

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Land of Promise

REPORT FROM PALESTINE

The Masters of Tomorrow

Fascism and Bolshevism

"Councils" and Soviets

The Permanent Revolution

By **MAX NOMAD**

The Party and the Class

Vol. II

Nos. 9 & 10

SEPTEMBER 1936

\$1.00 YEARLY

10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

Published at 1237 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition 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. 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 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 advance 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!

THE LAND OF PROMISE

-- Report from Palestine --

The reports on the new situation in Palestine generally speak of the building up of the country by way of Jewish capital and Jewish labor, of the resulting prosperity, of the more or less uniform participation in this prosperity by the entire Jewish people, and of the good prospects for a more and more extensive happy development. These reports are the more calculated to arouse comment and hopes as for some time now in the other countries the lot of the working class and middle bourgeois elements is an increasingly wretched one. Throughout the world, as the crisis continues, products and means of production are being destroyed. Everywhere unemployment reigns, and the masses are looking forward apathetically to a new world war. Only Palestine, the country in process of building up, is said to form an exception.

In Palestine, the moneys of Jewish and British capitalists are being turned to account. Toward Palestine press the increasingly impoverished Jewish artisans and workers from Eastern Europe and the U.S.A., the Arab nomads and peasants, the Oriental Jews. With the setting in of the crisis and with the advance of monopolization, a migration to Palestine arose thru the growth of Fascism with the accompanying impoverishment

of the Jewish middle stratum, as in Germany, thru anti-Semitism. In these countries a nationalistic sentiment takes form among the Jews; and there is a strengthening of the same sentiment among the Arabs, among whom a great national movement had existed as early as 1917.

Zionism or Palestinism, the national movement of the Jewish masses, is divided into various parties, corresponding to the class stratification. There are two democratic-liberal parties, which arose thru the split in the party of the "General Zionists". The smaller of the two new parties stands closer to the fascists, the larger to the labor party. There is a large fascist party, the "Revisionists", with a few small splinter groups in its train. Furthermore, a large clerical party of the "Mizrachi". The labor party (MAPAI) and the "General Federation of Jewish Labor in the Land of Israel" (Histadruth) are reformist-nationalistic. To these may be added also a reformist organization ("HashomerHatzair") made up of the members of the agrarian labor communes; various youth organizations; and a women's organization ("Wizo").

All these groups advocate immigration of the Jews of all countries to Palestine. This immigration is opposed only by the illegal group of the Comintern (PCP).

Palestine is bounded on the west by the Mediterranean Sea, on the north by Mount Lebanon, on the east by the River Jordan and on the south by the desert of Sinai. It has an area of about 10,000 square miles.

From west to east, Palestine is divided into three plains which run approximately parallel to the sea-coast. In the west, the fertile lowland; in the middle, the highlands; and in the east, the Jordan depression. The central highlands attain an elevation of 2500 feet. The surface of the Dead Sea, into which the Jordan issues, lies about 1300 feet below sea level.

Within the Ottoman Empire, Palestine consisted of a few administrative districts (vilayets) of the Turkish province of Syria. After the War, and the Arab uprising, Palestine was separated from the other Arab countries and made a British mandate territory, which was to be administered by England under the League of Nations. (The same sort of thing occurred with the northern part of Syria, which was divided into four parts and placed under a French mandate.) The mandate over Palestine goes back to the Balfour Declaration, (November 2, 1917), according to which the government of His British Majesty looked with favor upon the

establishment in Palestine of "a National Home for the Jewish people,...it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and the political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country".

The government for Palestine is located in Jerusalem. It consists of the High Commissioner and his three leading officials and the department heads. The government is subordinate to the Colonial Office in London, to which all laws must be submitted for approval. In Jerusalem is located also the headquarters of the English aerial and land troops. Jerusalem is connected with the two other large cities, Haifa and Jaffa-Tel-Aviv, by good automobile roads and a railway.

Jaffa is mainly a port for the orange export trade. Haifa, whose harbor has been improved, is at the same time a base of the British Mediterranean fleet. Into Haifa runs the southern arm of the pipe line which brings the oil from Mosul to the sea; the northern arm passes thru mandate territory of France. There are also a few airports of the lines running between Europe and South Africa and Europe and Eastern Asia. Further airports are being planned.

On the eastern boundary of Palestine is the Transjordan, which likewise is administered under an English mandate, and by the same High Commissioner in Jerusalem. In Transjordan also "reigns" the Emir Abdullah, a brother of Feisal. In the southwest, Palestine borders on Egypt. A railway line connects Cairo by way of Jaffa with Haifa and Jerusalem; it is joined onto the Hejaz Railway and has a bus connection with Bagdad and Beirut. Palestine is thus an important part of the British Empire, for communication by water as well as by land, and--still more important today--by air.

The officially recognized languages are English, Arabic and Hebrew. English is hardly spoken except by the higher officials; the rest of the population speaks Arabic, except for the Jewish youth and the Oriental Jews who speak Hebrew. The Jewish population also speaks the languages of their country of origin, and mostly Yiddish. The Jewish press, however, comes out in Hebrew.

The population of Palestine, according to the government census of Oct. 23, 1922, was distributed as follows: Rural - 389,534; Urban - 264,317; Nomads - 103,331; a total of 757,182.

In 1934, the racial division of the population was estimated as: Arabs - 870,000, and Jews - 310,000.

The methods of production in Palestine are in part still biblical in their primitiveness. Among the arab nomad tribes the closed family economy (clan) is dominant. This form is breaking up, thru sale of animals and lands, into wage labor. A large part of the arab agriculture is still reminiscent of the Middle Ages and Feudalism. The large landed proprietors (effendis) lease the ground to arab peasants (fellahs), by whom it has been tilled for long generations. The rental amounts in general to one-fifth of the yield in kind. The effendi also lends money to the fellahs so that they may purchase the necessary harvesting implements. The interest rate ranges up to 150%.

