

at their head, who in 1924 was one of those who subscribed to the Dawes Tribute Plan, have hitherto maintained their privileges without scruple.

"The 3000 millionaires have once already driven Germany into defeat.

"The 3000 millionaires are further interested in a new war because they make billions in armaments.

"The 3000 millionaires want to keep wages down, for the higher then is their profit.

"The 3000 millionaires play one section of the people off against the other, for the better then can they remain on top and make their profits.

"Must all that remain as it is, German people? We are able to change it, all of us together. What a great power is represented by the millions of the people against the thin stratum of the 3000 millionaires, if we all desire to be reconciled to each other again, so that the people's will becomes the highest law, and not the egoism of the 3000 millionaires.

"You, National Socialist - you, Social Democrat - you, Catholic - you, Communist - you, worker - you, peasant you, artisan - you, technician: do we not all, sons of the German people, have the same longing for a life in peace, joy and well-being? Do we not all today have the same distresses?

"Let us pledge true comradeship for the defense of our vital interests and of peace, for the defense of Germany against the grasping upper crust of 3000 millionaires!"

Any worker who has retained some measure of political sanity will now be able to understand what Stalin meant when he told Roy Howard that the idea that the Soviet Union had any "plans or intentions of bringing about world revolution" was tragi-comic misunderstanding.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

"SOVIET" - - - Russia To-day
• *The Latest Russian Executions - WHY?*

Fascist Corporatism - By Danie Guerin

New Strikes - New Methods

The New Marxian Quarterlies

NEW BOOKS

Vol. III

No. 2

FEBRUARY 1937

\$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' council! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

"SOVIET" - RUSSIA TODAY.

The sixteen shots which killed the old bolsheviks in Moscow found their echo in the world. Attempts were made to solve the "puzzle" as to the reasons of this slaughter. Outside of the Moscow "communists", the opinion prevails that the Moscow Trial was a grandiose frame-up similar to that of the Reichstag fire trial. All kinds of ideas are presented in this respect, but no real analysis is given of the reasons for these murders. The question "guilty or not guilty" raised in the labor movement will find no answer. The question is stated wrong; it does not touch upon the essentials of the case. For the present official labor movement, it is simply impossible to deal with the situation in Russia objectively because all real criticism on Russia is also a criticism on the old labor movement generally. Those socialists and communists who find their ideals fully or partly realized in Russia are incapable of grasping the naked social brutality of the Russian conditions without also recognizing the shabbiness of their own ideals. To understand the Russian development from October to the day of the killings of the October heroes presupposes a realistic understanding of the structure of the country. Neither Otto Bauer nor Trotzky, whose utterings of indignation today fill the press of the neo-Moscow labor organizations, possess such an understanding.

The Bauer's and Adler's, for whom Russia is the country of growing socialism, speak with surprise of a backslide into barbaric conditions. To them the killings are a "misfortune" for socialism in general. No one can expect those people to recognize that it is precisely their own "ideal" which turned once again and openly into "barbarism". And Trotzky, against whom all the filth of the paid and unpaid Russophiles is thrown today, - what can he possibly answer. Will he prove to us that throwing dirt was also a specialty during the times of his own ruling, and that long before Stalinism, it was customary to kill communists and workers; that such actions belong to the necessities of the Russian system? No, Trotzky does exactly the reverse, and nothing else can be expected from him. The workers of Kronstadt were killed by order of Lenin and Trotzky because their aims were in opposition to the bolshevik state of 1920. In our opinion it doesn't matter whether Stalin or Trotzky issue orders to kill or deport opponents. What interests us are the reasons for these drastic acts.

Why were the insurgents of Kronstadt and the sixteen old Bolsheviks, both of which were communist groups within the Russian understanding of Communism, outlawed and killed? Because they differed with the rulers in the Kremlin. When a state, supposed to be communistic, kills and deports communists, the question comes to the fore: which one is here communistic, the state or the communists? The answer to this question is the starting point towards a clearer understanding of what is going on in Russia.

Essential Moments in the Development of Russia During the Last Years.

Lately, a series of extremely reactionary laws have been passed in Russia. For instance, the prohibition of abortions, the creation of new ranks in the army, new authoritative school regulations, etc. Most of these laws have cultural-sociological purposes and are only comprehensible if related to the underlying economic reasons. And here it is only necessary to remember Stalin's speech of June 1931 at a meeting of leading Russian economists. The press of the Communist International regarded this speech of "historic importance"; which it undoubtedly was. Stalin demanded the total abolition of the, until then, relative equality of workers' wages and favoring instead wide-spread wage differentiations. He further demanded the complete abolition of the relative collective leadership in the factories and its replacement by the personal initiative of the director who is responsible only to the state. The most important point in Stalin's speech was

the demand for the establishment of the principle of profitability in all enterprises. His speech was followed up by a series of corresponding laws. More than thirty wage-graduations, the differences ranging here from 100 to 1000 rubles per month, were put into effect. The voice of the workers in the factories was absolutely quieted. The red directors became the autocrats of the enterprises; the profitability of the factory became the most important factor; the rationalization of the labor process was illustrated by the further extension of the piece-rate system. Exploitation was increased in all possible ways.

Soon thereafter the trade unions were subordinated to the labor commissariat and ceased to function as instruments for the betterment of working conditions. The unions were reduced to organizations for social insurance and became propaganda instruments of the state in its endeavor to develop the productivity of labor. The consumers-cooperatives were "reorganized"; the directors of the productive enterprises could use them now "to give the better workers better means of consumption". Until then there existed among the working class, as already stated, a relative equality in the living conditions even though this was rather an equality of misery. Now, with the differentiations in the living conditions, there also arise differences in interests and with it, differences in the position of the workers towards the state and its social arrangements. A period which had been favorable for the creation of a rather unified social ideology had found its end. Stalin said in his speech: "To restrict ourselves to the old sources of accumulation is impossible. The further development of industry and agriculture necessitates the adaptation of the principle of profitability and accelerated accumulation". In capitalist countries when, due to the scarcity of profits, accumulation is slowed down, the capitalists increase the exploitation of the workers to overcome this situation. The "first and only workers state" has no other methods. The all powerful state in place of the former capitalists continues the capitalistic method to secure profitability by increasing exploitation. As production itself, so also the accumulation of capital, shows that there is no difference in the relation between workers and capitalists in general and those of the Russian workers towards the state especially.

Those people who believe in the socialistic character of the Russian Society must ask themselves the question: why is it that the workers, the "collective owners" of the means of production, show so little interest in increasing their "social property" that Stalin has to use the whip to remind them of their duties?

Yes, the state had to make laws "for the protection of the social property" because it was afraid the workers would take their property home with them. Are the Russian workers really so stupid and short-sighted not to realize their real interests?

The Russian worker cannot fail to recognize that he stands in no direct relation to the means of production or to the products of his labor. He cannot develop a direct interest towards social problems within the Russian state of affairs, for he is a wage slave just as his brothers outside the borders of the USSR. It is not even important whether the Russian workers clearly realize their position in society, or if illusions still becloud it. The fact is that the workers act in the only way an exploited class can act. And, correspondingly, irregardless of whether Stalin is fully conscious or not of his position as the central pivot of an exploiting society, what he has done and what he can do express the necessities of such a society.

Russia is not capitalistic since yesterday; it became capitalistic with the abolition of the last free-elected workers' councils. By 1931 the Russian economy had removed all elements foreign to its capitalistic structure. Those old Bolsheviks who were not able to help Stalin's course to success became bitter opponents to his regime and had to be eliminated. The dissolution of the Organization of the Old Bolsheviks in 1935, the deportation of many of the members, clearly shows that the present regime will, and has to, eliminate those out-dated traditions which are personified in the Old Bolsheviks. The latter, and also the class conscious workers, the communists, become more and more incapable to defend and support the policies of the government. They become valueless for the state machinery and this the more so as they recognize ever clearer their functions as slave drivers of the exploiting hierarchy. Others with less scruples aim to get their positions and push them aside. Their competitive power is based upon the fact that they are unhampered by traditions and also in their lack of sympathy with the working class.

An increase of exploitation presupposes the enlargement of the exploiting apparatus. The working class cannot exploit itself. An apparatus is needed whose human members do not belong to the working class. Bureaucrats, professionals, "commanders of industry", as Stalin calls them, based on a broad layer of the labor aristocracy are necessary. These bureaucrats are aiding the ruling clique, from which they receive privileges that raise them above the level of the

average worker. Despite the empty talk about the "transition into a classless society", there has developed a new ruling class in Russia. The workers sell their labor power to this new class of functionaries leaders of cooperatives and enterprises, and to the bureaucracy ruling production and distribution. This colossal apparatus is the buyer of the labor power. It rules collectively and autocratically at the same time. It does not produce value, it lives on the surplus value, on the labor of millions of wage slaves. The ideology of this privileged strata is not the workers consciousness. Interested in exploitation, this exploitation forms their ideology. In bitter enmity, the bureaucracy fights all tendencies in society turning into the direction of the abolishment of exploitation. In order to maintain its own privileges, the bureaucracy will use any and all means to destroy the forces that threaten to do away with privileges. To make itself secure, it will liquidate all the material relations brought about by the October revolution which opposes or might oppose the needs of the new exploiting class. Therefore it has to kill off the remnants of the revolution to which the old Bolsheviks belong.

In order to get the gigantic mass of surplus value for the building and transforming of the entire economic system in Russia, it was necessary to develop a vast class of slave drivers, parasites and exploiters. This new class develops in contradiction to communism. The open gap in the structure of the exploiting society, expressed in the absence of a clear recognizable exploiting class, was closed. In this must be seen the essential development in the last few years in Russia. It is today a complete capitalistic state in all its forms of life. The workers, too weak to be able to organize production in the name of the class, left the field to the party. The latter, only able to recognize partial interests, accomplished in Russia exactly what the private capitalists did in other countries. The Bolshevik Party, taking over the historic role of the bourgeoisie, became itself the bourgeoisie and developed the productive forces to the point which the bourgeoisie in other countries had reached long ago. It has already become a hindrance for the further development of the productive forces and for human progress in general just as the bourgeoisie everywhere else. There is no need for the disqualifications of persons who functioned as the rulers in this period of development in Russia. It is necessary to realize that any other person or party in place of the present would have been forced to function precisely in the same way.

