal the fragmentation among the workers, yet in case of a victory of the leftists, the struggle of the various ideologies, with their material basis in the organizations, will come back upon the order of the day; unless—though this is not at all probable—in the course of the struggle against fascism, and thru the power of circumstances, the present labor organizations are broken up and give place to new class formations. This, the most favorable perspective, appears to be precluded by the necessity of preserving unity, and the backwardness, which permit at most of compromise solutions which later on may possibly constitute the basis for the formation of the unified class movement.

No doubt the struggle for the power in Spain is between three different tendencies; practically, however, the struggle has as yet been confined to the one between Fascism and Anti-Fascism, even tho there was no lack of endeavors to bring other factors into the reckoning. The reactionary forces taking up for Fascism are confronted by those of a bourgeois-democratic and social-reformist cast, the at the same time by a movement aiming at socialism, so that each individual group is fighting against two tendencies: Fascism against Democracy "and Revolution, this Democracy" against Fascism and Revolution, the Revolution against Fascism and bourgeois democracy. In case the reaction should be struck down, then, as things now stand and unless prevented by the general exhaustion, the struggle of the bourgeois-democratic forces against those which are aiming to set aside the exploitation society must again come into the forefront. Even though the love-feast which would be a natural accompaniment of the general exhaustion and a victory of the leftists should postpone this conflict for a time, still this quarrel is bound to become once more the dominant note in Spanish politics; for neither bourgeois society nor a Spanish state capitalism is in the long run capable of any progressive improvement in the position of the workers; This situation is already anticipated in the frictions within the anti-fascist front, in the mutual sabotage of socialist Stalinist and anarchist-syndicalist formations, and which may be multiplied the longer the civil war is drawn out, since in such conditions the real socialization is bound to spread and the social-reformist forces challenged to greater resistance.

Even though the "left" bourgeoisie may already regret having risked the struggle against the reaction, it has a bitter interest in the possibility of its being made. It is the prisoner of a situation in which forces are operating which it is no longer capable of controlling. Even though the parliamentary labor parties may have the design of bringing the bourgeois exploitation society undamaged out of the present chaos, yet neither are they any longer capable of controlling adequately those forces whose strength has grown in the course of the struggle and which are striving for socialism. Even though the fascist assailant may prefer to spare the bourgeois interests to the full extent possible, still in order to win he is obliged to impair those interests more and more, both by reason of his own military and diplomatic necessities, and the insecurity and backwardness, which permit at most of compromise solutions which later on may possibly constitute the basis for the formation of the unified class movement.

It is necessary to take a glance at the labor organizations in Spain in order to understand the frictions within the anti-fascist front. Among these anti-fascist organizations there is, first, the Social Democracy which ranks as the strongest political organization of workers. It has 65,000 members, and, as in other countries, this body is divided into fractions. It has a right and a left wing and a so-called center; this latter, however, differs so little from the right wing that
one can afford to disregard it and to speak of Right and Left. The right wing, under the leadership of Indalecio Prieto, rules the organizational apparatus; the left wing and the youth organizations which have combined with the communist youth formations are led by Largo Caballero. The trade-union organization controlled by the Social Democracy, the U.G.T. (Unión General de Trabajadores), sympathizes with the left wing and regards Caballero as its Lenin. The U.G.T. has about 1,400,000 members. The S.P., and its unions are no more revolutionary than is their leader. They are "leftists" only because a part of these organizations has gone so far to the right that their denunciation as Socialists is now nothing more than a joke. What has remained social-democratic in the pre-war sense rates today as "left.

This "leftism" has become necessary to the Social Democracy in order to evade convulsions that might be brought about by real oppositions. The "left" character of the Spanish Social Democracy is said to be manifested in the person of Caballero. Until rather recently, Caballero was nothing more nor less than a typical social-democratic trade-union bigwig. In the meanwhile, however,—to believe the current reports—he has been the seat of a miracle; the spirit of Marx and Lenin is thought to have seized him overnight in an elemental force, so that he is now striving for radical solutions in the sense of the Russian prototype. An attempt is being made to wipe out the man's past, as well as the past of the social-democratic movement in general. It is sought to excuse his activity as minister under Primo de Rivera and his pitiful role as minister of labor in the first republican government on the ground that as a victim of capitalist iniquities and in view of the sabotage of unfaithful subordinates he is not responsible for the pettinesses of his parliamentary, labor-fakerish past. As a matter of fact, it has become necessary, after the wretched collapse of the Social Democracy in Germany and Austria, to overcome the oppositional sentiment in the socialist parties with a somewhat more radical phraseology. The new red color which the left wing has applied to itself does not affect in the least the character and construction of these organizations, which in spite of the more radical phrases, maintain the dictatorship of the bureaucratic apparatus over the members, and which, thru a refined system of sick benefits and insurance, tie the members of the trade unions to their bureaucrats, however corrupt these latter may be. Bureaucrats who even today can conceive of socialism only as a mastery over the workers by the State.

The pseudo-radicalism of the left S.P., is forced upon it. Caballero is not leading the masses to take more radical steps, but he is running about behind the workers in order not to be left quite out of the running. Just as that part of the bourgeoisie which found itself ready for a coalition policy with the labor parties has become the prisoner of the present situation, so the left Social Democracy is being forced to a more radical policy thru the circumstances of the struggle of the armed workers; but the Social Democracy, like the left bourgeoisie, is ready to march backward again at the first opportunity. Caballero and the S.P., are not fighting for socialism; they are attempting, with social-democratic demagogy, to maintain capitalist society in its present form, and in case this capitalist society nevertheless goes under, instead of a communist society to build up a state capitalism which would mean little more for the workers than the state capitalism of Stalin or Hitler.

The Communist Party of Spain (Third International) is no more than the tail-end of the S.P. It claims to have 50,000 members, which is certainly a gross exaggeration. The C.P. exercises its greatest influence in Madrid and Vizcaya. As in France, so also in Spain its influence is determined by the necessities of Russian foreign policy. Structure and character are the same as in all other communist parties. Like the S.P., also the C.P. has endeavored either to prevent the manifestations of the workers or, where they were not preventable, to stifle them as quickly as possible. Azana's liberal government was regarded by the C.P. as an ally of France, and since France was the ally of Russia, the Spanish communists felt called upon, in the interest of the Russian block policy for the coming war, to support the Spanish government insofar as possible and to protect it against the dangers from right and left. The influence of the C.P. in Spain, however, is slight. With its subordination to the S.P., it can hardly receive consideration any more as a special organization.

The "right" and "left" oppositional groups which broke away some years ago from the official Communist Party, in order later to merge into the Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista (P.O.U.,M.), and which are usually designated as "Trotskyists", represent within the Spanish movement the line of the "genuine" Bolshevik-Leninists. Their noise is greater than their influence; they have, according to their own data, about 5,000 members; the names of Lenin and Trotsky go by the names of Maurin and Andrade. The principal influence of the organization is in Barcelona, where it publishes two weekly papers: La Batalla in the Spanish language, and
Front in the catalonian. The struggle of the "false" Leninists and their social-democratic allies against the P.O.U.M. has compelled the latter to draw closer to the anarcho-syndicalist movement than can commonly be expected of Leninists. This friendliness is, of course, truly Leninist and in practice extremely childishly, carried on with the idea of bringing the anarcho-syndicalist movement under the influence of the P.O.U.M. Thus Juan Andrade writes in the September number of Plebs: "In Catalonia, which has always been a stronghold of anarchism, it begins to lose influence to the Marxist parties and especially to the P.O.U.M...... The revolution can be victorious only if the Marxist parties are able to assimilate the numerous anarchist workers. This is the key to the future for Spain." The fact that the P.O.U.M. still speaks of other "Marxist" organizations is a sufficient indication that it still today regards the S.P. and C.P. as revolutionary movements to which it feels more closely bound than to the anarcho-syndicalist workers. This is equivalent to saying that the P.O.U.M. as well is rather to be set down in the camp of the bourgeois-democratic (or state-capitalist) elements than to be embraced among the workers struggling for socialism, however hazy may be their programs. It is true that the P.O.U.M. takes a position against the coalition policy of the popular-front parties but it will not have a position against a Spanish state capitalism after the Russian model, just as it also still today understands by the dictatorship of the proletariat only that of the bolshevik party.

Over against these "marxist" organizations, which have nothing more in common with Marxism than the name, stands the anarcho-syndicalist movement, which, even though it has not the organizational strength of the popular-front parties, can nevertheless be rated as their worthy adversary, capable of bringing into question the aspirations of the pseudo-marxist state capitalists.

Spanish anarchism has a long history. The labor organizations which were formed in 1869 and influenced by Bakunin soon won great influence both in the industrially more developed parts of the peninsula, as well as in the more backward parts among the farm workers of Andalusia. The socialist organizations arising later were never in a position to break the influence of the earlier anarchist movement. Later on, the anarchist organizations absorbed the ideas of the French syndicalists with the growing industrialization of Spain, which gave added importance to the struggle for day-to-day demands, the anarcho-syndicalist movement in Spain grew very rapidly. In 1911 the syndicalists organized the Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (C.N.T.), which first loosely combined the various trade unions and then the more recently formed industrial unions, the Syndicats Unico.

In 1914 the C.N.T. had 25,000 members; only four years later, 500,000; in 1923, a million; and in 1931, approximately 1,500,000. Though the C.N.T., in its relation to the anarchists, as also by reason of the persecutions at the hands of the reaction as well as of liberalism and the reformist labor organizations connected with this latter, the anarchists lost further influence and their membership dwindled. Today the C.N.T. has a membership of about 600,000. During the October uprising (1934), the catalonian anarchists sabotaged the revolutionary movement. In Asturias, however, they fought together with the railroad workers, and as also by reason of the catalonian anarchists in October 1934, however much to be condemned, is explained by the fact that the "leftist" government of Catalonia had forced the C.N.T. to go underground, that it brutally persecuted the anarchists, that even upon the outbreak of the uprising which was supported by the catalonian government, it still failed to give up the struggle against the anarcho-syndicalists. The hatred which
civil war to a quick end. This end would not diminish the sacrifices of the proletariat; the white terror of conquering fascism will far surpass all the previous bestialities. In view of this situation, the fighting workers will no doubt go all the way down the line. But even their defeat is powerless to affect the situation, which is objectively ripe for revolution. This defeat is also at the same time the beginning of a new series of workers' struggles which will stand out far in advance of everything hitherto accomplished and which even today, before the beginning of the world war and the beginning of the new world-revolutionary wave, point to its colossal impetus. The victims of the Spanish revolution are already the first victims of the approaching world revolution, nor could a present-day victory of Spanish fascism suffice to conjure the fact away. The verve and the enthusiasm of the Spanish revolutionists of today is a guarantee of the victory of the new workers' revolution tomorrow.
The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capitalism, the decay period of capitalist production, evokes ever greater convulsions of economic, to new imperialistic and political conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class there is only the revolutionary way out which leads to the communist society. No one can dispute the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the situation of our time the very essence of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity.

As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

"All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!"