The effendis form a part of the population of the arab city, insofar as they don't prefer to consume their revenue, raked in by the overseers, in foreign parts. Some of them also sell parts of the soil and set up on the balance an intensive plantation economy. In the measure in which the effendis make the transition from leasing to running plantations, the fellahs become wage workers. A 1929 estimate proportions the soil of Palestine, from the agricultural point of view, as follows: cultivated - 5515 sq. km., cultivable, but not cultivated - 3389 sq. km., uncultivable (forest and pasture land) - 7750 sq. km., not specified - 3346 sq. km., a total of 20,000 sq. km. The balance of 6,000 sq. km. is probably desert.

The arab city is mainly a trading center. The inhabitants, tradesmen and artisans, are usually also land owners.

The jewish colonization began around 1880. The first jewish villages, confronted by economic collapse, were rescued at the time by a Baron Rothschild thru the introduction of improved plants and by financial support. The first Zionist Congress was held in 1897, at which the goal proclaimed was that of "establishing for the Jewish people a publicly recognized and legally secured home in Palestine."

There is in existence a Jewish National Fund (KKL) and a Palestine Foundation Fund (KH). The KKL, which is the central land purchasing agency of the Zionist organization, was brought into being in 1902 for the purpose of acquiring land as the inalienable property of the Jewish people. The land is purchased from the arab owners, effendis and families, clans and village communities, and often leads to the driving off of the fellahs from the land of the effendis. In a few

cases, more recently, the Arabs are left in possession of smaller surface areas, which they are now intensively cultivating with the aid of credits and modern implements. In 1934 the KKL possessed an area of 41,500 hectares. The KH began its activity in the year 1921; it finances agricultural and urban colonization, education, immigration, health, religious and communal institutions. Both funds are subject to the executive authority and the committee of action, elected by the Congress which meets every two years. The congress is elected on a democratic basis by the Zionist organizations of all countries, and thereby financed: anyone who pays a shilling has the right to vote in selecting the delegates. The Zionist bodies are combined with other non-Zionist, but still Jewish, bodies to form the expanded Jewish Agency.

The Jewish agricultural activity is divided between plantation economy, cereal culture and mixed farming. On the plantations (end of 1934: 15,000 hectares Jewish, 10,000 hectares Arab) the products are citrus fruits, almonds and wine. The operation is by estates (5 ha upward), intensive peasant farms (1.5 to 2.5 ha) and communes (1 ha is equal to nearly 2.5 acres). In the mixed farming there is market-gardening, cattle raising for the production of milk and cheese, and poultry raising with production of eggs. In this type of farming, small peasants are dominant, and are bound together in producers' cooperatives.

The cereals are planted by the approximately 10,000 workers of the communes and workers' settlements in the valley of Jezreel and by the peasants in Galilee. Agricultural settlements also exist around Haifa, Petach Tiqva, Kefr Saba and the Jewish colonies, the owners of which are also engaged as workers and employees in the city. It appears, however, that these auxiliary enterprises are on the way to becoming basic.

Owing to the large amount of immigration in the last few years, there exists in Palestine an increased demand for soil for agricultural purposes and in the cities for constructions, so that land prices are constantly rising and land speculation has assumed an enormous scope. According to the Palestinian (Turkish) land law, a fourth of the purchase price must be paid down and the rest in six months. The realty companies accordingly buy up land to the extent of about four times their capital. They then split it up into lots and, as is natural in view of the land hunger, sell it at a very considerable profit, thus being in a position to meet their obligations. When, however, the land hunger has a relapse--as, for example, thru the offer of cheap land and the possibility of exploiting

cheaper labor power on the island of Cyprus, and the companies fail to get the land off their hands, hence are unable to pay the balance due, the amount paid down is forfeited and the purchase lapses. The companies have then lost their capital, and thus arises a possibility of crisis which, in a country where land speculation plays such a dominant part, is bound to have noticeable consequences. The KKL is trying to eliminate speculation, and gives away its farms in perpetual lease. But since this Fund (as well as the KH) exists on gifts and collections, it is unable to keep pace with the land hunger. For the land hunger, like the immigration itself, is a consequence of the increasing impoverishment of the Jewish masses and their fear of outright proletarianization. And the continuing impoverishment is bound to exert a restraining influence upon the money collections. Besides, the land is in the possession of the feudal nobility and its prices mount. The money at the disposal of the KKL is inadequate, and the Fund finds itself compelled to promote large land purchases of private companies, in which it acts as an intermediary. Thus speculation wins more and more influence, and the land-hungry masses of the Arab and Jewish country population are confronted with the task of breaking the chains of the feudal and capitalist property relations.

The most immediate consequence of these conditions is a building boom, which has been in progress in Palestine for several years. A part of the raw materials originates within the country, while lumber and iron are imported. The cement production in Palestine had increased in 1934 to 155,000 tons of which only 700 were exported while an additional 148,000 were imported.

In existence also are numerous brick factories. In line with construction, there developed a large industry for carpentry, locksmith and similar construction work. The form of operation is generally that of the workshop: the proprietor as master and about five workers; modern tools and machines; electricity for power. The constructions are carried out by building contractors, who have a staff of special workers and also engage unskilled workers according to need. The differentiation between skilled and unskilled workers is not as yet very highly developed in Palestine, since of course the Jewish proletariat is only beginning to take form and had little technical experience until a few years ago. Even today the technical training, in line with the pressing demand for workers, is still very defective and the waste in production is relatively great. Recently, however, that demand has declined, and there is forming more

and more rapidly an army of unskilled workers who no longer have any prospect, within the existing property relations, of "coming up". And within this army there is also to be found a constant number of unemployed. That is to say: the different individuals get work from time to time, and the duration of the unemployment per man is still slight, but the absolute number remains constant. The panic arising from the Italo-Abyssinian conflict has had its effect also in this particular, increasing the unemployment. Figures, however, cannot be given since the trade union, which alone would be in a position to represent the unemployment statistically, (obviously for nationalistic reasons) attaches no value to the matter.