Class Relations in Russia In Agriculture

The differentiations in the living conditions between the workers and the bureaucracy during the first five year plan could not be fully developed. The bureaucracy still needed the workers in order to conquer the agricultural part of the Russian economy. And - opposite - in order to consolidate its position in industry, it had to win a decisive influence over agriculture. The anarchic character in agricultural relations was dangerous to the general economic development and therefore dangerous to the ruling clique itself. The introduction of modern productive methods was a historical necessity for Russia's peasant economy. Any government would have had to contend with it. First, in order to cheapen the production costs of the wage workers; and second, to develop the home market. The bureaucracy collectivized the farms in the name of socialism; the slogan was needed in order to mobilize the workers for this policy. The opposition on the part of the peasants necessitated close cooperation between the workers and the bureaucracy. How difficult it was at first to introduce the collectivization was illustrated by the emigration of tens of thousands of peasants and the deportation of other thousands to the polar regions and Siberia. Until the success of the collectivization drive, there existed individual small farms which were in a large sense independent from industry and therefore also independent from the leaders of industry. The peasants had no needs which would force them to unite with the industries. To bring about such needs, it was necessary to do away with the isolation of the peasants.

In order to develop agricultural productivity, it was necessary to introduce the products of industry, such as tractors, combines, etc. Today 87% of the cultivated land is collectivized; 300,000 tractors are in use. The whole of agriculture is fundamentally changed and with this its relation to the other parts of Russian economy. The peasants are greatly indebted to the state; their isolation has been broken and they become more and more conscious of their dependence upon the state. They are under the influence of the governmental price policy, exploited by indirect taxation and pressed by the government credit institutions. Last year an interesting policy occurred. The state ceased to sell the large means of production to the collectives but, instead, rented them out. The state set up a few thousand motor-and-machine stations for this

purpose which increased the influence of the bureaucracy over the peasants still further.

The collectivization brought about a new form of productive method, the so-called "artel" which means a relative loose combination of owners of agricultural means of production. Machines and buildings are used collectively. The artel is a new form of property relation. It produces with necessity not only economic inequalities but also ideological differences. Furthermore, wage labor is continued in the artel. Wages are paid according to the quantity and quality of the work delivered. The artel can also employ workers who receive nothing but their wages, in which case the artel functions as the exploiter. To become a member of the artel is possible only if a peasant brings with him property sufficient to satisfy the majority of the artel members. With the use of modern machinery, and the rationalization of the labor process, the artel allows an enormous increase in production. The recognition of this fact on the part of the peasants made the artel popular and drowned out the previously existing opposition. With this, the whole of agricultural development tends towards the slow transformation of the peasants into wage slaves. As yet the peasants have not realized their possible future. They only see the surface of the new relations with its peasantness of an increased income. At present the government can, corresponding to this situation, rely more on the peasants. It can play one class against the other, and as a matter of fact, the whole policy of the bureaucracy since the successful collectivization is a balance of power policy: the workers are played against the peasants; the peasants against the workers.

Today, with the beginning of the "classless society", we have in Russia three main classes: the workers are propertyless; the peasants, under the control of the state, own their property collectively; the bureaucracy owns and rules the industries and tries to get the whole of agriculture also under its absolute control. These class relations produce ever new differentiations in the life of the diverse classes. The poor and exploited workers have to strive towards the abolition of exploitation; the peasants demand the cheapening of industrial products which means the increase of the exploitation of the workers; the bureaucracy presses profits out of both classes.

The Situation of the Workers

With the development of the Russian capitalist economy, the commodity character of labor power becomes clearer. The tremendous wage differentiations became

extremely brutal when the differentiated buying power of the ruble disappeared. Until 1935 the subsistence minimum of the low paid workers was somehow guaranteed. Since then the money-wage became the only measurement for the individual consumption of the workers. The action of the law of supply and demand raised the prices. The bureaucracy advertised the price increase as a price reduction, and for the better paid strata and the bureaucracy which before was largely forced to buy on the "free market", it was actually a lowering of the prices, but for the workers it was a tremendous price increase which reduced their consumption to a large extent.

The total sum of all wages and salaries paid in 1936 was 63.4 billion rubles. The total number of wage-and salary employees, according to the Moscow statistical bureau, amounted to 24,100,000. This means an average income of 220 rubles per month. This is, in relation to the price level existing, a lower average wage rate than exists in any of the western European countries. Consumption goods are three to four times more expensive than in other countries. Compare for instance the price of a pair of shoes, that is 50 to 70 rubles, with those wages. The average price for black bread is 0.70 rubles per kg.; for better white bread 1.20 to 1.50 rubles. Milk per quart 1.50 rubles. Beef 9 rubles per kg. Butter according to quality 18 to 26 rubles per kg. An ordinary shirt costs about 20 rubles. The great mass of the Russian population lives today, nineteen years after the revolution, only a little better than during the times of the Czar. Consumption goods of a better quality are not, for a time to come, within the reach of the masses of the country. The statistics of the second five year plan explain this clearly. The total production of shoes will not even, in 1937, be more than 180 million pair which means that at the end of the year there will be at the disposal of each Russian, one pair of shoes. According to the plan, the total consumption of butter will, in 1937, be brought up to 180,000 tons. When we assume that one-half of the population buys butter, then only five pounds per head per year can be distributed. But so far, even this is only realized on paper. The housing problem is still worse. According to official Russian statistics, the average room allotted to one person is about three and one-half sq. ft. There is no hope that this situation will be relieved soon as the building industry constantly remains behind the increase of the urban population.

Under such conditions, it would be a mystery if the workers should not realize their position as an exploited class. Especially so in face of the fact that

the "commanders of industry", the bureaucracy in general, lives under far better conditions. Here salaries are drawn which start with 1,000 rubles per month. Once there existed a so-called party minimum which meant that party members could not draw more than 7,200 rubles per year. Today the sky is the limit.

Stakhanovism

An increase in mass consumption is absolutely necessary for Russia. The ruling class knows this, but ruling classes do not share their part with the poor. Under the Russian capitalist economic relations an increase in the living standard of the masses is only possible if capital increases relatively faster than mass consumption. Each increase of mass purchasing power means a still faster increase in the rate of exploitation. Marxism calls this process the relative pauperization of the workers. This is precisely what is taking place in Russia and which is falsely designated as Socialism. "Stakhanovism", the increase of productivity by better productive methods, is now largely adopted in Russian industry and agriculture. The wages of the Stakhanovist workers are raised by 100%, but their productivity is often raised tenfold. Whatever statistics may be considered, they all show that the wage increases are only a small fraction of the increases in productivity. The higher wages indicate an increase of exploitation. The part which goes to the workers becomes relatively smaller in proportion to the value created by the workers.

Slowly the workers realize this situation. With the decrease of the piece-work rates which follow each increase in productivity, the more class conscious workers come into opposition to Stakhanovism. Often Stakhanovists are beaten up by their colleagues. Many were killed. The attitude to the Stakhanovists taken by some of the workers is the same as towards ordinary strike breakers. But "Stakhanovism" will advance in spite of all this opposition. It allows a part of the working class the possibility to advance its standard of living. A strata of workers develops which supports wholeheartedly the bureaucracy as many better paid workers support their bourgeoisie in other capitalist countries. Thus the power of the working class is weakened. The general misery resulted in a general desire to fight against it. The chances which are now given to individuals to escape their misery will divorce those individuals from the class conscious workers.

The ideology of the Stakhanovist worker can be best described as a petty-bourgeois ideology. His home is

his world. He feels himself elevated in relation to the bulk of the workers. He talks of the non-Stakhanovists as of human beings of a low order who should be thrown out of the factories. He is conservative and sticks to the government whatever it might do. He bends before his superiors and steps on his subordinates. He has a saving account and invests money in government bonds. He is very much concerned in receiving interests, an income without working. He hates the real communists and applauds Stalins' attacks on the left oppositionists. Those people demanded the killing of those 16 old Bolsheviks. They will demand anything that their masters want them to demand.

The New Constitution.

The bureaucracy brought into power by grace of the workers needs, safeguards itself against the workers today. For this it needs allies and finds them in the peasants and the labor aristocracy. Class consciousness on the part of the workers is the greatest danger for all these privileged groups which have to destroy all beginnings of such insight. They began with the emasculation of Marxism. "Marxistically" they tried to prove the necessity and desirability of their privileges and the maintenance of the wage labor - capital relations, the party dictatorship, etc., posing all this as socialism. Every Marxist opposed to this counterfeiting became the deadly enemy of the bureaucracy. The political rights of the workers dating from the days of the revolution are radically done away with. The new Constitution of the USSR illustrates this clearly. It is designed to give a greater political weight to the non-proletarian layers of the country. A peasant vote amounted previously to one-third of a workers vote; now it has the same value. The fake democracy has to safeguard the privileges of the ruling clique. Not that Russia will copy early bourgeois democracy. On the contrary, its democracy is an instrument to safeguard the dictatorship over the workers. There is only one party; only candidates of the bureaucracy can be elected. The essence of 19 years of Bolshevism are best characterized by this new Constitution. All the real power belongs to the highest organs of the state. The "soviets" in the villages and cities have lost all independence. They can only function as organs of the state, as another police force. Every 300,000 voters will elect one representative which the party offers to the Soviet of the Union and one in the Soviet of the National Republics. The representatives of the former, together with the Soviet of the National Republics, then elect the High Soviet of the USSR. This one in turn elects a presidium in which all power is vested, including the

power to recall the High Soviet. This presidium together with the people's commissars elected by the Soviet of the Union functions as the government. The mechanics of this parliamentary system guarantee practically unlimited power to the government; then after all it is the government itself which proposes the candidates at the elections. The old dictatorship covers itself with a fake democracy. Otto Bauer of the Second International is very enthusiastic about the new Constitution, the new Democracy. He only regrets that in it his own party is still not represented. But for the workers, this fake democracy adds only insult to their exploitation.