WORK SHOP COMMITTEES IN ENGLAND

Although to a certain extent and within limits, British capitalism is predominant in determining the policies of European countries, and in assisting to precipitate a crisis, nevertheless British capitalism receives in return its own repercussions; although, at the moment, not of the same or similar severity, still it contains within its own national boundaries the contradiction of national and international capitalism.

The crisis now moves from one country to another with such rapidity that English gentlemen of avowed bourgeois democratic principles stand aghast and view with apprehension any economic movement by the workers. The stay-in strike of a very small section of the Civil servants, hardly noticeable and given no prominence by the press, raised the budget magician, Neville Chamberlain, to warn not only these workers, but also his Government of the striking significance of this behavior. "This kind of activity must be suppressed," says the Chancellor. "It is undemocratic; it is unconstitutional; it is a violation of Trade Unionism; it is unworthy of the British working man." And the chorus is reiterated by the Government, the Labor Party, the Trade Union leaders and the Communist Party. The latter, along with the rest of Social Democracy, have denounced all unofficial strikes, and they insist upon the workers bearing the
yoke of Trade Unionism, which binds the workers hand and foot to capitalism.

The British workers, who are now recovering from the terrific onslaughts made upon their standards of living (with the assistance of the last Labor government) are in constant battle with the old forms of organization. Out of the shell of Trade Unions, by way of spontaneous strikes, the workers are creating new weapons of revolt, in some cases successfully. The kicking-over of the traces, forming workshop committees and negotiating from the floor of the workshop, denote the changing from quantity to quality. The efforts of the Trade Union leaders, the prosecutions and mass fines imposed upon the workers, have had no effect. This year has witnessed more strikes in Britain, particularly in the Midlands, than in any previous year in its history. The miners as usual are leading the way, followed by the textile and clothing workers; and in all cases, either by strike or threat of strike, concessions have been granted. It remains to be seen whether these sops will hold the workers in check.

This winter will witness many demonstrations, protests (which have already commenced), and revolts by the unemployed who, by the way, are the only section of the working class who are to receive a reduction in their already miserable allowance. The National Government's attack upon the unemployed, to commence in November, is bound to produce hostility throughout the country, owing to its policy of re-armament, subsidizing the shipowners, the farmers, and the sugar beet industry, foreign investments, including ten million in Soviet Russia, and granting concessions to all classes of employed workers who have the courage to demand increased standards of living.

The Government may or may not withdraw their intended attack upon the unemployed, who now number 3,600,000 registered, who are divided into two groups, 1,800,000 on Unemployment Benefit, and a similar number of Out-of-work relief. This does not include the thousands who are outside the scheme of relief owing to the Means Test. Marches of the unemployed are already in the process of formation, and of course these hunger marches can be of no assistance, as the marchers are still hungry after their return from London.

In case the belly crawlers, the come-soonists have any doubts as to their support of Trade Unions, we will quote from the pamphlet Communist Party and Affiliation to the Labor Party, 1936: "We have never been in opposition to the Trade Unions. We have always believed that the Trade Unions were essential for the industrial struggles of the workers. Many of our members have extremely fine Trade Union records, and have recruited large numbers to the Unions. We do not want unofficial strikes. We are not splitters of the Trade Union movement - but builders of it. It is obligatory upon our membership that they be Trade Unionists wherever possible. We have always stood upon the principle of a strong, a democratic Trade Union movement being a key part of the workers power against capitalism."

To prove how reactionary these jumping jacks of the Comintern are, we must here state that there are 1,120 Trade Unions in Britain, and while there were in 1926 at the time of the general strike 8,000,000 trade unionists, in 1936 its membership has fallen to 4,500,000. Some sections have set up their own unions independent of the T.U.C. and general labor fakirism.

The new forms of organization contain the germs of Sovietism, and a consciousness on an altogether higher plane than the orthodox Trade Unions; but then this development of consciousness by the workers themselves, due to working in more highly developed industries, conflicts with the Leninist dictum that consciousness can only be imparted from without, or by the party. Hence the Communist Party's opposition to this new progressive form of organization.

The Communist Party also states that "we believe that our active methods of fighting the employing class are in the interests of the working class, and are in fact the only way of rousing the workers to such a pitch that the Labor Party can gain victory on the electoral field. Therefore, while our methods are different in some respects to the Labor Party, they are supplementary, not opposed to it." Obviously not opposed to the policy of the Lord Snowden's, the Sir Walter's, the Sir Ben's, etc. This in the name of Communist, and in the name of a working class party as though the working class had knighted these gentlemen. We have here also an admittance that the O.P. desire another Labor Party government, which government ruthlessly cut the wages of all civil servants and introduced the vilest, most despicable piece of legislation that has ever confronted the working class in Britain, the Means Test. The working class suffered its greatest suppression during the Labor Party regime. This, of course, is to be expected as long as the State apparatus exists, no matter which Party rules the roost.
ON THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

The following open letter to Feuchtwanger is taken from the Sozialistische Warte of Aug. 15, 1936.

Dear Mr. Feuchtwanger:

Only yesterday I read your article on the new Soviet constitution in the Deutsche Zentral Zeitung (Moscow) of July 2. Simultaneously I received another paper, the "Rote Fahne" (Prague) of July 22. In the latter is confirmed what until now had been officially denied: namely, that Zenzi Muhsem, widow of Erich Muhsem, who had sought asylum in the U.S.S.R., had been arrested and faces deportation because of "Trotzkyist activities". A close connection exists between these two matters, for, in your article in the Deutsche Zentral Zeitung, you praise the new Soviet constitution as a document of real democracy, thus marking the Soviet Union as the land of that freedom which is so ardently desired by every progressive human.

I do not know whether (and how long) you were in the U.S.S.R., or from what sources your knowledge of Soviet conditions is derived. But I was painfully struck by the fact that the author of "Success", the "Brothers Oppenheim" and the "Josephus", who in all his works demonstrates such a high degree of historical exactitude, a critical faculty, an unrelenting search for truth, a conscientious search for unassailable data, here deserts these methods and allows himself to be deceived.

You write that "the constitution of the Soviet Union for the first time in the history of mankind established actual freedom and equality of the citizens as its fundamental law".

For three years I have lived in the Soviet Union, worked in responsible posts of the Soviet apparatus. Since my return to the West, my connections with the U.S.S.R. have not been discontinued. In addition, I carefully read the Soviet press and all the important Soviet literature. On the basis of my observations, as well as from official Soviet material, I must tell you what long has ceased being a secret: Inequality in the Soviet Union surpasses by far the differentiation in many bourgeois countries. Common workers, nurses, scrub-women, streetcar conductors, small employees, in short, a group embracing millions receive a monthly income of from 80 to 150 rubles. A red marshal, a leading party official, a chief engineer, a "red director", a theatre or movie star, a successful journalist or author such as Radek, Kolsov, Scholochow or Fechin, receive between 5,000 and 20,000 rubles monthly, sometimes even more. In the same machine shop a Stakhanovite worker will receive 1,000 to 2,000 rubles monthly, while his co-worker whose physical and technical faculties prevent him from attaining record production receives from 120 to 160 rubles per month. Here especially the conditions you describe as characteristic of bourgeois democracy prevail: "that one-tenth of the renters occupy nine-tenths of the dwelling space, the remaining nine-tenths occupy one-tenth of the available space. This is true literally as well as figuratively.

In the Soviet cities the masses occupy an average dwelling space of 5.2 square meters per capita (Izvestia, May 30, 1936). But the upper strata has large dwellings, rented for life, or villas have been provided for their use. They ride in Lincolns, play in luxurious amusement places with jazz and champagne. Their women wear Paris gowns, silver fox furs and platinum jewelry. Visit the Metropol, National Grand Hotel, or Savoy in Moscow, or the Europa or Astoria in Leningrad after midnight; then ride out into the outskirts that even today have no water systems. Visit the barracks of the subway workers, the lumber workers, the street workers and peat cutters. Do not eat in the model restaurants of the Stakhanovites, but go into the kitchens of some unknown plant.

It would be a tragic mistake to believe in the possibility of betterment of this mass as a whole. The number of those who can climb into the upper group that is constantly consolidating itself into a tightly restricted upper caste is becoming ever smaller. This upper caste is becoming the real beneficiary of the state control of the means of production. They swallow the surplus value produced by the masses. The masses receive none of it.

So far, the "equality" in material things. Much more important is the question of civil and political equality. You hail the freedom of thought, press and assembly, announced in the new constitution, as a fundamental achievement. The deprivation of these
rights till now, according to your statement, has been the basis of sneering reflections on the citizens of Soviet Russia. This passage struck me most painfully. For it proved that you support the new constitution without knowing the old. The old constitution contained the same provisions; but the old provisions were "window-dressing", just as the new ones must be.

Article 141 of the new draft says essentially that only the Communist Party (the other "social organizations" mentioned are only subdivisions of it) has the right to run candidates. This is as it has been. There can be no change on this basis. But the party is not the leadership. The "party" has been for years the Polit-bureau of ten. This controls the press, the radio, the publications, all of "public opinion". Despite all constitutional rights, it is impossible for an uncensored line, an uncensored word to appear without danger.

Now, as before, the following laws prevail in the Soviet Union:

1. The law on "treason" (1934), that not only fixes the death penalty for flight out of the country, but provides for the internment in concentration camps for the relatives of the refugee, including his underage children.

2. The "Kirov-law" of July 12, 1934. Secret trials against political offenders, in the absence of the accused, without possibility of defense, revision or pardon. ("D.Z.Z.", Aug. 12, 1934).


Now as before, concentration camps exist in the Soviet Union: in Kartli; on the Solovetski islands in the arctic circle; in Siberia; in Turkestan. There, in the lumber camps, railroad and canal building camps, in swamp reclamation projects, millions are working in a murderous climate under the most primitive hygienic conditions and with deplorable rations.

Now as before, besides exiled kulaks, priests and criminals, these camps include thousands of Social Democrats, Social-Revolutionaries and opposition Communists, men who support the principles of socialism; whose sole "crime" consists of disagreement with the Stalin line; men who took the phrase "freedom of speech", guaranteed in the constitution, seriously. Numberless witnesses testify to these conditions; the Yugoslav Communist Ciliga and his comrades, who for years were dragged from one concentration camp to another; the conscience-stricken G.P.U. commander of the Solovetski islands; Kisselev who wrote the "Camps of Death" after fleeing from Russia; the Czech Communist Josef Pirkou who gives irrefutable testimony of his internment in the Baikal-Amur camp in Siberia; Rudolph Phillip who in his "Max Hoelz, the last German" (Reco-Publishing House, Zurich) paints a picture of the terrible corruption of the upper strata; the former American Communist A. Smith who wrote the book "I was a Soviet Worker" (E. P. Dutton, N.Y.); the French-Russian author Victor Serge who in "Our Word" (Paris) appealed to Andre Glize; the five Austrian Schutzbund members who, in behalf of 200 disillusioned comrades, returned from Soviet Russia, wrote "Twice in Flight" (Labor Press, Vienna); Erich Wollenberg, red army commander in Bavaria, 1919, and many, many others I could name.