An important role in the construction industry is played also by the workers' cooperatives which appear as enterprisers. They take contracts, carry out the construction works and also engage unskilled workers. All receive the same wage, and the earnings are divided among the members of the cooperative (called kwuza), with the exclusion of the wage workers not belonging to the kwuza. A wage worker can work in the kwuza for only a maximum of three months, after which he must either become a member and pay a contribution, or, since the contribution is usually very high, he is obliged to leave the job. Thus this rule of the trade union has an effect the opposite of that professed: instead of liberating the workers within capitalism from wage labor, it throws them back every three months onto the market. The entire Jewish bus transport industry likewise is in the hands of such cooperatives; and owing to the small railway network, the bus lines are highly radiated. With the development of traffic there arose also motor-car works, though the engines are still imported. Road construction also is carried out on a large scale, mainly by the government, in part also by the communes.

A water main also is under construction from Ras el 'Ain (Jaffa) to Jerusalem. Its length is about 65 kilometers, and it rises from sea level to a height of 800 meters. This work is being carried out for the government by the federation as enterpriser. The Palestine Railways maintain very large repair shops in Haifa. The Palestine Potash Company, an English-Jewish concern, has the concession for exploiting the mineral wealth of the Dead Sea, and is a modern large-scale chemical enterprise. Entering upon the premises of the company is, however, strictly forbidden (it is said to be engaged in the manufacture of war toxics). Factories for the production of artificial silk have closed down recently, because it was not possible to

lower the wages of the workers sufficiently and because the working methods could not be further intensified to withstand the Japanese competition.

This entire industry is in general powered with electricity except for the rural water pumps, which in part are driven by Diesel engines. All the electric current for Palestine (apart from Jerusalem) is produced by the Palestine Electric Corporation, whose president is the former left social-revolutionary engineer Rutenberg, known for his participation in the execution of the priest Gapon. The company operates the power works with water power and Diesel engines. There is a factory and several smaller workshops for machine construction, and an iron foundry.

Joined onto agriculture is a food industry which makes fruit juices and fruit and vegetable preserves. The fruit juices are especially an important product for the Near East, since Islam forbids the use of alcohol and, owing to the climate, a great demand exists for refreshing drinks. Hence this industry exports its products also into the entire Near East. A special industry is based on olives, mainly of Syrian origin; it produces technical oils and fats, salad oils and soap.

The financing is carried out, on the one hand, thru the National Fund (purchase of ground and industrialization of agriculture) and, on the other, thru Barclay's Bank and the Anglo-Palestine Bank and its daughter enterprise, the General Mortgage Bank of Palestine. There is also a large number of credit cooperatives (agricultural and industrial) as well as speculative banks. The government bank is Barclay's.

The total value of industrial production in 1933 was 5,400,000 pounds sterling; in 1934 - 6,500,000.

Number of industrial workers: end of 1932 - 9,500; end of 1933 - 14,000; beginning of 1935 - 18,000. The total number of workers, employees, foremen, etc. engaged in the industries at the beginning of 1935 was 25,000. The total number of all Jewish workers in the country may have amounted around this time to between 70,000 and 80,000. The wages could not yet be determined; one may assume, however, an average wage of 200 mils or, roughly, \$1.00.

The party of the "Revisionists", the fascist party of the Jews, aims to establish the Jewish state on both sides of the Jordan (hence also Transjordan.) Its program resembles that of the Italian fascists. It advocates class collaboration on the basis of the

Jewish tradition. In this they have points of contact with the Misrachi, the Jewish clerical party, which watches over the Sabbath rest and over religious cooking and education, and which in these respects received at the latest Zionist congress far-going concessions from the labor party, which had almost 50% of all the representation, and from the liberal parties. The Revisionists wish to solve the question of the relations of Jews to Arabs in the sense that the Arabs in Palestine shall form a national minority with certain rights of cultural and religious autonomy under control of the Jewish state. The Revisionists have withdrawn from the general organization of the Zionists and no longer take part in the congress, but hold a congress of their own. A fraction of them, however, the Jewish State Party, has remained in the general Zionist world congress, where it forms the extreme right wing.

Every Jew in Palestine is automatically a member of the Knesset-Jisrael, an organization to which are subordinate the entire Jewish educational activity, the Jewish church, relief work, etc., and whose executive committee or national council represents the Jewish public in dealing with the government.

The Arabs are represented before the government mainly by the Moslem Supreme Council, headed by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. There are, however, also Arab parties which had their origin in the great Arab liberation movement and in the Arab uprising which in 1917-18, with the support of the English, freed the Arab countries from the age-long Turkish oppression. But the Arab Bedouins and urbanites did not yet have the strength to resist the power of English and French imperialism; and these latter are much more clever than the Turks in the matter of ranging the Arab countries into their world empires.

The Arab parties are not as yet so much distinguished by their programs as by the families at their head. The party of the Mufti and his family, the "Party of the Palestinian People", which receives a bounty of 70,000 pounds from the Moslem Council and owns two daily papers (Al Jamea - Al Shabab), aims at the independence of Palestine and the liquidation of the League-of-Nations mandate: "Palestine to the Arabs", entry of Palestine into the union of the Arab peoples. It maintains relations with Ibn Saud, the ruler of Hejaz. The party of the Nashashibi family, the "Party of National Defense", a sort of fascist organization which maintains relations with the king of Iraq and the Emir of Transjordan, demands the independence of Palestine, a purely Arab national government, and

wants to promote the development of agriculture. It has three daily newspapers (Falastin, Al Aslamiah, Adifa). A "reform party" under the leadership of Dr. Khaldis, the mayor of Jerusalem, unites the mayors and village directors of many arab communities. This organization seems to be the most modern of the arab parties and has more similarity with the party forms known from Europe. It demands the independence of Palestine in the pan-arab league of states and an alliance agreement with the English, similar to the anglo-iraq league. It rejects religious separatism between islamic and christian Arabs and combats Zionism. The arab youth organization, led by Jacob Bey Dissin, sets border guards against the illegal jewish immigration, combats in the villages the sale of land to Jews and has connections with the egyptian national circles. It was also connected with Chilmi Pasha, who founded a private bank called the "Bank of the Arab People", in order to finance purely arab land transactions. The Bank of the Arab People could not, however, overcome the distrust of the arab people and went bankrupt.