State Capitalism and Communism

Russia must be considered as a capitalistic country and as a deadly enemy to communism. This will become clearer as time goes on. Communists will be haunted and killed in Russia as anywhere else. If some people still nourish the illusion that socialism will be "built up" in Russia sooner or later, they will find out that privileged classes never give up their privileges by their own free will. Whoever hopes that a propertied class will give up its property without a struggle nourishes a religion. Socialism cannot be "built up". It is either the direct product of the proletarian revolution or it does not exist. The revolution of 1917 remained a bourgeois revolution. Its proletarian elements were defeated. It did not do away with the basis of all rule but only removed Czarist rule. It did not do away with all property relations but only with the private capitalist property relations. Only if the workers take the power in their own hands and organize society for themselves is the basis for communism given. What exists in Russia is State capitalism. Whoever wants communism must also attack state capitalism. And in the coming revolution the Russian Workers have to overthrow this state capitalism. The Russian exploitation society, like any other exploiting society, produces daily its own grave diggers. The relative pauperization will be followed by the absolute pauperization of the workers. The day will come when in Russia once more, like in heroic October, but more powerful, the battlecry will be heard - "All Power to the Soviets".

- Raetekorrespondenz -

- - - - -

RUSSIA'S LATEST EXECUTIONS - WHY?

A year ago the newly born Stakhanovism was already in full development. It made its first appearance in a mine where it promised, thru its unbelievable records, to revolutionize the rate of extraction of coal.

Months passed. The programs of the mines, as well as the rate of cutting down the mineral were augmented. The "heroes" were decorated while a dumb hatred against them grew among the workers. Here and there accidents were noted; the recordmen, in order to gain time, did not always take the necessary precautions, and on the 23rd of September 1936 a catastrophe came to crown the decade of overproductivity and to commemorate the first anniversary of Stakhanovism. In the bottom of the Tsentralnaia pit of the Kemerovo mines (in the Kouzbas, the second important coal basin of the U.S.S.R.) ten miners were torn to pieces and fourteen others were badly wounded in a gas explosion. The bitterness of the miners must have been considerable. The hated Stakhanovism was topping poverty with death.

Moreover, in spite of an intense propaganda carried on by the party and the trade unions, the extraction of coal remained the weak point of the economy, (only 85%, as 82% of the new program was said to have been reached in October and November.) Too much was being asked from these badly nourished men, groping in the oppressive atmosphere of norms that are never attained because they are constantly increased. The "all-powerful", who never concedes any responsibility for the failure of his own policy and the catastrophes it brings, had to find a scapegoat. It was time to resuscitate the classic saboteur.

This is our explanation of the most recent shooting that has just closed the trial at Novosibirsk. The other things were mixed in merely from habit, in order to make the most of the occasion. Indeed, there is German espionage and Trotskyism in the U.S.S.R., but hardly more than elsewhere. The shrewd folk who place them in every affair really exaggerate for themselves their conception of human credulity.

After the public trial held at Novosibirsk (the administrative center of Western Siberia) the military college of the Supreme Court of the Union has just condemned to death nine persons, most of whom are technicians in the mining district of Kemerovo; eight

Russians: Noskov, Shubin, Kurov, Liashchenko, Andreiev, Kovalenko, Leonenko, Pieskhonov; and the German engineer: Stikling. For the latter, Kovalenko and Leonenko the sentence was commuted to ten years in prison; the other six were executed. They were accused of having sabotaged the extraction of coal, of provoking catastrophes in the mine and of organizing terrorist attempts against the directors of the country with the aim of decreasing the military power of the country, of overthrowing the Soviet power and restoring capitalism. Those poor provincials, living three thousand kilometres from Moscow, in the heart of Asia, were at least crazy if they nourished ambitions of such a large scale. This consideration suffices to prove how artificial is the affair.

No, there was not one defense witness -- who would dare? The facts that come closest to the case are the following: the mentioned catastrophe, the bad ventilation and lack of safety in the mine, and an unimportant automobile accident suffered by Molotov, the president of the Council of the Commissars of the People.

Once more the "saboteurs" seem to be only poor victims sacrificed in order to turn away the legitimate discontent of the workers from those who are the real guilty ones. The workers are especially miserable in a recently cleared brush as the Kouzbas.

The accused confessed to everything that was wanted. They were powerless, puny, in face of the conformism, cruelty and the power of the new social order. They would have owned up to having had relations with the devil himself, if that had been asked of them. Not so long ago, the Inquisition used to receive confessions, -- but that was another Church.

The OUTLINE STUDY COURSE IN MARXIAN ECONOMICS is offered as a help to instructors of study classes on the first volume of Marx's CAPITAL. It may also prove to be of value to students of such classes. The Outline attempts nothing more than to suggest procedure, to eliminate a certain amount of preparation and to allow for elaborations by the instructor in each session as well as in the study course as a whole. The Outline has already proved to be of some value in classes on Marx's CAPITAL arranged by the Groups of Council Communists in the United States, and it is hoped that others may also benefit from it. (Over 100 pages-50cents)

F A S C I S T C O R P O R A T I S M

Before the Seizure of Power

Fascism has put - or put back again - into the order of the day, the words: corporation, corporatism, the corporate State. Never have these words been used so much as in the last few years. But at the same time, there exists the greatest confusion as to their true significance. It is this confusion which we will try to dispel.

Corporatism is one of the baits which fascism holds out to the petty-bourgeois and to workers with the mentality of small bourgeois. First, in order to conquer them; then, once it is installed in power, to conceal from them its true face.

If one studies this a little more closely, one finds three things in the "corporative" demagogy of the fascists:

1. - The promise made to workers with petty-bourgeois mentality to "deproletarianize" them, certainly not by effacing the great difference of opinion between capital and labor, between employer and employee, but in bringing together, in reconciling those two factors of production. The promise is made to these workers that among these mixed "corporations" they will be able to live as small bourgeois; that the right to work will be guaranteed to them; that they will receive a "fair" salary; that they will be insured against their old age; and especially that their employers will treat them on an equal footing as real "collaborators" in production.

2. - The promise made to independent petty-bourgeois (artisans, small business men, etc.) who are victims of the competition between the great capitalist monopolies and on the way to becoming proletarians, is that fascism will revive for them a regime which is inspired by that of the middle ages, by the pre-capitalism era. This regime will no longer be that of competition and the most rigid laws, but a regime in which the little producers will be protected, organized, and will re-discover security and stability under the care of the autonomous "corporation".

3. - Finally, the promise is made that the political parliamentary State, parasitic and incompetent, will be replaced by a corporate State in the midst of which all producers grouped according to their trades will be entitled to vote, under whose care all interests will be conciliated and harmonized under the sign of the general interest.

This triple utopia of the small bourgeois does not properly belong to fascism. It is found thruout the entire 19th century. Nevertheless, it assumes quite different forms in the thoughts of the reactionary petty-bourgeois and in the thoughts of the reformist petty-bourgeois.

Reactionary Corporatism

At the beginning of the 19th century, there were many small bourgeois who regretted the recent abolition of corporations. Economic liberalism had thrown them defenseless into the capitalist jungle. Pitiless competition ruined them and made proletarians of them. And so they stood solidly across the path of progress and tried to stop it in its march. They wished to return to a period which ante-dated capitalism.

The reactionary parties (in France, the monarchist party) and the Church exploited these retrograde aspirations for their own ends and inscribed upon their programs the reestablishment of corporations. For the needs of the cause, the myth of medieval corporations was created, which was nothing but an enormous falsification of history. The "corporations" of the middle ages, as a matter of fact, resembled in no respects this myth which it is now maintained that they were. They existed only for a moment in the Middle Ages, and capitalism very speedily eliminated them, or entirely altered their character. They only appeared late and were only developed within a limited sphere, that of the artisan and the small business man. And even within this domain, there were free metiers. As against this, big business which was already flourishing in the middle ages, escaped the corporative regime. The bourgeois who created it were grouped in real employers' syndicates, quite different from "corporations."⁽¹⁾

In proportion to the rate with which the mode of capitalist production expanded, the corporations masked a decreasing part of the economic domain. Thus it was that in France, the royal factories, forerunners of modern industry, were created outside of the old servitude of the corporative regime. When Turgot (1776)

(1). Tardy & Bonafous: Le Corporatisme, 1935.

and then the Revolution (1791) abolished corporations in France, they were already dead of themselves. Capitalism had "broken the chains" (2) which shackled its development.

Moreover, even within the "corporation", the division of opinion between Capital and Labor, the class struggle, appeared at a very early date. The aristocracy of masters rapidly took all power unto itself and it became more and more difficult for a worker to come into possession of the rights and privileges of a free man. After the 17th century, the worker became a proletarian. The corporation was nothing more than a monopoly of caste, a "Bastille where a jealous and avaricious oligarchy was intrenched." (3)

However, in the middle of the 19th century, the reactionary parties and the Church pretended to resuscitate these medieval corporations long since surpassed in the evolution of economics. They saw a triple advantage in propagating this utopia:

1. - To draw into their ranks the retrograde small bourgeois.
2. - To turn workers away from socialism and syndicalism by offering them these "corporative" organizations as a substitute.
3. - To make a breach in universal democratic suffrage by opposing to it professional suffrage.