Many overlook the shortcomings of the U.S.S.R. because they sincerely believe that the Soviet Union, despite all this, is still a force for freedom and progress. But anyone who does not wish to deceive himself, and realizes that the recognition of truth is the first condition of real progress must reject for himself and all others any policy of illusion, hard as this may be.

A country as powerfully fortified as the U.S.S.R. of today has no need of this terror for its maintenance. Terror here has become an end in itself - reasons of state that are a cruel mockery to the paper ideals of the constitution.

There remains the last fiction: the U.S.S.R., as an anti-fascist power. Here the statistics of the League of Nations remark: "During the sanctions period, the U.S.S.R. was the only participating state that, instead of decreasing, increased its exports to Italy by 10 percent." Further: official German and Soviet sources report that in 1935 the U.S.S.R. delivered to Germany 226,000 tons of manganese, the most important raw material for the armament industry - 52 percent of the total German manganese import.

Soviet exports to Italy mean oil. Soviet oil propelled Italian battleships to the Suez Canal. Soviet benzine was in the tanks of the airships that bombed Abyssinian hospitals. That was yesterday. Tomorrow, murder instruments produced by Krupp with Soviet manganese can submerge the world in death and destruction.

A terrible guilt rests upon all who know of these
things — and keep quiet. When this man is Feuchtwanger, the guilt is even greater.

— A. Rudolf —

(Former Soviet official. Author of "Goodbye to Russia").

---

**WHAT MUST BE DONE?**

Introducing our new pamphlet "What Communism Really Is".

(The Social Average Labor Time as the Basis of Communist Production and Distribution)  
Price 10 cents  
Order at once from Council Correspondence.

The collapse of the old labor movement, ideologically as well as organizationally, cannot be checked anymore; it is an established fact. As a result, we see everywhere despair and disillusionment among the many political groups and a desire for a united front of the proletariat. Some groups hope to win the confidence of the masses by making promising appeals, while others anticipate the rejuvenation of the labor movement by amalgamation and other artificial combinations. All of these experiments are destined to end in failure, mainly because these organizations are incapable of analyzing the present socio-economic development objectively, and are therefore unable to solve the problems they are confronted with. During many years of hard organizational activity, they erected and worshipped an edifice which caved in at the first severe blow of the class enemy. But instead of investigating the cause of the sudden disaster, the big architects of the labor movement continue to rebuild the collapsed structure with the same material and along the old lines.

The present international situation demands a new beginning based upon an ideology which is closely connected with concrete reality. The German situation furnishes a striking example for the international development. The trend towards fascist methods — politically and economically — proves that in order to reorganize society it is insufficient to merely change the government; that is, to replace the old government with a better one. Instead of bourgeois-liberal, fascist, socialistic or bolshevist government. Though such a reorganization changes the outer face of society, it does not alter the essence of capitalist society. The Soviet-Russian example, for instance, shows that the socialist-bolshevist form of government keeps the wage system intact. Soviet Russia advocates a more justified distribution of the wealth of the nation by paying so-called higher socialist wages. The fact remains, however, that as long as wages exist, the capitalist relationship exists. Wages and capital are two sides of one and the same thing: one is unthinkable without the other.

The result of the old labor-movement policy was, and still is, — if successful — a revolution from above. From the government buildings wave socialist flags, but the masses are not permitted to form the character of the new society. As the wage system continues as the economic basis, all premises for capitalist exploitation remain. The abolishing of private property in the means of production alone has nothing to do with communism.

In order to initiate classless society, it is necessary that the masses themselves influence the development of the Communist revolution. The emancipation of the proletariat depends upon its self-initiative to carry out all arising problems; they will have to do everything themselves and nobody can or must be permitted to relieve them of that task. We must realize that it is no longer possible for small conscientious minorities to lead an indifferent mass toward the revolution. The revolution which the proletariat now faces aims to change completely the fundamentals of society, and this act can be accomplished only by direct participation of the masses. The proletariat must learn during its struggles to execute power in the interest of its class. There is no other means but the actual struggle which will teach the masses that self-initiative is the requisite for a successful social revolution. It must learn to disregard all party and union leadership and to place all responsibility upon their own workers' councils. All other ways lead back to bourgeois revolution and to capitalism.

In order that the struggle of the workers may lead to a complete reorganization of society, clarity of the new economic form is of utmost importance. The first
The fundamental basis of capitalism is wage labor. Wage labor presupposes a division of society into producers and means of production. On account of this relationship, the workers are condemned to life-long wage slavery which makes possible the production of surplus value (profit) and accelerates periodical crises. The wage system is the main contradiction of capitalist society out of which all economic difficulties arise.

The enormous development of the productive forces, the boundless expansion of production have increased the capitalist contradictions immensely. The international crisis of the profit system on the one hand throws the proletariat into a stage of starvation; but on the other hand, it is the motor towards a state capitalist reorganization of bourgeois society. With the aid of state subventions, the objective of capital -- the production of surplus value -- shall be obtained. The intervention of the state in the productive processes (planned economy) may limit the economic freedom of the bourgeoisie, yet it does not alter the basic principles of the system as a whole. Even the acquisition by the state, as we find it for instance in Soviet Russia, does not abolish the capitalist relationship between the means of production and human labor power realized in wages. Also under state capitalism accumulation of commodities, and with it the wielding of power of the product over the producers, continues to exist. The only difference lies in this: in place of the superfluous bourgeois class, the state has become the exploiter. The economic programs of the social democratic and bolshevist parties are all based upon state-capitalistic conceptions. They therefore are based upon the capitalistic mode of production and are merely a continuation of wage slavery.

The main object of the proletarian revolution is the overthrow of capitalism; that is, the abolition of the wage system. This can be accomplished only through a political struggle which, however, must not lead to a new form of 'state-socialistic' oppression of the working class. During the revolution, the main task is to bring about a relationship between the workers and the social product which makes impossible the formation of a new ruling class. In his socio-economic studies, especially on the experiences of the Paris Commune, Karl Marx came to the conclusion that the organization of the communist society must be based upon the association of free and equal producers and assigns his part. The worker remains a wage laborer. The difference between state socialism and association is in reality the difference between capitalism and communism. Precisely for this reason there is no room left in the communist association for a ruling power over the producers. Not the state manages the administration of production and distribution, but these functions will be performed jointly by the consumers and producers. While the reformist theory of the socialization or nationalization of industries only means a continuation of capitalist concentration, the Marxian conception the socialization of the economic system as a whole is already ripe for communism. It
should be evident that the revolutionary initiative in all factories and shops should be developed so that the proletarians themselves will erect the communist system of production. This is a process which can only be performed from the bottom up by the producers themselves. This revolutionizing economic development cannot be accomplished by any legitimate steps from above. By introducing the factor of working hours as general basis for the process of production, the economic power does actually get into the hands of the working class. The relation of the producer to the products of society is based in itself, and the individual's share of the product is determined by the actual production itself. The complete process of production is thus based on a sound foundation and the masses themselves manage and plan their own economic problems. A bureaucratic system to control prices and distribution is therefore irrevocably obsolescent. That means the conditions are given for the state to vanish as the interference by the state as a powerful factor in the economic conditions has become superfluous. The monetary system will be replaced by a form which uses the socially necessary labor-time as a unit of reckoning. The distribution of consumer's goods presupposes, of course, the impossibility of giving to the producers the full equivalent of their labor time. The production process uses, or consumes, not only labor power but also machines, raw materials, etc. Besides these fundamental requirements for the smooth continuation of the process, society must provide means which make possible the development of "unproductive enterprises" which merely serve scientific and cultural interests. The producers, therefore, will not receive the full equivalent of their labor time, but these deductions are an economic necessity. The intensity of accumulation, however, must be determined by the producers themselves in order to avoid the development of too great a difference between social accumulation and social consumption, as such a difference would lead to disturbances and crises. Reproduction and accumulation on a communist basis are functions which can be controlled by the producers by simple bookkeeping and by direct executive power over the funds accumulated. The bookkeeping is so simple that any worker who is able to read and write could do it. No trained specialists are needed.

These are in general the principles of the communist mode of production. They are applicable to industry and to agriculture. The economic dictatorship of the communist association dismisses all rights of exploitation and expels every one who does not accept this law. But since the producers themselves run industry, they build the fundamentals for a development which eventually will make the dictatorship superfluous. Upon the basis of association, the proletarian dictatorship is merely a transformation to classless society. As communist society initiates a planned system of production in accordance with the collective wants of society as a whole, the capitalist mode of expropriation will be replaced by a system in which production is carried on in the interest of all members of society, thereby ending the struggle for individual supremacy -- society ceases to be divided into exploited and exploiting classes.

TO THE READER

It is much cheaper to mimeograph a magazine than to print it. But even this might still be too expensive for a small group of workers, mostly unemployed. Ink, paper, stencils, cover-stock, all this costs money; only the labor is free, as our fellow-workers use their spare time to do the Council Correspondence.

We want to have a better C.C., more pages, better material and one which appears regularly. Also we want to put out pamphlets from time to time. For this we need money and more help from the readers of the C.C. Please renew your subscription promptly and try to get new subscribers for us. Or send, if you can, some money for the press fund. We plan the publication of a series of important works, but to carry this through, we must have money.

You must have already recognized, that our group tries to uphold the Marxian theory, in spite of the continuous and increasing emancipation of this theory by the old parties. To help the C.C. means to help to carry over the Marxian theory to a new and more fruitful period of proletarian class struggle.

Send your share at once: Council Correspondence
1237 N. California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

Soon to be published:

OUTLINE of MARX'S Capital

THE PERMANENT CRISIS
Max Nomad's "Masters of Tomorrow"

Max Nomad's answer (#) to our article "Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?" (C.C., No. 7) gives us occasion to take up the theme once more. All considered, however, there is not much additional that needs to be said; now as before, the two conceptions stand fundamentally opposed. The space still available to us in this debate is to be used merely for refuting a few objections which seem to us unjustified and for clearing up various points which appear to have been left obscure.

Nomad objects to our borrowing the phrase about the "dictatorship of the traveling salesmen" (16) from a certain Jerome, a salaried employee of the C.P. We are not interested in Jerome or his connections; and while this particular statement of his appeared to us to hit the mark, we by no means identify ourselves with its author, any more than we identify ourselves with Nomad when we quote him with approval. The excitement about Jerome we have confidently to Nomad himself, who, no doubt characterizes this fellow correctly. To us, all the present functionaries and "leaders" of the old labor movement are in the last analysis "Jeromes", with whom we have nothing to do but with whom we are often obliged, nevertheless, to concern ourselves. Since these fellows do a lot of talking, they also frequently say something that strikes us as accurate; and in such a case it appears that Nomad also is not averse to turning the thing to account. For example, in his argument against us (27), he appeals to K.A. Wittfogel, who likewise is of the camp of the Third International, and to Heinz Neumann, a salaried subject of the C.P., and one of the lowest ascendants with which the labor movement has ever been burdened. Nomad may still explain to us why he himself is to be permitted to "borrow from a source from which ordinary prudence should have told us to keep away". (16)

Nomad wishes (16) to "protest specifically against one particular instance of our polemic methods, dealing not with matters of opinion or interpretation but with actual facts." P.M., he says, declares as 'groundless' the 'whole story' that Bismarck in pursuance of his state socialist (or state capitalist) plans, had solicited the support of Marx and of his closest associates. In the first place, I did not claim, as P.M. seems to insinuate, that this was 'a proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism'. In an article dealing with State Socialism and State Capitalism, this was adduced as evidence of Bismarck's state socialist tendencies. In the second place, my 'groundless' assertion is based upon a full-length story by Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of Marx's closest associates, told in his Kein Kompromiss, kein Wahlbundnis (page 8) which, in condensed form, I had presented in my Marx biography published in Scribner's, March 1933, page 190.