There are two arab trade-union organizations, concerning which, however, little is to be learned. They are said to be conducted, on the one hand, by Jacob Bey Dissin, and on the other by Chilmi or Nashashibi, to be in vigorous competition among each other and to be a collecting center for the political parties in question. At any rate, they appear to be completely under the influence of the arab bourgeoisie.

The General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine (Histadrut), which is affiliated with the Amsterdam International, had increased its membership (Jan. 1, 1935) to 67,562 of which about 45,000 were urban workers.

The normal working day in Palestine is eight hours. The average wage in urban construction amounts to 400 mils per day (about \$2.00); in village construction, less. The building trades pay the highest wages.

The Histadrut publishes a daily newspaper, the "Davar" which also includes an evening edition and, every two weeks, a children's paper. All these publications appear exclusively in the hebrew language (and script). Thus it comes about that to a large part of the workers, who speak nothing but Yiddish, the publications of their organization are almost or quite unintelligible. And so the workers are compelled to sit once more at the school bench in order to learn the difficult language and the almost undecipherable script. (While in countries where the latin alphabet is em-

ployed, the children learn to read and write in one year, here the process extends over about four years.)

In the year 1934 the Histadrut conducted a total of 68 strikes (in Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa and the agricultural colonies), involving 1104 workers and the loss of 11,403 working days, and 51 of which were won. In 34 cases the Revisionists attempted to break the strike, and in six cases were successful. The strikes led to five prosecutions in which 34 workers were sentenced to a total of 33 months imprisonment and forced labor, and to fines of 220 pounds. The Histadrut also supported eight arab strikes in which 785 workers walked out for a total of 4145 days. Two of these strikes were won.

The Histadrut controls the entire jewish labor market. There are neither state nor city employment bureaus, nor is there any unemployment relief. The Histadrut supplies the workers to the employers who thereby recognize the rates of pay. The employers are furthermore combined in their own unions which, however, do not as yet possess any general organization. On the other hand, the Histadrut is generally in a position to force acceptance of the wage rate, in which connection the relatively slight unemployment, the still prevailing lack of specialized workers and the relatively low wages exert a favorable effect. Nor is the jewish bourgeoisie in a position simply to exploit the cheaper arab labor power, because there is not so much skilled arab labor on hand and the jewish working class is said to offer a certain political protection with respect to the Arabs. In the rural districts, on the plantations, the matter is different. Here the exploited labor force is made up in large part of arab workers, who are experienced and cheap, though their wages also have gone up considerably. In spite of the fact that the Histadrut is fighting very vigorously, by way of picketing, against the influx of arab workers onto the plantations, it cannot prevent the planters from continuing to employ such workers (mostly former fellahs) nor prevent these arab workers from becoming familiar with the forms of trade-union struggle, which they now and then put to good use. The Histadrut has even gone so far as to combat an enterprise in Tel-Aviv where a revolutionary arab worker was employed. When the workers of this enterprise declared their sympathy with the arab comrade, a brawl arose between these workers and the trade-union functionaries, and a process was instituted with a view to debarring the workers from the Histadrut. Exclusion from the Histadrut is equivalent to losing the possibility of working; for while officially the Histadrut obtains work for all workers,

still the protectionism in vogue is such that oppositional or excluded workers get none. In this respect, the Histadrut may be regarded as a state organization. In most cases it can see that workers who are not in its organization are no longer employed by any enterprise .

To the Histadrut is attached a general sick benefit fund which has the disposal over hospitals, recreation homes and good physicians. The Histadrut builds workers' settlements and blocks of dwellings in which workers' families acquire homes which, thru installment payments, become their private property.

The predominant faction in the Histadrut is the Labor Party (MAPAI). It has about 6000 members and is loosely attached to the Second International. It has, besides, in the various countries where Jews reside, affiliated groups (Palestine League for Labor.) It is still more nationalistic than the other parties adhering to this International. It fills all offices in the Histadrut where it reigns in absolute fashion; the more so as the functionaries are appointed by the governing board.

The "Hashomer Hazair", originally a jewish youth organization widely disseminated in Eastern Europe, is increasingly acquiring in Palestine the features of a party. Hitherto, however, it has embraced only such working men and women as live in the country on labor communes (so-called Kwuzots). The kwuzots want to actualize socialist life in this way: that first with the aid of loans from the KKL and KH and on the basis of common purchase and sale, common cooking and common education of the children, they till their own soil and engage no wage workers.

The party which goes by the name of the "Left Poale Zion", with about 250 members in Palestine and various groups in other countries, especially in the U.S.A. and Poland, forms the opposition within the Histadruth, demanding democratization of the apparatus and equal right of the arab workers to organize. Its final goal is a soviet Palestine. It is nationalistic insofar as it demands the formation of a jewish labor center in Palestine. The LPZ is at one with the other zionist parties on the point that an assimilation of the jewish middle strata and proletarians in the countries of the Diaspora--even in the Soviet Union which is regarded as the first stage of communism--is impossible. They insist that after the abolition of private property and of the State a stage must be passed thru in which there is given to the nations on their own territories the possibility

of their cultural development. It does not take part, however, in the zionist congress. Its general standpoint is that of the Comintern to which it does not adhere because of the difference on the jewish question.

The illegal communist party of Palestine (PCP) consists of about 100 jewish members who in part are disappointed former members of the Hashomer Hazair. Since it conceives its main goal to be the weakening of english imperialism, it combats the jewish immigration, by which it finds that imperialism strengthened. On the other hand, it supports every arab national movement. It esteems the pogroms of the past few years as national-revolutionary uprisings; and with respect to the italian-abyssinian conflict it advocates the People's Front of the arab people with its leaders, the effendis, and recommends the forming of arab legions to go to Abyssinia and there combat italian fascism. The PCP is taking great pains to arabize its organization. It is the only organization which has come out for the payment of unemployment relief.