Thus it was that in France, since the first half of the century, a Pleiad of catholic writers (Sismondi, Buchez, Villeneuve-Bargemont, Buret, etc.,) denounced the misdeeds of competition and demanded the reestablishment of organized trades. The Count de Chambord, in his Letter on Workers, (1865) recalled that "royalty has always been the patron of the working class", and called for the "constitution of free corporations." From 1870 on, the Church officially incorporated "corporatism" in its doctrine. "The only means," declared the Catholic congress of Lille (1871) "to return to that peaceable state which society enjoyed before the Revolution is to reestablish, by catholic association, the reign of solidarity in the world of work." In 1894 Pope Leon XIII sent forth his encyclical Rerum Novarum in which, after having stated that "capitalism has divided the social body into two classes and has ex-

(2) Marx: Communist Manifesto, 1848.

(3) Martin Saint-Leon: History of the Corporations of Trades, 3rd edition, 1922.

cavated between them an immense abyss" he pretends to repair the ill by a return to the past: "For a long time our ancestors experienced the benevolent influence of corporations. And so, it is with pleasure that we see societies of this kind being formed everywhere." In his turn, La Tour du Pin, who was at one and the same time a Catholic and a monarchist, hoped that the corporation would bring together the worker and the employer, and "would replace, by a natural soldering, the artificial chains of its first hours." (4)

To these corporations, the reactionaries accorded but a consultative role. They did not intend to substitute them for the political State, but on the contrary they wanted to subordinate them closely to the State. Politics first! For the Count de Chambord corporations were to become the "bases of the electorate and of suffrage." For La Tour du Pin, they were to be the "natural and historic electoral colleges of the body politic." But aside from them, there would be either the "patron" monarchy, or the authoritative State, of which the corporations would be but the "simple collaborators in their economic functions." (5)

Reformist Corporatism

While the reactionaries wished to return to the past, other ideologists, without demanding the reestablishment of the abolished medieval corporations, dreamed of transplanting their principles into modern society; dreamed of "organizing" work. But their aspiration was still confused. Saint-Simon wanted to divide the producers into industrial corporations. (6). His disciples maintained that the "regenerator principle" of the future society was not "different from the principles which reigned during the organization of the middle ages."

"Some legislative resolutions had as their aim the establishment of order within industrial acts. There was also an institution which made a particular impression on souls in its last days, and which responded to the need for union, for association as much as the state of society then permitted it; we mean to say, corporations. Without doubt, these organizations were defective in many ways. However, a bad organization was abolished, but nothing was built in its place. Although there have been institutions called corporations whose forms have been repugnant to us, it is not necessary to conclude that industrials ought not to combine into corporations, to produce from themselves those instinc-

(4) Saint-Simon: Du Systeme Industrial, 1821
 (5) Doctrine de Saint-Simon, Expose Premiere Annee, 1829
 (6) De la Capacite Politique des Classes Ouvrieres, 1864

tive efforts whose manifest tendency is to bring order by leading towards a new organization of work." (7)

Proudhon, in his turn, wished to "construct upon new relations those natural groups of work, working-men's corporations." (8) He affirmed that "the 20th century will open an era of federations. The industries are sisters; they are the dismembered parts, the one of the other. They should therefore become federated." (9)

But the social reformers of the first half of the 19th century had not yet a clear idea of the great difference created by capitalism between Capital and Labor, between employer and employee. Or, if they were conscious of them, they dreamed of putting an end to these differences, of keeping alive or causing to be artificially reborn, the small independent producer. For the saint-simonians, the term "industrial" indistinctly signified all producers without clearly stating whether they were concerned with the producer-employer, or the producer-worker. When Proudhon speaks of corporations of working men, he means corporations not of employers and workers, or of workers alone against their employers; but of small independent producers saved by 'mutuality,' 'free credit' or some such medication. In the place of having understood or wished to admit the difference existing between Capital and Labor, the social reformers of the first half of the 19th century remained within the domain of utopia.

But they marked out a line along which some of their heirs are hardly engaged: the revolutionary syndicalists. These revolutionary syndicalists take up again the ideas of Saint-Simon and Proudhon, "the organization of work", and "federalism", and they extricate them from all idea of utopia. They reject at the same time the idea of the corporations or small independent producers, the idea of mixed corporations (employers and workers united); the first, because it would be vain to oppose capitalist evolution, to try to keep alive or to resuscitate the small independent producer; and the second, because in the capitalist regime the interest of the employers and the workers are antagonistic, and to attempt to conciliate them, to practice the "collaboration of classes" would be trickery. The corporation of the syndicalists is a corporation of class. They struggle for the installation of a corporative proletarian society, after the abolition of the wage system.

(7) Du Principe Federatif, 1863.

(8) Vers un Ordre Social ~~Gerezien~~, 1907.

(9) Rocco: "Criso Dello Stato e Sindacati" "Politico", December, 1920.

But Saint-Simon and Broudhon have two very different posterities, the one of a revolutionary spirit and the other of a small bourgeois spirit. The reformists still keep one foot in utopia. Without doubt they have renounced the idea of corporations of independent producers. They are resigned to the gulf between Capital and Labor. But they hope to narrow this gulf by corporations marked by the "collaboration of classes". They would like, by the parallel development of patronal syndicalism and workingmen's syndicalism, by the obligatory competition of professional organizations and the practice of collective bargaining, to reconcile these two "indispensable" factors of production. They flatter themselves with the idea that they could share equally with the employer the economic administration at first within each trade and then within the framework of the entire nation, by the institution of an "economic parliament."

Only lately, in his Economic Federalism, (1901), Paul Boncour made of himself the brilliant interpreter of this utopia. Immediately after the war, this utopia was turning the heads of the reformists of a great number of countries, in Germany especially, but also in Italy, France, etc. Nearly everywhere the reformists believed that the hour had come for "democratic economics", for the corporatism of the "collaboration of classes". And in spite of all the deceptions experienced, it is still upon this utopia that the international reformists are building. Thus it is that in Switzerland, the trade unions decided to accept the principle of "professional communities", uniting employer and worker. In Austria, a little before the debacle, the Wiener Arbeiter Zeitung wrote that the social-democracy "could well admit the idea of corporations". In Belgium, De Man calls for "a mixed organization of production placed under the sign of corporatism", and in the plan of the P.O.B. that mixed organization "is going from syndical recognition and the generalization of collective bargaining to the establishment of an Economic Council in place of the Senate". (10). In France, the most important part of the plan of the C.G.T. (Federation of Labor) is the national Economic Council "composed of qualified representatives designated by the most representative organizations of patrons and workers". (11). And the International Syndical Federation itself dreams of "a true corporate State which should be effectively interpreted by the collaboration of employers and employees in the same organization or a common institution." (12)

(10) Corporatisme et Socialisme, Bruxelles, 1935

(11) Official Text of the plan of the Federation of Labor.

(12) "Le Mensonge de l'etat Corporatif" Le Mouvement Syndical International, Jan.-Apr. 1934.

But should this "Corporate State", in the spirit of the reformists, absorb the Political State? No. They do not see as far ahead as did Saint-Simon and Proudhon. Saint-Simon hoped that the industrial corporations would be substituted for the political power, that the council of industrials would replace the government. Proudhon wrote: "That which we would put in the place of the government is industrial organization. More laws voted for by the majority. Each citizen, each community or corporation to make its own". (13)

And so Saint-Simon and Proudhon marked out a way which, transposed from an utopian plan into the realm of class, leads to syndicalism and revolutionary socialism. In the proletarian society, "the workshop will replace the government", the parasitic State will be replaced by the free association of producers. But the reformists, who want to install their corporatism within the framework of the capitalist regime cannot substitute the "economic" for the "political". Syndical liberty, the condition sine qua non of the "collaboration of classes", such as they dream of, demands in itself democratic politics, and democratic politics implies universal suffrage and parliamentarianism. Also, they demand only the creation of a consultative role for the corporate organizations. For the authors of the Federation of Labor plan (C.G.T.), for example, the economic parliament "inspires the political power in its decisions."

Fascist Corporatism

We shall see how Fascism borrowed its corporative demagoguery from the reactionaries and reformists at one and the same time. From the reactionaries it took the idea of the resurrection of medieval corporations of artisans and small business men; and it is especially to the reformists that it owes the idea of the "collaboration of classes", the idea of a consultative economic parliament. But upon two essential points it separates from the reformists and attaches itself to the reactionaries.

1. The reformists wish to institute their corporatism within the frame of a democratic political State; the fascists within an authoritative political State.

2. The reformists want their "collaboration of classes" within each corporation under a regime of syndical liberty. The fascists, on the contrary, do not hide their intention of taking as a basis of their corporate State,

(13) The general idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century.

not the free syndicates of workingmen, but syndicates put under guardianship.

In Italy, Mussolini had a model before his eyes: the "corporate" constitution promulgated by D'Annunzio at Fiume (September 8, 1920), which, however, was never put into application. This constitution was, from certain angles, sharply reactionary in inspiration. It created in the small town of Fiume, which was very little industrialized, ten obligatory corporations in full possession of autonomy, "such as were established and carried on in the course of four glorious centuries of our communal period." But its author, the former militant syndicalist of Ambris, introduced equally the reformist idea of an economic parliament composed of sixty members and elected by the corporations. (14)

In another way, Mussolini borrowed directly from the ideology of Italian reformatism. During the occupation of the factories in 1920, a delegation of militant syndicalists close to the Ministry of Labor offered the cooperation of the workers to the administration of enterprises "as being more likely to assure Italian industries a better yield." And in its motion of September 11, the Federation of Labor invoked the "superior interest of national production". From this language to that of the fascists of the following years, the connection is direct. On October 31, 1921, the central committee of the Fasci "affirmed that in the superior interests of the nation, the industrialists and the workers must search for all possibilities of accord." And it proposed the principle that "the two factors should condition each other and become integrated within the realm of production." On March 15, 1923, the fascist Grand Council demanded that all the syndical organizations (employers' and workers') assure "the effective collaboration of all the elements of production, in the supreme interest of the country." The fascist historian, Volpe, maintained that "the germ of the corporate regime is founded upon that resolution." (15)

At the same time, Mussolini borrowed from the reformists the idea of a consultative economic parliament. About the time when the Italian Federation of Labor proposed that the laws be elaborated by a "consultative body of syndicates," he wrote to a friend: "In the future, we shall see multiple parliaments of competents substituted for an unique parliament of incompetents." (16)

(14) Ambrosini: D'Annunzio et la constitution syndicale de Fiume, "Revue de Droit public", 1926, p. 741.