In Scribner's, for June 1934, page 409, Nomad wrote: "At the close of the sixties, Bismarck played with the idea of nationalizing all branches of Germany's economic life. To carry out that plan, he even solicited the collaboration of Marx and his closest associates." On page 410, Nomad continues: "The reason for the German Socialist's opposition to the State Socialism (i.e., State Capitalism) of the Prussian Junkers was obvious. Under the political overlordship of the Hugenbergs and Von Pappen of those years, all the power, all the more privileged positions in the government, in the administration of the legal and political institutions, and in the educated classes, went to the educated scions of the Junkers and the upper middle classes, while the educated lower middle classes, from which most of the Socialist leadership issued, would be reduced to the role of mere subalterns with salaries of low-paid white-collar slaves. That is why in his time, Karl Marx, as a revolutionary democrat, disregarded Bismarck's offer, and why the Socialists, as a general rule, have not been enthusiastic about the nationalization of individual branches of industry in those countries which lacked democratic institutions." (Emphasis ours.)

To which we replied in C.C. #7, page 21: "Nomad mentions the state-capitalist plans of Bismarck and states that Bismarck sought to assure himself of Marx's aid in the matter. But this can hardly be alleged as proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism, even supposing that Bismarck had actually entered into such relations with Marx. As a matter of fact, the whole story is groundless; Bismarck never turned to Marx in this connection, but conducted an inconsequential correspondence with Lasalle, whose opportunism, as is well known always met with Marx's severest condemnation."

Any unprejudiced reader on comparing these two quotations can see for himself that Nomad's protestation is in vain. His entire article in Scribner's is concerned with pointing out that the marxist as well as the fascist movement is driving to state capitalism; every
example of which he there makes was served to support
this thesis, hence also the alleged intersession between
Marx and Bismarck. Since he furthermore presents the
reason by which Marx was led to reject Bismarck's offer
namely, because these was not enough in it for the so-
cialist intellectuals, nothing further is needed to dem-
strate that Nomad sees here also the compatibility of
Marxism with state capitalism. For Marx rejected the
natural inference is that there would possibly have
reason by which Marx was led to reject Bismarck's offer
according to Nomad, solely and exclusively be-
cause the reward was too slight; from which the only
natural inference is that there would possibly have
been no refusal if Bismarck had offered more than ...

Nomad appeals to the authority of W. Liebknecht in order
to show that his story in Scribner's was not 'ground-
less'. He appeals, that is, to the authority of a man
of whom he himself has said: "For though he had been
in personal touch with Marx... what is usually called
'scientific socialism' had always remained the deepest
secret to him. A master of ultra-revolutionary oratory
today, and of ultra-moderate and opportunistic journalism
tomorrow, and at bottom nothing but a radical democrat.
For the father of the immortal German rebel of 1918,
lacked both tact and consistency, and his only redeem-
feature was his dog-like devotion to Marx, even tho
the latter treated him like a dog." (Johann Most,
Modern Monthly, July 1936, page 15.) It is upon a pro-
paganda capitulat of this man, who, like Nomad, had a spec-
ial predilection for trumpeting the state capitalist
plans of Bismarck, for making mysterious ploys out of
the capitalistic labor policy, of the time and for
"showing up" the "duplicitous" of the government in an
equally "duplicitous" and mysterious manner,—it is upon
the chatter of this man that Nomad tries to support his
assertions in Scribner's. It is true that Liebknecht has
frequently related (e.g., apart from the passages drawn
upon by Nomad, also in the Leipzig trial for high treas-
son in 1872, that the prussian government and the prus-
ian Junkers had made the most persistent attempts to in-
duce him to exploit the labor movement in their own in-
terest, and that after he had become certain of the mat-
ter, he had "broken off all connections with the agents
and hired writers of Herr Bismarck"; but these imputed
exaggerations and the frequently also well-founded rumor of
speeches on the part of Liebknecht (for no doubt at that
time, just as today, attempts were made to secure the
labor leaders for political purposes) can by no means
be used to construe the possibility of a connection be-
tween Bismarck and Marx.

In reality, the "state-capitalist" plans of Bismarck
consisted in nothing more than various political maneu-
vers for securing the interests of the government, which
never had any intention of serving more than Germany's
upswinging along the path of private economy. We have al-
dready, in our article in C. C. #7, mentioned the reason
for the appearance of "state-capitalist" tenden-
cies in otherwise "normal" capitalist countries. In
Germany, the dearth of capital and the struggle between
associating capital and large landed property—a struggle
which Marx had bridged over by Germany's development into an imperialist power—had
brought forth, by the side of many other political
shufflings and manoeuvres, also the peculiar "labor
policy" of Bismarck and the combination with Lassalle
in the winter of 1862-64, and thereby a political at-
mosphere in which the entire working population fre-
cently felt that its was the government's darling. Las-
salle was ready to support the Bismarck government in
exchange for direct and universal suffrage. The
"apostle of class harmony", as he was called by J.
Krieger, hoped then to secure for himself a position in
Parliament by means of which the situation of the work-
ers was ostensibly to be improved. Hence his readiness
to operate with the feudal reaction against Capital,
his striving for the "social kingship" and a sort of
Hitler-role for himself. Bismarck, however, turned
down the proposition of introducing direct and universal suffrage and other concessions, such as workers' cooperatives with financial aid of the State. All that
had nothing to do with Marx and Marxism, a fact which
even Nomad recognizes at another place.

Thus he writes in bis biography of Most (Modern Month-
ly, June 1936, page 19): "With all his deadly criticism
of capitalist profit-making, the author of Capital
would have never considered the idea of allying himself
with the feudal past as against the bourgeois present.
But Lassalle, in order to further his own political am-
bitions, was flirting with Bismarck, and was ready to
lend the Junkers the support of the working masses as
against the Progressive Party, which represented the
interest of the upper middle classes." (#)

(#) It is interesting to note that in Nomad's article
in Scribner's, the socialist leadership was not to be
had for Bismarck's plans ostensibly because he would not have been the state capitalist
conceived by Bismarck all the good positions
would go to the educated scions of the Junkers, and the
upper middle classes"; while in Nomad's biography of
John Most, he expresses that "Lassalle wants to proceed with Bismarck ag-
ainst the "upper middle class." Now if Bismarck's State
capitalism was directed against the "upper middle class", how can Marx and associates then occupy an unfavorable position toward Bismarck's plans on the ground that
their carrying out would have brought all the good posi-
tions to the elements of the "upper middle classes"?
Marx "would have never considered" because, as we learned from Nomad previously, he was not content "with salaries of low-paid white-collar slaves." Lasalle, on the contrary, seemed to be more modest? We have been compelled to take up Nomad’s "protest" in order to show that we are by no means interested, merely in order to win an argument, in twisting ideas or contesting facts. But after all, like the protest itself, so also our answer to it is so much wasted effort; for regardless of whether Marx and Bismarck negotiated, wished to negotiate or were on the point of negotiating, or whether Bismarck asked or did not ask whether his answer or failed to answer, regardless of all that, we are sure that to Nomad state capitalism, or state socialism, remains identical with Marxism. Or doesn’t it?

We are glad to take note that Nomad has used the term intellectual to apply exclusively to "the vast crowd of educated or semi-educated people that may or may not have a college degree, but can make a livelihood without resorting to manual or lower clerical labor." (17). And since it is too late in the year to be exclusively true, the "outs", not the "ins", whom Nomad regards as having the state-capitalist ambitions, the preliminary material for the "Masters of Tomorrow", is limited to those intellectuals who are out of work or poorly paid. This infinitesimal minority of intellectuals, notwithstanding the fact that all the social instruments of power are in the hands of Capital and of the contented "ins", succeeds in certain favorable situations in getting the masses behind it, in throwing out the capitalists and changing places with the "ins". Whereupon the "ins" temporarily (as in Russia) become "outs", and it is not until after the social wealth begins to increase and the possibility arises of conferring advantages upon all the intellectuals that the "outs" again become linked to the exploiting state apparatus. Thus Nomad summarizes his theory. Such, it appears, is the gist of Nomad’s theory. And so it is not the practicing, but the jobless or poorly paid intellectuals who are the champions of state socialism; they are such, then, not by reason of the fact that they are intellectuals, but because of their economic condition. Hence it is not essentially their intellectual function, which is either not exercised or poorly rewarded, but their political attitude and their gift of persuasion by which the masses are deluded, which forms the secret of their coming power. This is the conception which Nomad opposes to the marxist doctrine of class struggle. As a state bureaucracy, which of course embraces intellectuals, the rule of the intellectuals depends precisely upon the unemployment and poverty existing among them. We shall come back to this point in the further course of these remarks. For the present, we might merely state that after this clarification of his intellectual concept, Nomad’s theory strikes us as still more fantastic than before.

Nomad tries to demonstrate the existence of a contradiction in our position on the Russian bureaucracy and the problem of the intellectuals. "On page 27," he writes (19), "the bureaucrats are (to P.M.) the capitalists, and on page 17 they are the intellectuals!" To us, the Russian state bureaucracy rates as a total capitalist. As a state bureaucracy, not as a group of intellectuals, it rules society and thus lives off society. We have not contested, but emphasized, that a large part of the intellectuals and of the idealized workers belongs to this bureaucracy. On page 17 we said: "The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy or, as today in Russia, a struggle against a state bureaucracy. The struggle of the intellectuals in private-capitalist countries has meaning only so long as there is a revolutionary organization. It is not until and unless a state-capitalist revolution has been successful, it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals is taken up again...." And on page 27: "The special group of people which has the sole right of disposal over production is not the intellectuals but the state bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals."

Since the labor bureaucracy, and later the state bureaucracy, consists in large part, or exclusively if preferred, of intellectuals, if the working class turns against the bureaucracy, its struggle is necessarily directed against the intellectuals. But it does not combat the intellectuals just because they are intellectuals, any more than it combats stamp-collecting or art-loving capitalists as stamp collectors or art fanciers, but in both cases because they are exploiters. Intellectuals, however, cannot be exploiters unless they have control of the means of production. The working class cannot take a hostile position to the socially necessary intellectual professions brought into existence through the social division of labor, but only to a deceitful labor bureaucracy or to an exploiting state apparatus, regardless of the social stratum there dominant. Of course it is possible to this extent, just at a bad tenor belonging to Nomad’s intellectuals, but to mobilize the working class against him is surely something too much of a good thing. It would likewise be
possible to attack the intellectual Nomad on the ground that he consumes bread which he himself has not baked and thus contributes to consuming the surplus value created by the workers; but that too would surely be carrying matters too far. Intellectuals are not capable of exploiting the workers merely because they are intellectuals. But: once they are in control of organizations, they can deceive the workers; and if they have at their disposal the means of production, they can exploit the workers. We repeat: insofar as the workers of exploiting the workers merely because they are intellectuals, it can only be combat intellectuals, it can only be a struggle against the labor or state bureaucracy.