The Anti-fascist Action ("Antifa"), adhering to the world committee in Paris, has about 500 members and is under the leadership of the LPZ. It is supposed to be the foundation of the united-front movement for struggle against fascism, imperialism and anti-semitism. Anyone can become a member, excepting members of the PCP; these latter being excluded because they combat jewish immigration, while the Antifa and the LPZ take the view that the creation of a jewish proletariat in Palestine will represent a force which cannot fail to operate against imperialism and that the combatting of the right of free immigration and taking root of the jewish workers in Palestine is chauvinistic. The Antifa as well as the LPZ want to combat the jewish chauvinism of the Mapai, Histadruth and Revisionists together with the arab chauvinism of the PCP. They champion freedom of the mother tongues and form circles in which Yiddish, German, etc., are spoken.

The situation in Palestine has recently changed. The "prosperity" described above has receded almost simultaneously with the outbreak of the abyssinian-italian conflict. Unemployment has grown and with it the uncertainty and the discontent within the working class. Since the PCP was the only organization to come out for the payment of unemployment relief, it succeeded in improving its standing among the unemployed. The other labor parties and the Histadruth were unable to come out for unemployment relief, mainly because they feared that the english government would in that case greatly restrict jewish immigration.

The Histadruth intensified its struggle for weeding out arab workers from jewish production; and the LPZ which for a time had sought to find a common basis with the PCP on the unemployment question, saw itself compelled, in order to reestablish its zionist renown, to conduct a sharp struggle against the PCP. The Histadruth, which hitherto had simply denied the existence of unemployment, is now trying to appease its members with so-called constructive means. That is, it calls upon the workers to pay a contribution into an unemployment fund. From this fund, money will be turned over to the cooperatives and also to private enterprisers for the purpose of "extra work-making". And from the same fund, workers who work in return for arab wages will be paid the difference between these latter and the jewish wage rate.

The sharpening of the arab-jewish relations, beginning in April 1936, which led to guerilla warfare and to an arab strike, covered over the social unrest of the working class with a lively and warlike national sentiment. On both sides the masses were organized for "self-protection and defense". This self-protection was participated in, on the jewish side, by the members of all the organizations. The various parties in their appeals laid the blame for the clashes either upon the Arabs or else on the competing parties. It is only to be observed that in this situation not a single organization sought to conduct the struggle against its own bourgeoisie.

The nationalism of the jewish workers, like that of the russian, german, french and other proletariat, is an indication of the drawing back before revolutionary, international tasks. The creation of the "jewish homeland" can only be brought about chauvinistically. The zionist solution of the jewish question can be accomplished only in combat against the Arabs. And, for that matter, the jewish fascists come out openly for this struggle, while the others accept it by keeping their mouths shut or giving utterance to hypocritical phrases. The Jews themselves cannot fulfill the zionist desires, but are compelled to become allies of english imperialism. English imperialism makes use of the arab-jewish oppositions for its own purposes. Zionism becomes an instrument of the english struggle against the strivings for national independence on the part of the Arabs. Under the conditions of Palestine, Zionism can only come forth in capitalistic garb. The Jews are obliged to be capitalistic in order to be nationalistic, and they have to be nationalistic in order to be Zionists. They are obliged to be not only capitalistic, but capitalistic in an extremely reactionary form. As a minority, they cannot be

democratic without damage to their own interests; and being land-hungry, they have to take a position against agrarian reform, binding themselves with the arab feudalists against the fellahs. They are not only reactionary themselves, but they lend force to the arab reaction. The fellahs are driven from the soil which the effendis sell to the Jews. That part of the soil remaining to the effendi is turned into plantations, the fellahs become wage laborers. The furthering of capitalism in Palestine and the sharpening of capitalist oppositions by way of Zionism are revolutionizing, but only in the same sense as the whole of capitalism is revolutionizing; it is no concern of the working population. The working class can only take note of the matter and thru its own intrusions into the process, thru the representation of its direct economic interests as wage workers, help to drive it forward. The sharpening of capitalist oppositions lies in the interest of the proletariat, but it cannot side either with the Arabs or with the Jews; it can take up neither for the division of the soil nor for its control thru the feudal masters or jewish societies. It can only be completely internationalistic and thus completely immune to all palestinian conflicts. It has to attack the most immediate direct exploiter without regard for the consequences on the national plane. As soon as it does more than that, it represents these or those capitalist interests. Anyone who is a Zionist must, especially now with the setting in of the crisis and with the growth of unemployment in Palestine, go along the whole way to Fascism. On the basis of Zionism, the increasingly impoverished "poor whites" become more and more race-conscious, and copy against the Arabs what Hitler has undertaken against the Jews in Germany. The Arabs can answer only in the same fashion. Any other kind of Zionism than this fascist one cannot exist. From the conditions in Palestine today the Jews must learn to comprehend that they are yielding to illusions when they think to be able in Palestine to evade the class struggles of capitalism. They must learn to comprehend that it is very much a matter of indifference where they put up, that everywhere, and inclusive of Palestine, they have only one task: that of setting aside the capitalist relations. All other problems are imaginary ones; they are of no concern to the working class.

TEL - AVIV

-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-

-O-O-O-

-O-

- 1 5 -

THE MASTERS OF TOMORROW (#)

I

Sometimes a single gesture may unwittingly give away the whole show. In his eagerness to heap as many arguments as possible against "the reflections of Max Nomad", P.M. borrows from a source from which ordinary prudence should have told him to keep away. But he throws all caution to the winds and quotes approvingly a "jocular" remark made by a certain Jerome who, in the theoretical organ of the American Communist Party, has boldly stated that "the dictatorship of the intellectuals is as unthinkable as the dictatorship of traveling salesmen". It did not occur to P.M. that he was identifying himself with the special pleading of a hired lickspittle of the new Russian nobility whose rule is nothing but the dictatorship of the office-holding, administrative and technical intelligentsia; and that his fellow-champion of Marxist orthodoxy who called me "a pen-mercenary of fascism" - if offered a higher price by Hearst - would

(#) It was impossible for the present writer to discuss all the topics touched upon by the author of Dictatorship of the Intellectuals. It would have taken a full sized volume to refute all his assertions with which I disagree. I, therefore, chose only those points which I considered as the most essential. I disregarded the amenities of his personal tone with their "subtle" abuse and amusing air of omniscient superiority. I wish, however, to protest specifically against one particular instance of his polemic methods dealing not with matters of opinion or interpretation but with actual facts. P.M. 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 Wahlbündnis (p.8) which, in condensed form, I had presented in my Marx biography published in Scribner's, March, 1933, page 190.

just as brilliantly prove that "a dictatorship of capitalists is just as unthinkable as the dictatorship of pants-pressers".