(15) Histoire du mouvement fasciste, Rome (in French)

(16) Letter of April 23, 1918, quoted in "Temps", Dec. 19, 1934.

At the constitutive assembly of the Fasci on March 23, 1919, he declared: "Actual political representation cannot suffice us; we want direct representation of all interests. One could offer as an objection to this program that we are returning to corporations. What does that matter?"

And, in fact, the fascist program of 1919 demanded the "creation of national technical councils of labor, industry, transportation, etc., elected by the collectivity of professions or trades, with legislative powers, and the right to elect a general commissioner with power of minister."

But here the reactionary inspiration re-appears; the fascists understood "politics first" in an entirely different way from the reformists. The political State to which they would subordinate the corporate organizations was already, in Mussolini's mind, the authoritative State, and the "parliament of competents" was in reality a war machine directed against the "parliament of incompetents", against democratic parliaments.

Moreover, the fascists counted upon building the future "corporate State" not upon the basis of free workingmen's syndicates, but upon the basis of "fascist syndicates", created beginning with 1921 which constituted above all a war machine directed against free syndicalism.

In Germany.

In "National Socialism" the reactionary inspiration is equally visible. It must not be forgotten that in Germany, the medieval corporate regime survived up to the middle of the 19th century for independent trades, and that in the years that followed there was an attempt to revive them. Thus a law of 1897 accords to artisans and small business men the right to group themselves into corporations and this right could even be transformed into an obligation if the majority of the members of the trade demanded it.

From Fichte (17) until our days, numerous reactionary writers have extolled the reestablishment of medieval corporations, notably after the war. "It was logical", wrote Mueller van den Bruck, "that the attack against the parliamentary system which, among the revolutionaries was carried on under the slogan of 'councils', should be led among the conservatives under the banner of corporations. They are concerned with giving the corporations their due by understanding them, not his-

(17) L'Etat commercial ferme, 1800.

torically and romantically, but by inspiring them with modern ideas, by mixing corporative and syndicalist ideas." (18)

Gregor Strasser declared that "German socialism takes its point of departure from the spirit and continuation of the professional system of the guilds and the corporations of the middle ages." (19)

But at the same time, the Nazis borrowed the corporatism of "collaboration of the classes" from the German reformists. The laws called those of "socialization" of 1919, in the elaboration of which the reformists took part, admitted, for certain industries, a mixed administration by patron representatives and worker representatives. The Constitution of Weimar speaks of "assuring the collaboration of all the elements of production, of interesting employers and employees in the administration." (article 156)

And, on the same point, Feder extolled the "incorporation of employers and workers of the different economic branches into professional corporations whose aim would be to lead them, one and the other, from an atmosphere poisoned by the class struggle and to orient them towards the common aim, which is national production, with a sentiment of confidence and of reciprocal responsibilities." (20) Within these corporations, "employers and employees should sit in the court together with the same rights." (21)

The Nazis also borrowed the idea of a consultative economic parliament from the reformists. In the image of the Economic Council of the Reich, created in 1919, they proclaimed, in 1920, the creation of elected regional economic councils with a Supreme Economic Chamber at the head which would be charged with conciliating the diverse interests. (22)

But the Nazis understood "politics first" in an entirely different way from the reformists. The "Political State" to which they would subordinate corporate organizations figured in their minds as the authoritative State, and their economic parliament was in reality a war machine directed against democratic parliaments. "The elections," wrote Goebbels, "will no longer be made upon the basis of political parties,

- (18) The Third Reich, 1923.
- (19) Discourse of July 20, 1925 in Kampf und Deutschland.
- (20) "Fondements de l'economie nationale-socialiste"
- (21) Daunted: "Les Buts du N.S.D.A.P."
- (22) Program of the National Socialist Party, Feb. 1920.

but on the basis of organized professions in the midst of the State." (23)

Moreover, the Nazis do not hide the fact that the "cornerstone" of their future "corporate State" will not be constituted of free workers' syndicates under their actual form, but of "disenfranchized"-syndicates deprived of their representatives and placed under the strict guardianship of the national-socialist State.

Capitalist Magnates Against Corporatism

There remains for us to examine a very important point. What do the capitalist magnates, the money-lenders of fascism, think of its "corporate" demagoguery? As long as the fascists had not yet seized power, the magnates saw more advantages than inconveniences in this demagoguery. Would it not attract numerous petty-bourgeois to the fascist ranks? Would it not turn aside from the class struggle and free trades-unionism a certain number of workers? Would it not make a breach in democratic parliamentarianism?

But, if they were permitted to say so, the money-lenders of fascism are at heart themselves irreducibly hostile to all corporations, to all "collaboration of classes", to all relations "upon an equal footing of equality" with their exploited workers. In their enterprises as in the industry, they wish to dictate their orders, and not meet their personnel as equals. They fear, above all, that the exploited will demand a right to control their own affairs, and will claim a certain part of the economic administration. They do not forget their great terror after the war when the workers in Italy occupied the factories, claiming the right to run their production themselves; when in Germany, for several days, the councils of workers and soldiers were the only legal power. Therefore, they have systematically sabotaged all the plans for corporatism and workers' control whose principles they momentarily accepted. In Italy, the "workers' control" promised to the metal workers after the occupation of the factories (1920) was never applied. In Germany, the patrons systematically opposed the application of the laws called "socialization" of 1919, and refused to take part in organizations like the Councils of Coal and Potassium, refused every effective collaboration with the representatives of the workers. In Italy, in Germany, in no country do capitalist magnates want "corporatism", or, if they accept the principle, it is only after it has been rendered unrecognizable, emptied of all content. Thus it is, for example, that

(23) Goebbels: "Der Nazi-Sozi".

the French industrialist, Mathon, deplored the fact that "there are those who have dreamed of restoring corporations", seeing in that "a collaboration often pushed to the point of the workers' participating in the management and enjoying the benefits of enterprise." On the contrary, this realm should remain the hunting preserve of the boss. He says that "in principle, only the employers ought to direct an economic corporation. To them belong the enterprises which it constitutes; they should have, from this fact, the supreme direction of it, and the responsibility. They are more qualified for this direction. They alone can judge with clarity and a sufficiently large viewpoint, with necessary competence and experience. The necessity of a single leader is formal." (24) In consequence the economic corporation ought to be composed exclusively of employers. But, this domain being reserved, Mathon does not see the inconveniences of this when employers and workers find themselves in the "social" corporation and there debate together the questions relative to salaries and to conditions of work.

All French employers who have written on the "corporation", whether it be Maurice Olivier (25) or Lucien Laine (26) have given the same opinion: no participation of workers in the economic direction. "That would be to fall into disorder." Hitler himself, in a moment of sincerity, expressed an analogous opinion. Otto Strasser asked him in 1930: "Then will the collier be master in his own home?" Hitler replied angrily: "The present system is basically just; there can be no other. Co-ownership and co-decisions of workers is Marxism." (27)

The national German party, which calls itself national socialism when it speaks to the masses, expressed the intimate thought of a big capitalist when it inscribed in large characters upon its program of 1932, "We drive back the corporate State". (28)

And, in fact, we shall see that the next step in Fascism, once it is master of power, will be to drive back the corporate State which it promised in order to institute finally a ridiculous caricature.

(24) La Corporation, base de l'organisation économique, 2nd ed. 1934.

(25) Pourquoi, comment sauver l'économie nationale, 1935.

(26) Cf. Information Sociale, June 20, 1935.

(27) Cf. Conrad Heiden: History of National Socialism, (German edition)

(28) The framework of this study being limited, we must imagine corporatism, especially here, under the interesting light of the working class; that is to say,

Footnote #28 continued:

mixed corporatism, or "the collaboration of classes". But all the capitalist magnates are also hostile to autonomous "corporations" for the independent petty bourgeois (artisans, small business men). They feel no need that small producers should be protected by such "corporations" against their competition. They are even opposed to a "corporate State" in the midst of which all interests would really have a voice in the court. They do not wish to harmonize their interests with other interests, but they want to make their interests prevail in wiping out or ransoming all others.

- Daniel Guerin -
From "Revolution Proletarienne".

(D. Guerin: Author of "Fascisme et Grand Capital", just published by Librairie Du Travail, 17 Rue De Sambre-et-Meuse, Paris X. - price 18 Francs.)

NEW STRIKES -- NEW METHODS

The international character of the class struggle comes more clearly to light in direct actions of the workers themselves than in the paper-actions of the petrified Internationals. The real character of the proletarian class struggle is shown better in the most immediate necessities of the workers than in all the complicated theories of the leaders of Labor. This fact was very well illustrated in the last few years by the adaption of the "sit-down" strikes in various countries.

In Poland, Hungary, Spain, Belgium, France, England, and now also in the United States, workers have occupied working places in order to win their demands. Instinctively, as well as by intelligent consideration of the changed situation, workers have realized that it has become almost impossible to fight the bosses successfully by sticking to the traditional means of striking and bargaining. The new method of the "stay-in" strike resulted and results out of two different situations. It may be an expression of weakness as well as of strength on the part of the workers.