Our "very ingenious argument", as Nomad writes (18), by which the Russian "intellectuals" are divided into intellectuals as such and into the state bureaucracy, so that the bureaucracy exploits that part of the intellectuals not belonging to it just as it does the workers—hence the fact that in this case too, like Nomad himself, speak of "ins" and "outs"—we are surprised to find that Nomad, whose whole theory is based on this twofold division of the intellectuals, now rejects it as improper. Insofar as concerns Russia, Nomad regards all the intellectuals as taking part in the exploitation of the workers, even though the shares of the booty turn out to be different in the different cases and even when this relation still goes on. Nomad insists on the permanent revolution, that is, on the continuous struggle between the "ins" and "outs". Well, then, he will have to admit that the success of the struggle between the "ins" and "outs" depends on a further factor. Why is it that the one group can draw more than the other? What are they fighting about? There is no doubt that they are fighting for positions of power, which are decisive in the distribution of the loot. Hence one group must have positions of power which the other does not. Hence the positions of power are not controlled by all the intellectuals, semi-intellectuals and ex-workers, but only by part of them. With the denial of this fact, Nomad's whole theory of the permanent struggle between the "ins" and "outs" collapses. With the acceptance of this fact, there likewise collapses the theory that all intellectuals are at the same time the exploiters. Nomad has thought himself into a blind alley. The plain fact is that the "ins" as a class are a factor controlling the reproduction of the distribution; that is the source of their predominance with respect to the "outs". These latter are confronted by the "ins" as master of the means of production, as capitalists, albeit both the "ins" and the "outs" are here intellectuals.

With the aid of the dictionary and taking his stand on a Russian phrase, Nomad regards all the intellectuals in Russia as state employees forming a part of the bureaucracy. We are not concerned either with the dictionary or with the Russian phrase, but only with reality, and we are still waiting for Nomad to demonstrate that "the intellectuals as a whole, forming the state bureaucracy, are the masters of the country". (20) If anyone were to say, with the Russian bureaucracy themselves, that the state capitalism in Russia has put an end to the exploitation of the Russian workers, Nomad would certainly give vent to all his scorn of such naivete. When the Bolsheviks assert, however, just as Hitler does of his National Socialism, that every laboring person in Russia is a part of the state and participates in the government, then Nomad accepts of this swindle exactly as much as he needs for his private theory and restricts his scorn to the part left over. He writes (19): "In Russia, where every branch of the country's economic and cultural life is managed by the Government, every man who is not a peasant or manual worker is a government office-holder, a member of the bureaucracy." As a matter of fact, the manual workers and peasants belong just as much (or just as little) to the state bureaucracy as does the great majority of the intellectuals, which works for the ruling bureaucracy just as the workers do. By reason of the class character of Russian society and by reason of the different reproduction costs of labor power, the distribution of the intellectuals is not better paid because they belong among the workers, but because, in view of the fact that the market law continues to operate with reference to labor power, because wage labor still exists, the reproduction costs of labor power is not socially regulated but is left to the individuals. By the way, it ought to be known to Nomad that down until little over a year ago the Russian state bureaucracy supported itself not so much upon the intellectuals as upon the skilled manual workers and was for this reason frequently dubbed a government of the "labor aristocracy". It is not until quite recently that the picture seems to be changing and the bureaucracy seems to be adapting itself more to the interests of the intelligentsia and peasants, at the expense of the labor aristocracy as well as of the workers in general. This change of front is not a voluntary one; it corresponds to the inevitably increasing internal contradictions of the old policy, as well as to the general tendency to the strengthening of private interests in Russia. It is at the same time the old capitalist policy, which by means of economico-political manoeuvres weighs more or less heavily upon the different social groups at different times, so long as this is objectively possible, in order that actual control may remain in the hands of the government.
To support his idea that all intellectuals are to be rated as an exploiting bureaucracy, in spite of the contradictions among themselves, Nomad refers to the fact that in capitalist countries, in spite of the opposition between the small and large capitals, all capitalists are united by a common interest against the workers. In this connection, however, he neglects to note that present privileged Russian intellectuals are not in a position to exercise direct exploitation, but have to be content with what is allowed them by the ruling bureaucracy. They have no power of disposal over the productive apparatus, whereas the small capitalists in the private-economy countries, however much they may be controlled by the large concerns still, as immediate owners of means of production, are direct participants in the exploitation of the workers. It is right here, of course, that we have the difference between state- and private-ownership capitalism, a difference which Nomad carelessly overlooks when that is necessary for the defense of his theory.

Just as only a part of the intellectuals rises into the state bureaucracy, so it is only a still smaller part which sees matters in the way that Nomad conceives of them. What is Nomad's proof that "ever growing sections of the more enlightened part of the intelligentsia in non-fascist Europe and America are flocking now to the various marxist parties", that the "influence of the Communist Parties is now growing in France, Belgium, Spain, U.S.A., etc." (21) Wherever the "marxist" (?) parties are growing today, they are growing not as independent movements on the march to power, to state socialism, but by reason of the fact that they no longer possess such ambitions, that they are restricting themselves to obtaining flunkey jobs to perform for private capital. That is quite well known to Nomad himself, as shown by the following passage (26): "If a large part of the intellectuals in various countries, instead of turning socialistic or communist, joins the fascist ranks, ... it is their desire for a short cut to power that is responsible for the success of the new gospel. Many of the fascist intellectuals would join the communist movement if they saw that it had any chances, or at least intentions of winning immediately. For by now it has become obvious to most observers that the leading Communists of the non-fascist countries have ceased to be revolutionaries at all; that ever since 1923 they have become ordinary Russian patriots abroad. Like the socialists of pre-War times, the Communists - meaning of course the official leadership - have become a party of anti-capitalist protest and not of anti-capitalist revolt."

Hence, according to Nomad, the communist parties are growing because "ever growing sections of the more enlightened part of the intelligentsia ... see in the Russian example the possibility of putting an end to their economic insecurity, the hope of throwing off the financial magnates, and the prospect of becoming masters of their own country themselves," (21) although it should, after all, be clear to this "more enlightened part of the intelligentsia" that "the leading communists have ceased to be revolutionaries at all". According to Nomad, then, the C.P. is growing because it is state-capitalist and because it is striving for intellectualist rule and also because it is not; according to Nomad it constantly does what it ought to do in conformity with Nomad's theories, even though in reality it does something quite different.

In countries which rate as backward from the point of view of objective ripeness for the proletarian revolution, the influence of the communist parties has recently increased as a result of the deepening of the crisis, while in those countries which have attained this objective ripeness, their influence has already sunk to something approaching zero, just because they did not seize the power, because they did not even start to look for it, or because they simply did not pursue the plans which Nomad tries to ascribe to them. They simply refused to become the "Masters of Tomorrow". That these elements, in the course of a proletarian revolution directed against them as well as against the bourgeoise, will attempt to divert it into state capitalism does not affect the fact that they themselves are no longer doing anything for the success of a state-capitalist revolution. The intellectuals have now acquired a greater degree of interest in the C.P., just as they once did in the S.P., because it has ceased to pursue any state socialist plans and thereby improved its chances of becoming even today a legal mass-party with a lot of jobs to dispense. Even though individual intellectuals are taking up with state-capitalist dreams, still the growth of the communist parties is not determined by these illusionists, but by the petty vermin that wants to arrange itself somehow in the present-day world and wants to be something even today.

Fascism attracts the intellectuals because it takes an outspokenly small-capitalist position, because it wants to defend "creative" capital against the "financiers", although it is after all compelled to do the very opposite, since the circumstance that the fascist as well as the communist movement embraces people who dream of state capitalism...
does not affect the fact that the whole fascist movement has a pronouncedly private-capitalist orientation, even though he nevertheless only subscribes to monopoly capital. Nomad's calling up of the interesting bedtime story of the concealed designs of Mussolini to become the Italian Lenin can hardly serve as proof of the "bolshievist" designs of the Fascists. Even before the founding of the fascist organizations, Mussolini had already sold himself to the Italian capitalists. (Cf. A. Balabanoff's "Als der Duce noch nicht Duce war", Sozialistische Warte, March-April-May 1936; or, for that matter, Nomad's biography of Mussolini in "Rebels and Renegades"). Nomad may let himself be deluded by the capitalist tendencies to concentration and centralization, and wherever these tendencies operate quite independently of the fascist or bolshevist parties and come forth quite as vigorously in countries without such parties as in those countries where they represent great mass movements.

In order to swell his material, Nomad is fond of throwing times and concepts together pell mell. Thus he writes on page 22 with reference to the capitalist war economy and the Russian collectivization, conceiving both as conscious attempts at planning: "In both cases the interests of the acting classes involved was the driving force, which is what you call the human factor, and not the 'objective' or 'extra-human' element of the growth of the social forces of production." In reality, however, these measures were imposed upon their "initiators" by the force of circumstances. Neither the war nor its economy, any more than the collectivization, was in conformity with the economic interests of the capitalists, or with those of the Russian bureaucracy, as the case may be. War diminishes surplus value, the collectivization strengthens the forces directed against the bureaucracy; and yet the "initiators" of this economic policy are forced to take it up without regard to their own economic interests. Every exploiting society is subject to the contradiction that in safeguarding its immediate interests its further interests are extensively damaged; which is simply a manifestation of the power of the objective elements over the subjective.

In exploitation relations, the more "planning" is done, the greater the chaos. And to denote the magnification of the oppositions and difficulties as an "element of conscious planning" can only occur to someone who has remained stuck in the bourgeois ideology. And it is also only on the basis of this bourgeois ideology that attempts can be made to answer the question of the intellectual fascist rule of Italy. With examples from the past. What was possible in feudal China and in the Paraguay of the 16th century does not and cannot demonstrate the future possibility for the intellectuals of setting up their neo-feudal rule notwithstanding the existence of the industrial proletariat.

Even though it may be "simply amazing" for Nomad to hear that in our conception the intellectuals have no economic functions, his amazement originates from his incapacity to distinguish between economic factors and those of a technico-organizational character. The capitalist functions which his intellectuals have taken over will take over from the capitalists are not appraised as economic. Of course, the bourgeoisie frequently employs the concept of economy even with reference to the culinary skill of their housewives; however, when we speak of economic functions, we use the word 'economic' in the sense of social, and do not mean the capacity to operate a factory or to manage a business establishment. Neither the fascists nor the intellectuals fulfill economic functions; the thing is simply impossible, for under capitalism, the economy is regulated by way of the market, and otherwise it would not be capitalism. The natural necessity of bringing human consumption into such harmony with production that the society can continue to exist—and this constitutes the economy—is the natural capital, but takes the round-about course of the market, in which the process operates blindly.