P.M. betrays the weakness of his position in many other ways. He claims that I do not "clearly delimit" my "concept of the intellectuals". And it is on the strength of this accusation that he flings at me that joke about the "traveling salesmen". As a matter of dry fact, I did "clearly delimit" my concept of the intellectuals on the very first page of my "Rebels and Renegades." There I wrote that the term 'intellectual' was used by me "in the specifically economic sense of a stratum deriving its livelihood from mental occupations." Which certainly includes a great variety of people, such as office-holders, teachers, professional men, technicians, clergymen, commercial and financial experts, journalists, writers, artists, politicians, professional revolutionists and agitators, trade union organizers and so on; all this 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.

I repeated that very same concept over and over again when speaking of "office-holders, managers and engineers"; of "the owners of education, the lords of the swivel chair and the desk"; of the "privileged employees of the capitalists and the bourgeois state"; only occasionally, to avoid repetition, I used somewhat less precise expressions, such as the "new middle class" and the "educated lower middle classes". It is not my fault if P.M. could not find out (couldn't he really?) what I actually meant. Even ordinary bourgeois reviewers understood perfectly well to whom I was referring. I certainly did not mean the "middle class in general", and if I used the expression "middle class" then I did so in the usual connotation, and not in that of "the new middle class" which largely coincides with the conception of the "privileged employees", and not with the small property-holders.

Sometimes scions of the prosperous capitalists, of the "privileged employees" or of the lower middle classes (in Marxian language called "petty bourgeoisie"), and sometimes self-educated upstart workers, the intellectuals are divided into various income groups, just as the property holders are. Some of them, the "ins", are satisfied with the existing system; others, the "outs", the underpaid or unemployed, are just as strenuously opposed to it. The "ins" devour an enormous part of the national wealth; they enjoy a bourgeois standard

of living, and in their large mass are always ready to side with the existing system against the manual workers.

In short, formally "employees", the "ins" are in fact, due to their higher educational qualifications, minor partners of the capitalists as a whole; the lesser nobility, as it were, within the great bourgeois aristocracy of the modern age. And in proportion as the major partner, the capitalist, becomes a mere consuming parasite, leaving most of the functions of technical and commercial management to his "paid employees" - in the same proportion these "employees" become the potential successors of their employers. But, being satisfied with their social position, they are naturally a conservative element; they are not in a hurry to dispossess their masters (or major partners); for any serious interference with the property relations may disturb the social peace and endanger their own privileged incomes.

In writing about the various mass movements, I was of course dealing chiefly with the "outs", the unemployed or underpaid journalists, lecturers, college graduates and undergraduates, "lawyers without clients and doctors without patients" (Marx), educated ex-workers in search of a white-collar position - in short, all that motley army of impecunious or starving intellectuals, near-intellectuals and would-be-intellectuals, that is dissatisfied with the existing system and is very often militantly active in the various radical or fascist movements. It is this group which, in my opinion, has the ambition of eliminating the capitalist class of parasitic consumers, and of establishing its own rule in a system based on government ownership and an unequal distribution of incomes.

I admit that, to support my thesis, I have largely resorted to adducing the Russian example. For that system has evolved an enormous hierarchy of intellectuals who are bureaucrats at the same time: administrative office-holders, technical managers and engineers, savants, journalists, professors, writers, Marx-theologians, army officers, scientific spies, trade-union and sports organizers - who owe their bourgeois comfort to the labor of the uneducated workers and peasants.

Faced by this crushing example, P.M. has resorted to a very ingenuous argument. Russia, he says, is just a capitalist state in which the bureaucrats are the capitalists. The rest of the population, intellectuals, workers, peasants, are subject to that new capitalist class, just as they are subject to the capital-

ists in any other country. Thus, there is a capitalist dictatorship in Russia, and therefore it is preposterous to talk of a domination by intellectuals.

You don't believe it? Here it is in his own words: "the group of people who has the sole right of disposal over production" are "not the intellectuals but the State bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals", "the Russian intellectuals are dominated by the Russian bureaucracy, just as in other countries they are dominated by capital" (page 25); "no trace of a rule by intellectuals is discoverable under either system. The intellectuals are nowhere identical with the State" (page 26); "the Russian bureaucracy is at the same time the Russian capitalist class, since it fulfills the capitalist functions" (page 27).

Yet only a few pages earlier (page 17) when speaking of the antagonism between workers and intellectuals which he had to admit, he had said: "The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals (in the capitalist countries-M.N.) could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy; or, as today in Russia, a struggle against the State bureaucracy"; and further, on the same page: "It is not until and unless a state capitalist revolution has been successful, (which apparently means only Russia-M.N.) it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals (my emphasis-M.N.) is taken up again with redoubled fierceness". So there is "no trace of a domination by intellectuals" who are "dominated by the Russian bureaucracy", and yet the workers will have to take up "the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals". On page 27 the bureaucrats are the "capitalists", and on page 17 they are the "intellectuals".

Now, what is the meaning of "bureaucracy"? Any dictionary will supply the information that it means "Government officials collectively". 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 a manual worker, is a government office-holder, a member of the bureaucracy, no matter whether he is a judge, a political administrator, a factory manager, an engineer or a chemist, a higher transport or postal employee, a journalist, an actor, a singer, professor, trade union organizer, army officer or bank accountant; a certain amount of education or training exceeding the average educational level of the manual worker guarantees him a soft job and a salary which is above the average wage of a manual worker. (One may disregard here the "border

cases", such as the lower grades of the office-workers, typists, filing clerks, etc., who generally are closer to the workers both by their educational level and by their income. There are similar "border cases" between small capitalist employers and workers as well). All of these groups are at the same time bureaucrats and intellectuals - the intellectuals, as a social group, simply becoming the bureaucrats of a system with a government-owned economy.