In fascist countries, or in countries with extremely

weak labor organizations, in order to fight against unbearable conditions, the workers have to use strike tactics which exclude immediate defeat. The absence of organizations for arbitration forces the workers into spontaneous actions at their working place. Staying-in in the mines, as it happened in Poland and Hungary for instance, was, under the prevailing conditions, the only possible way of forcing the bosses to consider the demands of the strikers. The difficulties involved in evicting the workers from the mines was the reason why this form of strike was first adopted by the miners. Those "hunger-strikes" aroused the laboring population outside of the mines, whose pressure on the authorities brought about concessions on the part of the bosses, even if only temporary, in order to relieve the situation.

Workers in Belgium also occupied mines and factories and thereby gained some results. In many cases they were driven out by soldiers or swindled out of their positions by the professional labor fakars. (Compare C.C., Vol. II, #5) The strikes in Belgium, greater than the attempts in Poland and Hungary, assumed at once political character. Arising out of necessity, it brought the real character of the struggle between labor and capital to the fore: the question of power became visible to the ideologically most backward worker. The alignment between state, labor leader, and capital, did not need to be proven theoretically. Simply by trying to strike for higher wages and better working conditions, a real revolutionary condition was brought about in which the workers, so to speak, learned over night that their real interest lay in the possession of economic and political power which, however, presupposes the destruction of the power of the bourgeoisie.

Even what little real action there was on the part of the workers in Fascist-Germany, it had to take place on the factory grounds. The absence of legal labor organizations brings about the development of the self-initiative of the workers, of actions and organizations based on the working place. Out of this arises new strike methods and also the necessary development of Committees of Action which are the forerunners of Workers Councils.

The big strike-wave which forced the Blum-Government in France to grant temporarily large concessions to the workers was successful only due to the adoption of the sit-down method. The occupation of the factories created an entirely new situation with which the bosses could not cope at once. Under the then existing conditions an attempt to drive the workers from

the factories probably would have meant civil war. The relative great strength of the French workers at that particular time allowed for the successful carrying thru of the sit-down strike on a large scale, without creating a real revolutionary situation at once. How close this form of striking comes to open revolutionary activity was made clear by the decision of the government never again to allow such a situation to arise. (Compare C.C., Vol. II, #8.) Yet as long as powerful reformist labor organizations have decisive influence over the workers, even such mass occupation might pass quite harmlessly for the bourgeoisie, even if - in the long run - considering the development of revolutionary class consciousness, they might prove to be of considerable danger to the ruling class. But as soon as the workers have escaped the control of the professional labor leaders, this form of strike will seriously threaten the existing form of society. Recognizing this fact, all reformist elements abstain from advocating it. If, during the French strike, the labor organizations did not object directly to the new strike methods, it was because they felt sure that they would maintain control and leadership during the struggle. Sometimes it is more expedient to destroy revolutionary possibilities by participating in revolutionary action with the view of ending the fight as soon as possible. Whenever this should be impossible, the labor leaders of the reformist organizations - interested in prolonging the capitalist system - will, together with the bourgeoisie, do everything in their power to break the strikes. Even where, due to conditions, sit-down strikes will have no direct revolutionary consequences, the labor bureaucracy will only, in exceptional cases, lend their support to such movements because they recognize quite well that this form of struggle eventually will make them superfluous.

These strikes initiate self-action in the striking workers. They bring to the fore, the fact that the arbitrators are unnecessary, that the struggle between workers and capitalists does not need a third party. The labor fakers will not, under conditions which are not generally revolutionary, directly and openly oppose the sit-down strikes because these strikes might serve also the purpose of the labor bureaucracy. Such strikes might convince the bosses that they are much better off by recognizing the professional labor leaders than to leave the class struggle to the self-initiative of the workers.

Monopolization of capital and the large unemployed army have weakened the strike-potentialities of the working class. As exceptions to the rule here and there strikes of the old order might be still success-

ful, but on a larger scale involving broad masses of workers; the obsolescence of the old forms of organization and tactics was recognized by the workers; this brought about the development of the new method. It is not accidental that with the attempts to form Industrial Unions, to organize the unskilled workers, the example of the French workers had been carried over at once to the American scene.

Following the strikes in the Akron rubber industry and the sit-down strikes of the W.P.A. workers, it is now the automobile workers strike that brings the new method into focus. The workers in the automobile industry know from experience how difficult it is to fight an enemy like General Motors, Ford, etc. The power of the industry is tremendous. With their company unions they still can split the ranks of the strikers; with their money they hire thugs galore; with their influence they can direct the militia against the workers. A prolonged strike, under the present conditions, makes the position of the workers more and more precarious. Their illusion that the Roosevelt regime is in favor of unionization and would support labor struggles for this purpose, gives the strike a greater impetus. The legend built around John L. Lewis and his determination, as well as his close connections with government agencies, created an optimism which led to the adoption of the new strike method. But at the bottom of it all stands the tremendous increase in the cost of living that nullified all previous wage increases, as well as the unbearable speed-up in the automobile industry which brought about a rising industrial activity and with this - due to a larger demand for labor - a favorable strike situation. (#)

Unfortunately, not everywhere but only in some places, like in Flint, did the workers put the new strike form to a real test. The bureaucracy of the Automobile Workers Union uses this sit-down strike as a weapon against General Motors and also as a warning to capital in general; that the latter better recognize the new Union as a lesser evil in contradistinction to the possibility of the self-action of the workers. The sit-down strike is not the strike of the union; it is only used by the Union as one weapon out of many within the bargaining policies. It is in the interest of the Union that this weapon is only demonstrated, not used, to the fullest possibilities. The expansion of the sit-down strike would change the character of the present struggle far beyond the wishes of the union. It would force the bourgeoisie to a real showdown and would destroy once and forever the illusion that the government stands (#) The next issue of the Council Correspondence will deal with the automobile strike at length.

behind labor. To preserve legality and an "orderly" union movement, the labor leaders, in their own interest, have to look out that the sit-down strike does not spread too far. At the first chance, for an empty promise, the Union decided to lead the auto-workers of Detroit to the music of their brass band out of the factories. The sit-down strike can be extended only against the wishes of the Union leadership; this form of strike will remain to be the exclusive property of the workers.

The sit-down strike is a powerful weapon. It eliminates scabbing within the plant as well as from without. It maintains a greater solidarity. If it leads to a real battle with the authorities, it forces the whole of the striking workers to participate, not a militant minority. It brings about a warlike situation in which the "general public" at once has to take clear sides. The factory, not the partial organization, as long as unionization is at its beginning, is now the real organization. The factory becomes a school for the development of class consciousness, as well as a training camp for self-leadership. More than this, regardless of whether the workers realize this or not, it is their first preparation for their future position as masters of their own destiny; as the rulers over the means of production. But for immediate purposes, by stopping production entirely, it cuts down the profits to an extent which might force the companies to consider the requests of the strikers.

But all this holds good only for certain periods, and in particular situations. If the mass of the workers is backward and due to the fact that the ruling class has all means to "form public opinion" at its disposal, such strikes might also arouse sentiment against the strikers and force defeat upon the workers in spite of the new weapon. A long drawn out strike, in cases where the ruling class can stand such a situation, might weaken the position of the workers inside the factories just as well as outside the gates. The desire to end this divorced situation, or the impossibility of bringing food into the plants, might tire the workers out before their demands are gained. Or the bourgeoisie might at once use military means to drive the "trespassers" from their property and end the strike more quickly.

Whatever the results - in particular cases - one thing is clear: this sit-down strike, by challenging directly the property rights of capital, is the first real step in revolutionary development since the establishment of workers councils at the end of the last war. At a time when ideologically the whole organized international

social movement is really going to the dogs, the actual class struggle, the motive force of social development brings out of itself new fighting forms and organizations, which, in turn, undoubtedly will also change the ideologies towards a more revolutionary position. Not even the present control of the sit-down strike by reactionary organizations and leaders can becloud this fact. It is true that the American workers can as yet only conceive a struggle for the betterment of their position by way of the Union. For this reason the present sit-down strikes will not have immediate revolutionary results. The present strike, because it remains an isolated affair, might be defeated; but a new wave of strikes, which unquestionably will arise again, will have to base itself on the last experiences and undoubtedly will be more forceful and revolutionary.

All present demands of the workers are incorporated in the general demand: recognition of the Union as the sole bargaining force. That demand is merely the result of previous experience which the workers had in their dealing with the bosses; however, it involves a contradiction brought about by the new strike method itself which will not forever remain in the dark. The workers exert here their real power in order to bring about a situation in which this power is again reduced to the bargaining abilities of a few new labor leaders. A whole revolution takes place as far as the forms of strikes are concerned; but the goal of these new strikes remains the same: to deliver once more all real class power into the hands of new labor lieutenants. But this shall not irritate us; behind all this activity stands the real desire of the workers to overcome their miserable situation. The sit-down strike must be extended and propagated irregardless of the fact that the labor fakers still cash in on them because this form of strike is, after all, of greater significance than all the labor fakers wish to see.

#

TWO NEW MARXIAN QUARTERLIES

Recently there appeared two new Marxist magazines: Science and Society and Marxist Quarterly. The first one directs itself to the academic world; the latter caters to the intelligentsia in general. Both do not seem to care to be of direct value to the workers, but hope to recruit their readers from the middle class. Contents and style are selected accordingly. Science and Society enjoys the support of the Communist Party; the Marxist Quarterly is a kind of "United Front" proposition made up by the Lovestonites, Socialists, Trotskyites and irritated Friends of the Soviet Union.

There is undoubtedly a real need for a theoretical Marxist publication in the United States. Judging from the first issues of the new quarterlies, it can hardly be said that they fulfill this need. Both show an outspoken tendency to avoid questions of the actual class struggle of today and to remain in the spheres of abstract thinking in spite of their claims to establish the unity of theory and practice. There is a civil war raging in Spain but these "Marxist" publications do not seem to find it important enough to give it some space. The war is too near and it is dangerous to risk an analysis of it without developing some contradictions. Since Science and Society is a veiled C.P. publication, the opportunistic policy of this organization, based on the needs of Russia, excludes scientific treatment of actual problems as any theory in this respect made one night might have to be denounced the following day. In a Quarterly the danger is correspondingly greater; to avoid difficulties, the magazine has to restrict itself to problems as remote as possible from present-day needs. Sterility is the presupposition for the existence of this publication.