Nomad's argument that the fascists are to be regarded as "major partners" of Capital for the very reason that they "are swallowing up an ever growing share of the Nation's wealth" is perhaps sufficiently disposed of with a mere reference to the fact that all countries, inclusive of the non-fascist ones, need an ever growing share of the surplus value for governmental purposes. And this is explained by the fact that, with the concentration of capital, the functions of the governments become more and more extensive and the imperialist character of capital makes necessary an ever more imposing array of instruments of power, as well as the fact that the general chaos, which is constantly growing greater by reason of the crises, places ever greater demands upon the governing machinery, and all this quite apart from the problems of the fascist movement.

Nor can Nomad's reference to the "anti-capitalist gestures" of the Italian fascists be accepted as proof of the correctness of his ideas, for these "social-political" factors are not at all "anti-capitalist", but are capitalist necessities. That is to say, that these wage
increases and shorter hours are needed by Capital, so long as the thing is objectively possible, and are in- teresting for the most various reasons; for example, in order still further to break the competitive capacity of the small capitals in the interest of the large concerns, or in order to offset the increased intensity of the labor process and to enable the necessary reproduction of labor power, and likewise in the interest of social security, since an industrial proletariat can simply not, in the long run, be treated like slaves or serfs. This social policy is not out of harmony with the fact of the sharpened exploitation of the workers; it is rather a manifestation of this latter, revealing that Capital has been successful in raising the degree of exploitation. So that in spite of the fascist "social policy", the situation of the Italian workers has not been improved, but worsened, while Italian capital has increased its profits in accordance with this worsening. Any objective work on the Italian development since Mussolini's seizure of power will teach Nomad that he talks nonsense when he asserts that the fascists proceeded against Capital in order to further the interests of the workers and thereby to conform to their own bureaucratic necessities. In general, Nomad should be more careful about the choice of his "proofs". It is simply impossible—to take another instance—to maintain that the Japanese officers' caste (25) has independent disposal over Manchuria. A single glance at the capital investments in Manchuria would have taught him better. And even though half these capital investments are made by the Japanese government itself, still the Japanese government can hardly be claimed to be identical with Nomad's fascist officers' caste, but with Japanese capital and large landed property; a circumstance that finds expression, according to Nomad himself, in the fact that his officers "are in the habit of bumping off from time to time the most prominent representatives" of the Japanese ruling class.

On page 26 Nomad attempts to identify our conception regarding fascism with that of the Stalinists. We had not, however, as Nomad will have it, asserted that fascism has been created by "the necessity of saving the capitalist system either from the proletarian menace or from the internal weakness." We said rather that "it was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal" (26). The direct control of monopoly capital over the other social strata precluded the continuance of democratic parliamentarism. Fascism directed itself not against a menacing revolution, but against the reformist activity of the labor movement within the frame-work of bourgeois democracy. From the external point of view, fascism arose from the necessity of strengthening the imperialist potentialities: for example, in order still further to break the competitive capacity of the small capitals in the interest of the large concerns, or in order to offset the increased intensity of the labor process and to enable the necessary reproduction of labor power, and likewise in the interest of social security, since an industrial proletariat can simply not, in the long run, be treated like slaves or serfs. This social policy is not out of harmony with the fact of the sharpened exploitation of the workers; it is rather a manifestation of this latter, revealing that Capital has been successful in raising the degree of exploitation. So that in spite of the fascist "social policy", the situation of the Italian workers has not been improved, but worsened, while Italian capital has increased its profits in accordance with this worsening. Any objective work on the Italian development since Mussolini's seizure of power will teach Nomad that he talks nonsense when he asserts that the fascists proceeded against Capital in order to further the interests of the workers and thereby to conform to their own bureaucratic necessities. In general, Nomad should be more careful about the choice of his "proofs". It is simply impossible—to take another instance—to maintain that the Japanese officers' caste (25) has independent disposal over Manchuria. A single glance at the capital investments in Manchuria would have taught him better. And even though half these capital investments are made by the Japanese government itself, still the Japanese government can hardly be claimed to be identical with Nomad's fascist officers' caste, but with Japanese capital and large landed property; a circumstance that finds expression, according to Nomad himself, in the fact that his officers "are in the habit of bumping off from time to time the most prominent representatives" of the Japanese ruling class.

On page 26 Nomad attempts to identify our conception regarding fascism with that of the Stalinists. We had not, however, as Nomad will have it, asserted that fascism has been created by "the necessity of saving the capitalist system either from the proletarian menace or from the internal weakness." We said rather that "it was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal" (26). The direct control of monopoly capital over the other social strata precluded the continuance of democratic parliamentarism. Fascism directed itself not against a menacing revolution, but against the reformist activity of the labor movement within the frame-
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without capitalists"—to be inadequate and now wants to replace these terms with that of "unequalitarian socialism," which appears, that is, that he has meanwhile arrived with Henryk Grossmann (25) at the view that "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner, and the Russian State, that is, the bureaucracy, is only one sole firm, so to speak." Whatever Nomad or others may understand by Socialism or Communism, however much they may water and falsify concepts, so far as we ourselves are concerned, Communism still remains a state of affairs in which the workers themselves are the masters of the means of production, and State Capitalism the social condition in which the State stands over against the workers as the owner of the means of production just as the private capitalists did previously. That is simple and clear and needs no new formulations. -- But to come to Grossmann, whom Nomad likes to flaunt before our eyes.

We are not interested in Grossmann's sympathies for the U.S.S.R., since, with all respect for Grossmann's scientific achievement, we have still not ceased to think independently. As a matter of fact, however, what he presents as Grossmann's view, and which he then accepts as his own, proves either that Nomad can't read or that he is incapable of reproducing things as they are written down. Neither in the passage adduced by Nomad nor anywhere else does Grossmann say what Nomad here tries to impute to him. Grossmann does not concern himself in the least with the question of whether "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner" and which exchange relation, and whether capitalism can exist without the exchange relation. And to Grossmann, as to us, the significance of the exchange relation is represented in the following passage: "The abolition of exchange means, at the same time, the abolition of wage labor. The capitalist mode of production resting on wage labor presupposes, surely, the existence of the capital relation, that is, a relation in which labor power as a commodity is purchased on the market by the owners of the means of production. Where a commodity is exchanged on the market between the working class and the employing class, there must necessarily exist also exchange value. If Hilferding speaks of the disappearance of commodity exchange and of value—and he has to do so in order to arrive at his "regulated economy"—then there is also no place for the exchange of the commodity 'labor power'; or in other words, this implies that the capital relation also, the capitalist mode of production, must necessarily disappear. What comes to take its place may be either an unavowed master—worker relationship, as in the Middle Ages, or else a socialist communal economy." (29) As soon as wage labor prevails in Russia, there must also be in existence there, according to Grossmann, a capital relation. And, thus, with the existence of the wage and capital relation in Russia, a regulated economy there is out of the question. So that to us and to Marxism the Russian "planned-economy" tendencies have nothing in common with a socialist planned economy, but only the technico-organizational measures of monopoly capital carried to the extreme.

Nomad's false interpretation of Henryk Grossmann is matched by his exposition of marxist principles in which he rejoices that others also (Stalin, Sorel, Hook) have found it necessary to stand Marx on his head. In the first place, we may say that socialism does not mean "primarily a change in the form of production, or in the ownership of the means of production" (29), as Nomad asserts, but signifies, according to Marx and also to us, the abolition of any and all property relation with respect to the means of production thru their socialization. The question of distribution is not for Marxism "a secondary matter," (29) as Nomad puts it, but is inseparably bound up with the form of production. With the change in the forms of production there change also the forms of distribution; nothing else in this respect is possible. Marx was not of the opinion, as Nomad writes, that "during the first phase of communism ... there would be no equality of incomes", but Marx writes that by reason of the equal incomes the inequality will still continue to exist. Let us listen to Marx himself: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as if it had developed on a basis of its own, but on the contrary as it emerges from capitalist society...The individual producer received back from society, with deductions, exactly what he gave. What he has given to society is his individual amount of labor. For example, the social working day consists of the sum of the individual hours of work. He receives from society a voucher that he has.
contributed such and such quantity of work (after deductions from his work for the common fund) and draws through the central storeroom on the socialist system the means of consumption as the same quantity of work costs. The same amount of work which he has given to society in one form, he receives back in another. Here obviously the same principle prevails as that which regulates the exchange of commodities, so far as this exchange is of equal values, i.e. equal quantities of labor in one form are exchanged for equal quantities of labor in another form. The right of the producers is proportional to the amount of labor they contribute; the equality consists in the fact that everything is measured by an equal measure, labor, ... and labor, to serve as a measure, must be defined by its duration or intensity; otherwise it ceases to be a standard of measure. This equal right is an unequal right for unequal exchange is of equal values, i.e. equal quantities of measures thus. Right can by its very nature only consist in the application of an equal standard, but unequal individuals are only measurable by an equal standard inseparably as they can be brought under the equal observation, be regarded from one definite aspect only, e.g. in the case under review, they must be considered only as workers and nothing more be seen in them, everything else being ignored. Further, one worker is married, another single, one has more children than another, and so on. One's capacity for labor and the actual share in the funds for social consumption, the one will in practice receive more than the other, the one will be richer than the other, and so forth. To avoid all these inconveniences right must be unequal instead of being equal. But these deficiencies are unavoidable in the first phase of communist society." (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, pages 29-31).

So that Marx says exactly the opposite of what Nomad, like others previously, would like to read from him. For the very reason that the incomes are the same, whereas the individual conditions of the different workers are dissimilar, it is nonsensical to speak of the removal of all inequality. Any other equality than that of incomes cannot exist in this phase of communism, as otherwise the "application of an equal standard" would be precluded, which in this first phase of communism is still necessary. Nor do the disquisitions in the Critique of the Gotha Program stand alone in this respect. They are in close relation with the general standpoint of Marxism. Our interpretation, not that of Nomad, is confirmed by a great number of passages of "Capital", of Engels' "Anti-Dühring", etc. No other than our interpretation can be brought into harmony with the marxian doctrine of value. In Marx's writings, the higher is distinguished from the lower phase of communism precisely in virtue of the fact that in this higher phase the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" can be actualized, whereas it becomes possible to dispense with the narrow legal standpoint of equal incomes in spite of the unequal conditions of the individuals. While in the first phase of communism each worker receives for the same labor time, assuming equal intensity of labor (in case of relatively harder labor, shorter hours), the same income, since he is regarded only as a worker and nothing else, later on any standard of this sort is dispensed with, since society is able to leave this narrow legal foundation. If Nomad had made himself a bit more familiar with the communist laws of production, he would have been in a position to arrive at a better understanding of Marx's disquisitions and he might also have spared himself the silly question "who is to determine a man's needs?" Nomad is incapable of conceiving an independent human being. It might be stated, however, that even if people lack the capacity for anything further, there can after all hardly be any doubts as to they are in a position to "determine their needs"; at any rate, we have never yet met anyone who did not know what he wanted.