Once this is the case, it is rather comical to say that in Russia the intellectuals are ruled by the bureaucrats; one might just as well say that in the United States the property-owners are ruled by the capitalists, or that under the feudal system the nobility was ruled by the aristocracy. One may, of course, say quite correctly that in Russia the means of production are owned by the bureaucrats as a whole, who benefit by them at the expense of the rest of the population. But this would be exactly the confirmation of my thesis: that under a system of government-ownership the intellectuals as a whole, forming the state bureaucracy, are the masters of the country.

Now, to suit his argument, P.M. simply draws a dividing class line between the upper and the lower levels within the same class. To him the bureaucrats are only the super-commissars and trust managers who give orders and are rewarded with Rolls Royces and villas in the Caucasus or in the Crimea. The middle and lower grades of the political, technical and cultural state apparatus, the plain intellectuals with only a Buick or Chevrolet to their soul, with a modest country house for the summer, and only one servant - these unfortunates, who can give orders to the workers only and must carry out the instructions of the higher-ups, are of an altogether different class substance: they are the oppressed and exploited "employees", "intellectuals" - maybe even "proletarians" ? - suffering under the yoke of a small number of bureaucratic-capitalist leviathans.

Those to whom such pleading sounds convincing should be reminded that the same methods could be applied to the capitalists as well. In America it is only the managing boards of a few hundred concerns - and that number could be even still more reduced - which actually direct the destinies of the country; the average or small manufacturer or business man is at the mercy of the Rockefellers, the Morgans or the Du Ponts; as a result, he usually hates those capitalist demi-gods just as much as the average Russian intellectual-bureaucrat detests his superior - whose place he would like to take. Yet there is in both cases a common bond

of interest between the top and the middle - as against the mass of workers and peasants.

P.M. tries to prove his thesis that a "dictatorship of the intellectuals" is impossible by the assertion that "the majority of the intellectuals has always gone along with capital and still today goes with the ruling class". The fact is that the majority of every oppressed or "under-privileged" class under "normal" conditions is always under the sway of the ideology of the masters; it is only under exceptional, revolutionary circumstances that it joins the determined rebellious minority. 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; they 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 the country themselves. They are the pioneers of their class. Even among the fascist intellectuals - as will be shown later - there is a tendency towards a sort of super-totalitarianism under which the state, that is the bureaucracy, would altogether do away with the private capitalists.

Of course large groups of well-paid "ins" among the intellectuals will to the very last remain faithful to the private capitalist system; but so will likewise certain "proletarian" elements, such as policemen, body-guards, flunkies, foremen, highly skilled workers, municipal laborers and other "civil servants" with steady jobs who are satisfied with the existing system.

In Russia the "specialists" remained enemies of the Bolshevik regime until they lost all hope that the private capitalist system would ever come back. Under the old system they were so well paid that they preferred to be "privileged employees" rather than equal or minor partners of a new political bureaucracy which was forced to clip their salaries. In a similar way part of the capitalist class, especially high finance, under certain conditions, prefers the feudal or semi-feudal system to bourgeois democracy, if the former gives their special group the opportunity of enriching itself at the expense of the other capitalists. The old Russian bureaucratic intelligentsia was naturally counter-revolutionary, for it felt that the Bolsheviks would take away their soft jobs and rele-

(#) It is not correct that the Communist Parties are on the wane; their influence is now growing in France, Belgium, Spain, U.S.A., etc.

gate them to minor posts. The Bolshevik revolution began with a dictatorship of a specific group of intellectuals - the most active militants of the revolutionary upheaval - which exercised its dictatorship even over the other groups of intellectuals; and as long as there was not enough to satisfy everybody, they were getting all the good things exclusively for themselves. But gradually, with the development of the country's industries, they were able to improve the position of the other sections of the intelligentsia as well, thus eventually weaning them away from their traditional subservience to the old private capitalist ideology.

In denying that the intellectuals are capable of engaging in any policy corresponding to their own class interests, P.M. falls back upon the old theory that consciousness is determined by our surroundings, that we are all blind manikins in the hands of inexorable economic forces, and so forth. We have heard these things before. Nobody denies that consciousness does not work in a vacuum and that more often than not we are pushed where we think we are pushing. But there is such a thing as going a little bit too far in the denial of the role of consciousness. During the War, the bourgeoisie the world over, to avoid utter defeat, did introduce the element of conscious planning into the economic life of their respective countries; the forcible collectivization of Russian farming was a conscious act of a bureaucracy bent upon fortifying its position. In both cases the economic interest 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.

It is this economic interest which early in the nineteenth century induced an energetic minority among the intellectuals and self-taught workers to join various radical democratic and revolutionary movements; and it is the same economic interest which in the present hopeless economic situation has made them consciously turn towards Socialism-Communism or towards Fascism, as a short cut to power.

P.M. makes a very sweeping statement (p.23) to the effect that "apart from the Russian example, there is as yet no case and no country in which a political bureaucracy, with the conquest of political power, ruled society also economically." Well, that "apart of the Russian example" is amusing enough, for that example alone proves that it can be done. But there are also other historical examples. K.A. Wittfogel in his "Das Erwachende China" (p.16) shows how in old

agricultural China the necessity of regulating the flow of the big rivers has created "a powerful water distributing (literally "Wasserbau") bureaucracy" which was the Chinese "master class". And on pp.24-26 he shows how after the abolition of feudalism the "administrative bureaucracy" became not only the "ruling class", but in fact, though not formally, the collective owner of the entire land, the taxes which they squeezed out of the peasants being "in this case identical with ground rent." After that it is only as the merest curious detail that I may mention the famous "communism" of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the eighteenth century, where the monks - a sort of clerico-fascist intellectuals of 200 years ago - owned and ruled economically and politically the whole country, the Indian natives slaving for them "communistic-ally."