Marxian theory wants to help to change the world, not merely interpret its history; it therefore must deal foremost with theoretical problems which have direct connections with the immediate needs of the working class. But so far these new publications seem to serve only the competitive needs of the "left" intelligentsia. Adhering to the "Marxism" of the Third International, it is impossible for the scientists to take into consideration the real and important questions of today without falsifying Marxism so crudely that the scientist is reduced at once to a cheap prostitute of the ruling clique in Russia. He can remain a scientist only if he adheres to the bourgeois principle of

divorcing science from the real needs of society. He restricts his activity to problems which have no immediate value in the struggle against present-day society.

Even though Ginzberg in the Marxist Quarterly laments that it is "one of the great tragedies of our time that the two major cultural forces of modern life, science and socialism, should see one another thru the distorting fog of mutual misunderstanding", this divorce is once more upheld by these pseudo-marxist's themselves. And as long as they only fight for partial interests, this cannot be different. The very language used by these people shows that they are really not interested in what they preach: how is it possible for science to identify itself with socialism? It would have to divorce itself first from capitalism which presupposes abolishment of capitalism. Present-day science cannot find its way towards socialism; it has to be brought to socialism thru the proletarian revolution. The appeal to the bourgeois scientist to become a revolutionary means practically that he should cease to be a scientist. In order to function as such, he cannot dissociate himself from capitalistic interests. Socialism will free the scientists, also, from capitalistic fetters; but it is the work of the proletariat.

However, for Ginzburg, the "scientists have a world to rebuild for themselves and for humanity"; the workers have only "a world to win". Brameld, in Science and Society, does not demand so much. For him it is sufficient that the American scholar enters the United Front of the Communist Party "for the defense of whatever democratic rights now exist." On the wrong assumption that the schools can actually function as institutions of learning, that they are not restricted institutions of learning for capitalistic purposes, he serves a "Marxism" adaptable for school use, but sufficient only for the capitalistic, political needs of the Communist Party. By both, science is opposed to Society: first, science and capitalism; then science and socialism. That each form of society, due to the division of labor, has its science separated does not mean that it is largely more independent from the direct needs of society than other groups and functions within society. Socialism will do away with the artificial distinction between science and society which has arisen with the division of labor within exploitative societies. It will bring clearly to light the interdependence of all social functions and thereby eliminate all requests and needs for privileges.

The Marxist Quarterly, although it does not serve a

particular party, has more freedom in the choice of subjects, but by adhering to the general needs of all parties this freedom is again limited. For commercial reasons, it also cannot say "too much"; someone's feelings might be hurt. In order to safeguard the existence of a Marxist Quarterly, it has to be as little Marxian as possible. The elements writing in this magazine, as well as those who contribute to the other, are unable and unwilling to do more than repeat repetitions as their political-party commitments exclude a new start toward a Marxian approach to social questions. Some articles are readable in both magazines, but the general impression does not allow much hope for improvements in the future as far as the magazines themselves are concerned. Most of the articles dealing with special questions are largely unintelligible for the layman and the more so for the worker.

Of interest to the reader accustomed to the academic language might be the articles by Margaret Schlauch dealing with the social basis of linguistics, and Struik's article on "Mathematics", both appearing in Science and Society. A critical evaluation of these pieces, however, although necessary cannot be given here. In the same publication (#2), Hogben's article "Our Social Heritage" and Enmales remarks on the interpretations of the American civil war contain many valuable thoughts in spite of the desire of the writers to subordinate themselves to the needs of the Communist Party. The extensive review of Keynes' book "The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money" by Darrell (#2) also warrants mentioning.

The Marxist Quarterly describes Marxism as "more than a method and system for present-day education; it is a theoretical expression of the class struggle to realize socialism; its philosophy implies a faith in man's creative intelligence to build a rational civilization of plenty, beauty and freedom". A part of this creative intelligence fights, in 172 pages, "the forces of disorder, bewilderment and reaction." That is, Carl T. Schmidt presents a sober article on "Farm Labor in Italy" which restricts itself to an empirical demonstration of the changes which took place in the conditions of agricultural labor since the establishment of the fascist regime. This article, as valuable as it is, could appear in any of the existing bourgeois-liberal publications. A Marxist Quarterly is not needed. In our opinion, the Quarterly should rather serve the needs of the Marxian theory which cannot be published by the bourgeoisie. Hook's philosophical article on "Marxism and Values" appears to us as waste of space. He discovers once more what has already been discovered so often - in this case, that "the morality of

marxist socialism is an historical morality which admits of ultimate values but not of final or eternal ones." Hook, here in this article, continually creates his own problems in order to have something to solve.

Naturally an article on the "American Revolution" had to be included, and L.M.Hacker tells at length anew what probably any reader of the Marxist Quarterly already knows: that with 1783 independent capitalist development started in America. Engel's article on "Materialism and Spooks" was apparently chosen to attract more buyers. The article itself is rather unimportant; it may have a proper place in Engel's collected works, but it does not enrich a Marxist Quarterly of today. Besides Schapiro's lengthy review of A. H. Barr's book "Cubism and Abstract Art", there is an article on "New Aspects of Cyclical Crises" by Bertram D. Wolfe which is of an almost indescribable emptiness. Here assumption follows assumption without even an attempt to prove them. It is true, the article is only contemplated as a general survey to be followed by more details, but even as such it is extremely poor. The "falling rate of profit" upon which Marx's theory of crisis is based, results for Wolfe temporarily in "a higher rate of profit." If the falling rate of profit is due to the changes in the organic composition of capital in favor of the constant part, and if it also is the driving force for technical progress, investments and trustification, as Wolfe states, then the result can only be a further fall in the rate of profit - not a higher rate. The rate of profit falls constantly with the progressive accumulation, but this latter process compensates the fall in the rate of profit with an increase in the mass of profit. Errors like this, and many more thruout the article, show clearly that Wolfe does not understand what he is talking about. The generalities of the article exclude a critical consideration; we have to wait for the detailed surveys. Just now, it is impossible to find out what Wolfe really wants to say. First, for Wolfe, Marx "attributed fundamental importance to the falling rate of profit; each crisis is a reflex of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall" (p.104); and then again on page 112 according to the same Wolfe, the crisis is "basically a rupture of equilibrium between the various factors of capitalist production", due to the market relation. He does not seem to know that Marx showed the necessity of the crisis already on the basis of total capital which is constantly in equilibrium, and proved that even under such conditions crises have to arise.

Corey's short article on "American Class Relations", concluding this first issue (which has, in addition two articles by Brabdon and Conze, also a series of

book reviews) is quite recommendable for it gives the Marxist some valuable information, always needed, and especially at present, on the struggle against the petty-bourgeois ideology that tries to talk the class struggle away by pointing out that the proletarian class is disappearing.

Our criticism should not stop students of Marxism to read these new quarterlies. All we want to express is the necessity of reading them with a critical mind. Scepticism is the beginning of knowledge.

#

Council Correspondence recommends:

F.ENGELS: Principles of Communism	15 cents
A.M.Simons: Class Struggles in America	10 "
MARX: Wage-Labor and Capital	10 "
A.Pannekoek: Marxism and Darwinism	10 "
Marx-Engels: The Communist Manifesto	5 "
MARX: Value, Price and Profit	20 "
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism	10 "
R.Luxemburg: Leninism or Marxism	10 "
Bolshevism or Communism	5 "
What Next for the American Workers?	5 "
World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution	5 "
A Study-Class Outline of Marxian Economics	50 "
The Inevitability of Communism. (A critique of Sidney Hook's interpretation of Marx)	25 "
Anti-Duehring (Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science) By F. Engels	\$2.00
Selected Essays: by Karl Marx	
A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right.	
On the Jewish Question.	
On the King of Prussia and Social Reforms	\$2.00

Order all books dealing with Marxism and the Problems of the Working Class from:

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

1237 N. California Ave.,

Chicago, Ill.

NEW BOOKS

#

PLANNING THE CHAOS?

(Douglas, Paul H. "Controlling Depressions", W.W.Norton & Company.)

In Controlling Depressions, Douglas adds another to the long series of projects for a capitalist planned economy. He asserts, on the basis of a variety of the under-consumption theories so popular today, that the crises of the present economic system could be avoided, or at any rate mitigated, by means of "intelligent guidance" -- that is, thru government control on the part of various planning agencies set up by the State. It is quite possible, according to Douglas, to have a capitalism which satisfies all classes.

The causes of crisis are classified as "initiating" and "cumulative". By way of the former, business loses its state of equilibrium; while the second makes matters progressively worse, once the equilibrium has been disturbed. Douglas denies the existence of a definite general cause of crisis. That is to say that the crisis to him may have its starting point in any part of the economic structure; and if this occurs, the whole economy is dragged into the maelstrom. But this is equivalent to making the whole economy dependent on the ever perfect functioning of all its various parts, and, since this can never be the case, permits of only one eternal condition of crisis. And it is possible for this reason that Douglas says that the overcoming of crisis hitherto has been rather a matter of chance than the result of a definite law-like relation between depression and boom. With this "theory" he is necessarily incapable of harmonizing his explanation of crisis with the actual economic process; he can only recount one after the other the various manifestations of crisis, without grasping their inner connection or their relative importance in the total process.