Nomad does not limit himself, however, to turning the views of other people upside down; he is also not averse to distorting reality itself in conformity with his own ideas. In his argumentation he constantly speaks of the "reported large sections of the working class and won the sympathies of the masses for President Roosevelt". (30) In the first place, it is not permissible here to speak vaguely of "large sections" and perhaps attempt to maintain one's thesis with a reference to the shabby "public works" of the Roosevelt Administration, since of course we constantly speak of the working class as a whole; and secondly, what is Nomad's proof for his bold assertion? A single glance at the statistics would have shown him how badly he is mistaken. He would see that since the installation of the Roosevelt regime, the share of the workers in the social product has become not larger, but smaller; that the situation of the workers has been worsened, notwithstanding the slight upturn of quite recent date, which is not even attributable to Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy", but to the inflation and the further rationalization, insofar as it is not bound up with the temporary spurt in production as a natural result of many years of depression.
The April 1936 official figures of the general business indexes published by the Federal Reserve authorities show that the volume of industrial production was 12 percent below the normal level (>). The volume of residential contracts was 56 percent below normal, while that of residential contracts was 74 percent below normal. Factory employment in April 1936 was on this same basis 25 percent below normal, while factory payrolls were 31 percent under normal, and department store sales 28 percent below. Ponder the value of all of this. Factory employment in April 1936 was on the same basis 25 percent below normal, while factory payrolls were 31 percent below normal. Factory employment in April 1936 was on the same basis 25 percent below normal, while factory payrolls were 31 percent below normal. In view of the differences between these three figures, Nomad's talk of the improvement of conditions as a result of Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy" is revealed as nonsense. The circumstances of the mass are not to be wondered at, for the government and the bourgeoisie propaganda machine are, of course, on hand for the purpose of making those masses tipsy. The mass is enthusiastic not because it has obtained something, but because it is expecting something. In consideration of its own weakness, it sets its hopes upon another party.Nomad is enthusiastic for Roosevelt or Hitler springs, like its need of religion, not from its well-being, but from its misery.

Perhaps in order to show that the "intellectualist economy" is capable of improving the situation of the workers and hence also capable of assuring its rule for an unlimited time, Nomad will also present us with the rising wage figures of Russia. In case he does, we should like to ask him not to content himself, like the Russian intellectuals, with the wage figures alone, but also to let us have at the same time the price changes. Further still, the figures regarding the development of the productivity of labor....With all these figures in mind, he himself cannot help noting that in spite of the rising Russian wages, the situation of the workers has worsened with increasing accumulation. For the past year it has already become necessary in Russia to impoverish the working population not only relatively to the mounting production, but also absolutely; the disproportion between prices and wages has already led to an actual wage cut, a matter which Nomad probably knows as well as we.

Now that we have seen how Nomad can expound texts in his own interest and represent reality as he would like to have it in order not to upset his theory, it will not be surprising to hear that he can also predict in accordance with these theories our own future. Our position on the reaction of the intellectuals, he writes, is determined by the fact that "criticism of the intelligentsia as the ruling class of the coming period of a socialized form of economy" is directed also against our own "ambitions for power". (31) And then he compares us with all the other groups which at one time or another have promised to serve the masses and nevertheless were only aiming at power for themselves. When we speak of Workers' Councils, Nomad sees nothing more than the propagandists of the council idea, not the councils themselves, of which he can form no other idea than the one which he has of the bourgeoisie leader-mass organizations. He knows nothing at all of the economic functions of the councils, but sees in them only another party. For this reason he fails to realize how ridiculous he makes himself in referring to the Russian soviets as an indication of our own future. The Russian soviets were not "holding out the promise of 'withering away' of the State", as Nomad imagines (32). The soviets and the bolshevist state apparatus stood over against each other as separate organizations from the very beginning of the Russian revolution, the state apparatus seeing in the soviets only an instrument for the carrying out of its resolutions. With the extension of the state apparatus and the concentration of all power in the hands of the bureaucracy, the soviets were discredited, until today they have declined to nothing more than an empty decoration of no more significance than Hitler's "Labor Front". It was the State, i.e. the Party, that promised to "wither away"; the soviets could promise nothing of the sort. Even though the State was able to come into existence only by means of the soviets, i.e. of the Russian revolution, still under the Russian conditions the bureaucracy was soon in a position to deprive the soviets of all power. To us the councils or soviets are not instruments of the revolution with which the party works, but they are the basis of the dictatorship as well as of communist production. They cannot "wither away", nor have they any state beside themselves which could do likewise. They cannot promise that their "State" will vanish, for there is here no longer a State in the sense of the bourgeois or of the Bolsheviks. Their own state functions, i.e. the mounting of the working population not only relatively to the mounting production, but also absolutely; the disproportion between prices and wages has already led to an actual wage cut, a matter which Nomad probably knows as well as we.

Taking as his text the brief presentation of our conception of communist society contained in one number of the Council Correspondence, Nomad tries to demonstrate ...
that we merely use other names in promising and aiming at the same thing as all previous labor organizations. The fact simply is that as a special group we promise nothing at all: to us the revolution and what comes after it is an affair of the class, which can promise nothing to itself. It can at most do something, or omit doing something. As a part of the working class, we are pleased to cooperate in the class tasks, and it goes without saying that in this connection we will try to put across the conception for which we stand. However, our attitude is such as to preclude the possibility that we ourselves, as a special group, should occupy or strive for positions by the side of the class organizations. To that end we would first have to change our attitude and become a party. It would be entirely beside the point that we would be placed in a position to add another to the already existing labor bureaucracies. We hold it to be impossible henceforth, under the present conditions in the industrial countries, to develop a labor bureaucracy which would be able to operate against the class interests of the workers. The period of its usefulness preceding the revolutionary uprising precludes the forming of organizations which would be capable of holding the revolution to certain paths in conformity with their desires. Whether in the process of the revolution itself, organizations will be formed by which the previously forming councils will again be demonstratively and even if not provided. Still, just because this possibility exists, it is all the more necessary to insist on the exclusive rule of the councils. If reactionary forces should succeed in emasculating the councils, it is thereby also precluded that the workers' situation would be improved. The revolution is in that case only temporarily brought to a standstill; it will have to arise anew. In the last instance, the councils must after all assert themselves, for they alone are capable of actualizing communism, and only this latter is capable of doing justice to the needs of the masses.

According to Nomad, however, even then nothing is yet attained; for as he sees it, the councils will then do the same thing as the state capitalist parties attempted previously. And he tries to prove it to us with our own words. Since we speak of the necessity of centralism he writes that this "necessary centralism does away with the means of production in the hands of the producers,... is nothing but our good old Bolshevik state bureaucracy". (33) It would lead too far to explain to Nomad at this place the process of communist economy. It might be stated here, however, that there are all sorts of centralism, and not centralism without qualification. The technico-centralistic management of large industrial concerns is something different from the capitalist centralization of power in the hands of a few capitalists. The authority of the technico-organizational central apparatus extends only to the technico-organizational matters of the concern; it is subject to the control of the actual owners of these concerns. The technico-organizational and the economic centralization may, as in Russia, be largely combined; here the planning commission alone operates in harmony with the government, or carries out its desires. Not every centralism, however, signifies actual power over society. Whether the central control of production and distribution is at the same time centralization of power, or only a technical function and nothing more, depends on the whole complex of social conditions. A central organization alone has no power over the producers; in order to have that, it has to have also at its disposal material means for putting thru its plans even against the producers' will. That is to say that in order to impose its own will, it must have by the side of itself a state apparatus. The period of centralization here preceding the revolutionary uprising precludes the forming of organizations which would be capable of holding the revolution to certain paths in conformity with their desires. Whether in the process of the revolution itself, organizations will be formed by which the previously forming councils will again be demonstratively and even if not provided. Still, just because this possibility exists, it is all the more necessary to insist on the exclusive rule of the councils. If reactionary forces should succeed in emasculating the councils, it is thereby also precluded that the workers' situation would be improved. The revolution is in that case only temporarily brought to a standstill; it will have to arise anew. In the last instance, the councils must after all assert themselves, for they alone are capable of actualizing communism, and only this latter is capable of doing justice to the needs of the masses.
The ripeness of the situation. Of course, we too are aware that between theory and practice a complete agreement is not always immediately possible and that the organization of the communist society also will have to proceed with great difficulties; yet for that very reason, the theory must be represented all the more consistently.

Whether communism, as we see it, will be actually consistent with the productive forces, we wish here to give expression to the idea that in such countries only equality, communism, is capable of driving forward the productive forces of society, what we have in mind when we say that Nomad terms "suspicious". On the contrary: since we are convinced that even today in the industrially developed countries only equality, communism, is capable of driving forward the productive forces, we wished here to give expression to the idea that in such countries only equality, communism, is capable of driving forward the productive forces of society, what we have in mind when we say that Nomad terms "suspicious".

We do not regard it as possible to convince Nomad of what any other serious work on the subject would tell him, namely, that there has unmistakably been bound up with the development of the productive forces a level of development of the social forces of production and this development was bound up with the existence of classes, was the horrible bloody process of the creation of the proletariat and of industry. No equality was here possible; equality would not have been able to develop the productive forces in the measure in which capitalism was able to do so. The development of the productive forces at a certain stage of the development of human society is bound up with inequality. Inequality is here progressive. Equality in backward Russia, for example, with but little industry and an infinitesimal minority of proletarians, would never have been able to develop the productive forces in such measure as has been possible under the inequality of the bolshevist-capitalist dictatorship. The Bolshevists, like Capital in other countries, were progressive because they promoted not equality but inequality, even though by the very reason of this they became a reactionary force with respect to the international revolution. An exploiting society is objectively revolutionary when this exploitation is identical with the development of the productive forces. It is not until it stands in the way of the development of those productive forces that it becomes objectively reactionary. To renounce the exploitation of the Russian workers would be for Russia objectively reactionary; the inequality and exploitation has called forth industry and produced the proletariat that this afternoon, in Russia of the international revolution. Our point of departure is constantly the industrial proletariat in countries where the bourgeoisie is compelled to restrict the productive forces. Only such a proletariat, in such countries, is in a position, by means of communist equality, to drive forward the productive forces.

When we further said that with the setting aside of the class relations "there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions", we meant exactly what we said; not what Nomad tries hard to understand by it, "that there will be different incomes here that these differences will not be very sharp" (36). The sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions vanish precisely because of the equal incomes. An engineer will not feel so far removed from a manual worker when both have the same incomes; for it is not so much the occupation by which people are separated, but the various incomes to which those occupations give rise.

We do not regard it as possible to convince Nomad of what any other serious work on the subject would tell him, namely, that there has unmistakably been bound up with the development of the productive forces a level of development of the social forces of production and this development was bound up with the existence of classes, was the horrible bloody process of the creation of the proletariat and of industry. No equality was here possible; equality would not have been able to develop the productive forces in the measure in which capitalism was able to do so. The development of the productive forces at a certain stage of the development of human society is bound up with inequality. Inequality is here progressive. Equality in backward Russia, for example, with but little industry and an infinitesimal minority of proletarians, would never have been able to develop the productive forces in such measure as has been possible under the inequality of the bolshevist-capitalist dictatorship. The Bolshevists, like Capital in other countries, were progressive because they promoted not equality but inequality, even though by the very reason of this they became a reactionary force with respect to the international revolution. An exploiting society is objectively revolutionary when this exploitation is identical with the development of the productive forces. It is not until it stands in the way of the development of those productive forces that it becomes objectively reactionary. To renounce the exploitation of the Russian workers would be for Russia objectively reactionary; the inequality and exploitation has called forth industry and produced the proletariat that this afternoon, in Russia of the international revolution. Our point of departure is constantly the industrial proletariat in countries where the bourgeoisie is compelled to restrict the productive forces. Only such a proletariat, in such countries, is in a position, by means of communist equality, to drive forward the productive forces.