With an attempt at sarcasm P.M. writes that the intellectuals as a social group "cannot proceed independently - it cannot do Nomad the pleasure of finding his predictions confirmed" (p.23). And he points to the fact that there is no solidarity among them, while the workers are forced to practice solidarity; that the intellectuals are ready to flirt either with Stalin or with Mussolini and to turn for support today to the working class and tomorrow to the capitalists. Here again his argumentation does not hold water. Independent action is no special characteristic of a class and no special requirement for being victorious. The bourgeoisie in its struggle against the feudals, leaned upon the workers and the peasants; it is just as ready now, when threatened by the workers, to unite with the feudals, or with the clergy, the intellectuals of the feudal age, so to speak. Similarly, the intellectuals, to get power or political influence, are ready to take their allies wherever they can find them, prepared to betray any of them if by so doing they can consolidate their power.

Nor is solidarity a specific characteristic of a class. No class ever practices solidarity within its ranks, except under very pressing and extraordinary circumstances. Normally one-half of the working class is ready to scab on the other half; before and during the War the A.F.L. workers made it their business to scab on striking I.W.W. workers; and the I.W.W., in comprehensible resentment, occasionally retaliated. In Europe socialist workers would often act in a similar way against their more radical dissenters. One group of capitalists is always engaged in cutting the throats of another group, and various groups of capitalists are interested in various forms of government. No wonder then that one group of intellectuals--

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 poorest 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 Paretism of the Italian Fascists, or in the race gospel of the Nazis. Just as the capitalist bourgeoisie under different circumstances can embrace the Voltairian 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 flunkys of the capitalists, as P.M. seems 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 parasite 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 officers' caste, now in possession of Manchuria, 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 flunkys of the Chinese-Manchu capitalists, nor of the Japanese multimillionaires 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 feudals 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 ruling class always 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, Condottieri, 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 Treasury for 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 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, 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 two 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 cowing 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 circum-

(#) There is no longer any secret about Mussolini's original intention of becoming Italy's Lenin, and that he chose his other road to power only because the breach between him and his former comrades could no longer be bridged.

stances 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 Bruening'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 not 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 the 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 innocents believe that the Socialists are "social-fascists", or, as Stalin put it "twin-brothers of fascism." So this was just another "gag" in their inexhaustible 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 declassé intellectuals and semi-intellectuals. He was severely called down and punished by his masters in Moscow; for if the German semi-intellectual "down-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 declassé 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 socialized, or "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 capitalistic. (#)

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 Zusammenbruchs-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 Herrschaftsverhältnis" which it is difficult to translate literally - M.W.) 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.S.R., Grossmann was reluctant to dwell in greater de-

(#) The immense majority of readers still identifies the concept of socialism with the absence of exploitation - an assumption which is altogether wrong. It was precisely for the purpose of indicating the exploiting essence of Soviet Russia's economic system that in my previous writings I used the term of State Capitalism. But the term "unequalitarian socialism" would be more appropriate.

tail upon this alternative. He apparently felt that he was on dangerous ground for, as far as the present writer knows from 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 "Herrschaftsverhältnis".

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 form 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 the means of production. 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

(#) 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 his "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 no "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 Marxian 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 intellectual level 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 upstart ex-workers at the head of the trade unions, such as the Hendersons, the Jouhaux, the Wm. Greens, the Legiens or Tomskeys, all of whom in time became first 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 declassé 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, tho 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 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".

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 remnants 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 remnants 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 ardent and honest Bolshevik Soviet militants? And will the sum total of all these ardent and honest 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 phrasemongering. 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" themselves - 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. writes 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 "enterprise", it is the State, that is the 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 an 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, M.N.) 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 apparently 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

(#) 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.

disposes of this difficulty by simply declaring 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"; (#) And that "the demands placed on that element of the population performing intellectual functions are no higher than 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 allay 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 establish real equality of incomes. The "social forces of production" will work psychological miracles; the ex-workers in charge of the economic and political administration will forget their "present human egoism"; their egoism will apparently "find satisfaction in work in common" (p.32), and the bureaucratic wolf will voluntarily accept the same share of the national wealth as the proletarian sheep. We have read such stories once in the millennial visions

(#) 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 this is "skilled 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 themselves 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 bench. 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 tragical 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 declasses, 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, with the "proletarian" 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 Wacław 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 these 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 issues 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'".

(#) The words State Capitalism were used here for the reasons explained in the third footnote of Chapter II of this article.

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 millenium in which all exploitation would be eliminated once for all. Supposing that a 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 Bolsheviks, 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 rising 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 Bolsheviks, 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 Bolsheviks: 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

"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 "morale" with all sorts of philosophical justifications (rationalizations) and resorting 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 of 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 per-

petuation 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 bureaucratic 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 C O M M U N I S M 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 becoming visible. The old movement is organized in parties. 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 attacks its problems and decides its own fate. The workers 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 partly due to their traditional concepts; after viewing the class struggle as a struggle of parties, it becomes 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 nevertheless 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 according to economic interests. Class membership is determined 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 viewpoints 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.

- 43 -

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, come the differences on the question: what 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 diverse 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 only 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 af-

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 working class in its struggle for emancipation, but 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 bourgeois 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 class, as 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 vanguard, the 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 thru 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. Or, 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 new government (as in Germany in 1918) that is 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 intellectuals resources, and its economic power in factories and great enterprises. Against this the government party is too weak. Only through moderation, 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, deprived 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 then allow a new party to take power we have a bourgeois revolution - the substitution of a ruling caste by a new ruling caste. It was so in Paris in 1830 when the finance bourgeoisie supplanted the landed proprietors, in 1848 when the industrial bourgeoisie supplanted the financiers, and in 1870 the combined petty and large bourgeoisie took over the reins.

In the Russian revolution the party bureaucracy came to power as the ruling caste. But in Western Europe and America the bourgeoisie is much more powerfully entrenched in plants and banks, so that a party bureaucracy cannot push them aside. The bourgeoisie in these countries can be vanquished only by repeated and united action of the masses in which they seize the mills and factories and build up their councils.

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 its own power and the pacifying of the revolution through 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 course 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.

#####