The depression itself is, according to Douglas, a condition in which production can no longer yield a sufficient amount of profit, so that production be-

comes limited and the general dilemma follows. As regards the present depression in America, Douglas thinks he has found its specific initial cause in the fact that, thru monopolistic control of the economy, prices were artificially kept high in spite of falling costs of production; this resulted in super-profits and a drop in mass purchasing power which in turn brought on the crisis. Thus, as Douglas sees it, the depression arises, on the one hand, from a superfluity of profit and, on the other, manifests itself as a condition in which the profit is not great enough. He explains this contradiction by stating that prices did not fall sufficiently to maintain purchasing power at a high level; the commodities therefore remained unsold, and the subsequent depression compelled an enormous price drop and the resulting decline of profit. If the profits were once too high because prices failed to fall, they are now too low because prices fell too much. The fate of Capital thus depends on the most precise balancing of prices. A price policy by which profits are guaranteed and yet mass purchasing power is not restricted -- or a better distribution of consumption goods, which Douglas regards as regulatory of the movement of the whole economy -- should overcome the crisis or at least soften it.

As to the proper magnitude of profits with respect to the rate of accumulation by which prosperity is determined, what determines the continuation of progressive accumulation, and what determines the price movement: regarding these questions, which are only the beginning of the problem, this book has nothing to tell us. The author remains stuck fast in "common sense", which becomes senseless when applied to such a paradoxical thing as capitalist economy. In order to re-establish the relatively smooth-functioning market mechanism of laissez-faire capitalism, which is thrown out of joint by monopolization and over-accumulation, Douglas proposes intervention of the State. So that what he has in mind may best be summarized in the absurd concept of a planned laissez-faire capitalism. We are here confronted with a compromise speculation designed to carry the laissez-faire principle over into state capitalism. In other words, Douglas is preaching an economic state of affairs which is already at hand; for what can this compromise solution possibly be except the existing monopoly capitalism? His practical proposals are therefore, in principle, the same as those of the Roosevelt administration; he desires an honest and consistent NRA-policy. By means of monetary devices, control of prices, credit and profits, together with public works, he wants to prevent over-accumulation and raise mass purchasing power. He repeats all the familiar "planned-economy" proposals

which with unessential variations fit into the economic programs of all capitalist "planners", whether reformists or plain fascists.

The objections of the "anti-planners" to the effect that such a policy would be too much a strain upon the budget and would strengthen inflationist tendencies, Douglas answers by pointing out that inflation is controllable and that the anticipated prosperity would compensate for the present burden. International complications arising from such a program he regards as regrettable and unavoidable, but comforts himself with the hope in an awakening of reason which would soon bring with it international regulation of the economic life, once the national problem had been solved. He sees also that the carrying out of his proposals would invest the government with dictatorial power; still he doesn't want dictatorship, but lovely democracy, and he relies on the yielding disposition of the capitalists to secure their voluntary acceptance of the planned economy. He completely fails to see that his proposals and hopes are irreconcilable and mutually destructive. If, for example, like Douglas, one wants to rescue the "little fellows", he has to combat the monopolies. Douglas threatens these latter with state capitalism; that is, the complete monopoly and the final submergence of the little fellows. Sad as it may be, anyone who preaches state capitalism and planned economy within the prevailing mode of production, under the present conditions and especially in America, is merely promoting monopoly capitalism whether he likes the idea or not.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF INVENTION

(By S. C. Gilfillan - Chicago, 1936)

Gilfillan's book opposes the conception that inventions are solely the products of genial men who arrive at their ideas independently from society. He tries to prove that social changes govern both the inventions and the inventors. "The social causes of inventions all come from the world outside the inventor and act thru him.... Some other chief changes causing invention are growth of wealth, population, industrialism, etc." In other words, invention does not depend on genius but originates instead from the combination of a number of objective circumstances.

It is a process of perpetual accretion of little details, promoted by specialization of labor which enables a more intensive and fuller use of the capital required to devise and operate an invention. His extensive statistical material corroborates to a certain extent the materialistic conception of history which maintains that inventions are conditioned by social and economic forces.

In spite of the appreciable treatment of the subject in general, the book has a number of shortcomings. Gilfillan's viewpoint on the question of wages and inventions, for instance, is very deceptive. He computes the share that goes to capital and labor and says that "Inventions of the last generation have lowered the relative share of labor, but what should matter most to labor is the absolute share, because the production of standard goods (factory goods) is increased, cheaper, and therefore -- since they are mostly bought by the pay earning class -- what the worker loses from his pay envelope, he more than regains at the store."

The author does not seem to know that the invention of new labor saving machinery within the total process of capital accumulation reduces continuously and absolutely this pay earning class and that the unemployed worker cannot in any way regain at the store what he loses; in fact, never makes.

Gilfillan believes in invention as the mother of necessity and knows well that our present system has many shortcomings and disadvantages as to the appliance of inventions. He attacks the patent system, ignorant judges, industrial monopoly which willfully suppresses patents, waste of human and material resources, etc., and proposes instead to entrust special government committees composed of technologists, physical scientists, inventors and industrialists with the administration and 'wise' judgment as to how to employ best all inventions for the "protection of minorities and the public and consumer's interest." He would pool all existing patents and use them for the good of the whole nation, even cooperate in this respect with other nations on a world wide scale. In short, he knows nothing of the real character of present day society and its relation to technological advancement. His suggestions have to remain illusions.

The viewpoint of the author presupposes that "common sense" is the determining factor and that it is up to a few men with a good will to give history the direction they consider most desirable for our society. But as impossible as it is in his own opinion to explain

inventions out of the isolated individual, just as impossible it is to employ "common sense" in relation to social problems of today. Here also not the good intentions of the few, but class actions determined by the whole of capitalist development are the decisive factors.

- T. -

AN OUTLINE HISTORY OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(By W.T. Colyer, N.C.L.C. Publishing Society, London 1936)

This new Plebs book is an expression of the changes in the economic situation since the last war. Unemployment is not only looked at as a permanent necessity for capitalism, but also as an especially important problem that embodies severe complications and grave consequences during the period of capitalist decay.

The author criticises effectively the shortcomings of bourgeois social science in dealing with the question of unemployment and shows convincingly that Marxism is in a much better position to do justice to this problem. Unemployment is recognized as the direct outgrowth of the capitalist mode of production. The close relationship between unemployment and capitalist development is substantiated by factual data sculled from English history since the beginning of capitalism up to the present. At the same time, the author points to the connection between unemployment and social welfare citing the Poor Law, the Compulsory Unemployment Insurance, and the Means Test of today. The author's analysis of the present situation effectively shows that -- regardless of all so-called social security acts -- the workers' struggle against further pauperization will continue.

The book can be recommended highly.

FROM HEGEL TO MARX

(Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx by Sidney Hook.)

Hook's book brings hitherto unpublished material from the earlier writings of Marx to the attention of english

readers. On the history of ideas from Hegel to Marx he shows the social intellectual atmosphere in which Marx's thoughts developed. The biggest part of the book is of a descriptive nature. Hook's interpretation of the philosophical development of Marx is designated to support a point of view which he adopted in his "Toward the Understanding of Karl Marx."

Hook shows what Hegel and Marx have in common and what differentiated Marx from Hegel. The differences between 'dialectical idealism' and 'dialectical materialism' are explained on the manifold categories of natural and social science. In the same way Hook confronts Marx's thoughts with ideas of Bauer, Ruge, Stirner, Hess, and Feuerbach. In these confrontations lies, in our opinion, the real value of the book. It eliminates work for the student of Marxism and makes it easier for the general reader to understand important phases of the Marxian world point of view. Dealing with dialectics, Hook opposes Engels' and Lenin's attempts to apply dialectical materialism to nature. In Hook's opinion, Marx did not hold such a view, but his dialectical materialism is restricted to the problems of society; even here (and not very clearly) dialectical materialism is often reduced by Hook to such an extent that it seems to be nothing but a class ideology. His entire interpretation tries to say that more stress should be laid on the subjective factors of the historical process. The active moment in history is of course materially dependent and finds its expression in the class struggle but still it remains an ideational-active moment which first produces the will for revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist society. He does not see that the material relations are stronger than the passive and active consciousness, and that man is forced to change the world even against his will. Hook quotes this position very often but he does not grasp its content. With his special emphasis on the subjective factor in history, he tries to overcome contradictions in Marxism which he himself has created. Nevertheless, the book can be recommended even if it is impossible to see more in Hook's interpretation than a rather unimportant deviation from Marx, brought about by the dominating philosophical interest of Hook himself.

SPAIN TODAY

REVOLUTION OR COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by Edward Conze

(Greenberg Publisher, 67 W. 44th St. N.Y. - \$1.50)

Conze who is known for his book "The Scientific Method of Thinking," a popular exposition of dialectical materialism, has written this book on Spain probably with some haste. Parts of the book insofar as they lead up to the events of 1936 are very good; other parts in relation to the present civil war are of rather dubious value. The larger part of the book deals with the permanent causes of the social unrest in Spain, and with the description of the political forces within Spain. On this basis, in combination with illustrations of the Imperialistic designs of other capitalist nations, he attempts to explain the character of the present civil war.

Since this book was written, the actual course of development within Spain has diverged to a large extent from Conze's expectations, and the optimism prevalent in the book is not justified any more in the face of the present facts. Our own analysis of the Spanish Civil War in the "Council Correspondence", Number 11, 1936, makes a critical evaluation of Conze's book superfluous. But in spite of the shortcomings, the book serves very well as a basis for the understanding of the class struggles in Spain.

We recommend: "The International Review". The first volume of the International Review justified its claim: to publish the world's most significant thought and action. The second volume began with several extremely interesting articles. This magazine cannot be too highly recommended. It published Rosa Luxemburg's "Reform or Revolution", and will bring out Martov's "State and Socialist Revolution". It is indispensable to Marxists and revolutionary workers.

Subscribe now!

8 copies \$1.00 USA Canada and Foreign \$1.25

Address: P.O. Box 44 - Station O - New York City.