The workers, according to Nomad, are incapable of anything, but he finds that society can be conducted very
well by Heinz Neumann's "Lumpenproletarians" and the
"similar group of declassé intellectuals and semi-
intellectuals who seized all the power in Russia" (27).
What the workers can not do, also that the workers can not do
by the masters of all production, that can be done
quite well, according to Nomad, by the "outs", the un-
employed or underpaid journalists, lecturers, college
graduates and under-graduates, lawyers without clients
and doctors without patients, educated ex-workers in
search of a while collar position, etc., etc. (35). And
accordingly Nomad's struggle against this intellec-
tual rabble cannot be taken seriously. For if the work-
ers themselves are not in a position to take over pro-
duction today, they will not be capable of doing so
tomorrow either; if the intellectuals have or obtain a
monopoly on the control and direction of production,
they will also know how to make this monopoly perma-
nent. That, however, could only be welcomed. According
to Nomad's theory, since the intellectuals have become
a blessing to the workers: without them the workers
would have to go hungry, since they themselves are, of
course, incapable of directing production. And so the
workers would be obliged, in their own interest, to fur-
ther the ambitions of the intellectuals, in the exist-
ting labor organizations, for the sake of these organiza-
tions is the condition precedent to their own existence and their own success. What Heinz
Neumann still spoke of as the "Lumpenproletariat" has
meanwhile become for Nomad the light of humanity. True
it is only in their own interest that the intellectu-
als; but still their success is in line with the work-
ners' most immediate interests, since they must offer
the workers more than these latter receive from the
private capitalists. So that Nomad is then quite con-
sistent in saying that it is very much a matter of in-
dividual interests of the existing labor organizations
the workers join, since "each of these organizations,
in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help
them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours, etc." (41). And since, according to Nomad, this is and must
be done also by the Fascists, we really fail to see
why they too should not be favored with working-class
support.

In all this, Nomad never once stops to ask himself
whether what he asserts is in harmony with the facts
or, if so, is permanently possible. As a matter of
fact, political parties and trade unions have long as-
sured their existence by helping to make possible any
improvement in the workers' situation. It is solely
for this reason, of course, that the history of the
old labor movement has become a history of labor
fakery. The fact that these organizations, just like
the whole of bourgeois society, of which they are a
part, have had to be both revolutionary and reaction-
ary, helpful to the workers and injurious at another--this temporal factor Nomad has quite over-
looked. It reality, it is only in quite determinate
historical conditions that these organizations are able
to "do something for the workers", while under other
historical conditions they are obliged to operate against
the workers' interests, whether they want to or not.
What Nomad has to demonstrate is that these organiza-
tions are today in a position to become the workers'"benefactors"; but that is simply not demonstrable.

But to come back to the assertion that the intellectu-
als are capable while the workers are not, of directing
production. In the first place, here again we meet with
the confusion of technical with economic matters. For as
yet the intellectuals have performed no social-economic
functions; they still leave these to the market, not
only in private-capitalist countries but also, in a
somewhat more organized form, in Russia. And as con-
cerns their technical functions, Nomad attaches to them
excessive importance. If he had but a faint idea of
modern enterprise, he would have understood that, if the in-
dustrial proletariat as it actually is, it would be-
come clear to him that this proletariat is quite in a
position to manage production. This management is also a
function to which may be applied the statement which
Nomad relates exclusively to ordinary manual tasks; it
"disproportionately benefits" the workers, since they make use
of the intellectuals is the condition precedent to
the workers more than these latter receive from the
private capitalists. So that Nomad is then quite con-
sistent in saying that it is very much a matter of in-
dividual interests of the existing labor organizations
the workers join, since "each of these organizations,
in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help
them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours, etc." (41). And since, according to Nomad, this is and must
be done also by the Fascists, we really fail to see
why they too should not be favored with working-class
support.

In all this, Nomad never once stops to ask himself
whether what he asserts is in harmony with the facts
or, if so, is permanently possible. As a matter of
fact, political parties and trade unions have long as-
sured their existence by helping to make possible any
improvement in the workers' situation. It is solely
for this reason, of course, that the history of the
old labor movement has become a history of labor
continue to doubt that a part of the intellectuals necessary for production, in early recognition of the consequences of the altered situation, and thereby isolate and render still more powerless the part whose attitude toward this order is still unsympathetic. Under communist conditions, the intellectuals will have more to offer them than has the intellectual element in power at the time. Thus the salvation of humanity lies in this competitive struggle of the intelligentsia and manual activity. History ceases to become a struggle between Capital and Labor.

We have here been obliged to speak from the standpoint of Nomad's argumentation, although it would have been much simpler and more enlightening to deal with this problem without regard to Nomad, from the standpoint of Marxism. Only a further word in conclusion: Just as there is no partial truth, so also Nomad's theory is based upon a partial truth. Since class oppositions exist under capitalism and state capitalism, and since the intellectual professions are for the most part exercised by elements of the middle class, the opposition between intellectuals and workers, or intellectuals and capitalists, from one of a number of phases of these class oppositions, Nomad constructs the eternal opposition between intellectual and manual activity. History of class struggles; it becomes a struggle between the educated and those on the way to becoming so for the mastery over the ignorant; a state of affairs to which Nomad applies the name of permanent revolution. Yet, in this competitive struggle between the educated or relatively educated, the ignorant also are continually gaining, since in order to get the support of these latter the competing group is obliged to have more to offer them than has the intellectual element in power at the time. Thus the salvation of humanity lies in this competitive struggle of the intellectuals, and thus things will slowly become better also for the less educated, so that they themselves will naturally become more and more enlightened. And all that in complete independence of the economic problems of society and its transformations. If, however, we think Nomad's theory of the "permanent revolution" consistently to its end, we can come to no other conclusion than that there also, where the situation of the workers keeps on improving, a point must of necessity be reached at which equality is established and the opposition between intellectuals and workers has wholly disappeared; and hence there disappears also Nomad's permanent revolution, which now, after all, like all other socialist theories, has its "final". But even tho Nomad himself may like to split his head over the question of how he arrived at a permanent revolution without permanency, our attention continues to be directed to the more important problems of the class struggle between Capital and Labor. - P.M.-

To ALL THE WORKERS IN THE WORLD

Fellow workers, proletarians, workers of the world at large: Where are you? Where is your social and class consciousness when you permit the governments directing the destinies of your countries to support, by their non-intervention in the Spanish civil war, the military fascists that rose in arms in defense of privilege and capital.

Fellow anarchists and communists, syndicalists, socialists and trade-unionists: The hour of liberation for Spain has struck. The working class of the Iberian peninsula turns to you for help. In the defense of an ideal which is also your ideal, they are shedding their blood on the battlefields, convinced that you, fellow workers of the world, will respond adequately to their heroic sacrifice. Your governments have refused aid to the Spanish government that was elected by the people, but you are not neutral. Military-fascist uprising, if you feel an ardent desire for the freedom of the working class, do not hesitate and come to our help immediately. Your fellow workers in Spain require from you that support which your governments have denied Spain. There is not and there should be no other diplomacy among workers than that of doing their duty. Your duty, coming from your own interest, and fellow workers throughout the world, is not to permit the fascists and their allies to crush us.

THE NATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF LABOR
THE IBERIAN ANARCHIST FEDERATION
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The "Popular Front" and Fascism

A manifesto issued by the Communist Party of Italy and published in the "Impercor" (#38), the official Press Correspondence of the Communist International, states:

"Only the brotherly union of the people of Italy brought about by the reconciliation of Fascists and non-Fascists will be in a position to break down the power of the bloodsuckers in our country."

"Let us reach out our hands to each other, children of the Italian nation! Fascists and Communists, Catholics and Socialists, people of all opinions, and let us march side by side to enforce the right of existence of a civilized country, as ours is. We have the same ambition—to make Italy strong, free and happy."

"Workers and intellectuals, Socialists, Democrats, Liberals, Catholics! Use all your endeavours for the reconciliation and unity of the Italian people, for the creation of a People's Front in Italy. The present rulers of Italy wish to keep the Italian people split into Fascists and non-Fascists. Let us raise high the banner of unity of the people for bread, work, liberty and peace!"

"We proclaim that we are prepared to fight, together with you and the whole Italian people, for the carrying out of the Fascist programme of 1919 and for every demand which represents a particular or general and immediate interest of the workers and the people of Italy." The C.P. — Mussolini's most loyal Opposition.

Democracy in Russia

"The 18 prisoners, accused of conspiracy to murder Stalin, were sentenced to death at 2.30 a.m., August 34. They were convicted on the evidence of their own confessions, obtained from them by the Ogpu before the trial; and the Ogpu knows all the tricks of the third degree. Why did they not retract their confessions when in court? Broken fragments of manhood; hemmed in, as they were, by bayonets; torn between the fear of further torture and the last glimmer of hope of release—each individual had a promise that his life would be spared, on condition that he adhered to his confession. After the sentence, the 16 were not given much opportunity to withdraw their confessions; at dawn, August 35, it is officially reported, they were all shot, including the inevitable stool-pigeons. Why shoot the stool-pigeons? Dead men tell no tales. And why did Tomsky shoot himself? Well, because he had plotted to kill Stalin, but because Stalin was plotting to kill Tomsky, after screwing out of him a false confession." (F.W. Chandler in "Controversy" #1.)

Roosevelt's Prosperity

The current monthly survey of business made public by the American Federation of Labor states that:

Profits of the larger corporations are approaching pre-depression levels, with profits for 250 large industrial corporations for nine months of 1936 55.5 per cent above the corresponding period in 1935.

Dividend payments to stockholders of 458 companies increased 33 per cent in 1936 over 1935.

Productivity in many industries has been enormously increased due to speed-up methods and technological improvements.

In the automobile industry in 1936 gains in production per worker were double the wage gains. In the boot and shoe industry production per worker per hour has increased 10.5 per cent in 1936 as compared with 1935 while the worker's earnings per hour have actually decreased 2.5 per cent.

The rise in hourly earnings of wage earners has been § cent an hour in 1936 above the 1935 figure while the cost of living has gone up 3.3 per cent, so that the worker has actually received less for his hour's work in 1936 than he did in 1935.

The worker's weekly income, however, has increased more than hourly earnings because hours have been lengthened. The average work week in industry has been lengthened two hours in 1936, increasing from 33 to 43 hours and by thus adding to the work time of those already employed instead of taking on new workers, industry has denied jobs to several thousand unemployed.

By working two hours longer and by receiving half a cent more per hour, workers have added 1.11 to their weekly pay, raising the average wage level from $51.35 to $53.53. This is a 5.5 per cent increase, somewhat more than the increase in cost of living so that the average weekly wage of 1936 will buy 3.1 cent more per cent than last year.
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