

who ever worked under the present speed-up methods knows that no worker could toil 12 or 14 hours daily anymore, and in some industries even the 8 hour day has already become too long. This is illustrated by the fact that the 40 year age limit is rapidly being established. Such measures are just as harmful for capitalism as they are for the working class because in a crisis it will be much more difficult to find a new basis for profits; it is a situation that tends to lengthen the crisis and to shorten the period of a new prosperity. For the working class it simply means that a further rise of the living standard becomes impossible. For a while wages will stagnate until a point is reached where the downward trend becomes absolute. The old labor movement, whose policy it is to fight for better living standards for the masses, is bound to suffer defeat after defeat, and due to this ineffectiveness heads towards a complete breakdown. It would be erroneous to find the explanation in the unions' numerical weakness, or in their non-revolutionary activity, but it is the economic laws of motion that dominate every phase in society, especially in regard to the value of labor power. Were the unions in a position to monopolize the price of labor power, they might be capable of increasing it temporarily above its value. However, this has already become an impossibility on account of the steadily growing army of unemployed. With this, the old labor movement has lost its ground. It continues to live on its past success. A revival of that activity is an economic impossibility. The old labor movement is doomed and must make room for new forms of organization.

- - - - -

N O T E:

The COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE often accepts articles from writers who are not affiliated with the Groups of Council Communists.

These articles are signed to denote that we do not necessarily endorse the view of the writer entirely. All material presented without signature is to be considered as the collective work of the members of the Groups of Council Communists. We will appreciate suggestions, criticism and articles.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Brownshirts of Zionism!

- *CHILD LABOR - A Class Issue*
- *Wages and Prices*
- *Shop Delegates in France*
- *Notes on Productivity and Profits*

TROTSKY and Proletarian Dictatorship

Vol. III

No. 4

APRIL 1937

Two YEARLY

FOR A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

Published at 1237 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .
By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

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

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

THE BROWNSHIRTS OF ZIONISM.

A few days after the termination of the Arab strike and revolt in Palestine, two unsuspected and harmless Arabs, passing thru the Jewish town of Tel Aviv in a carriage, were fired at and wounded by "unknown assailants". Unknown for the reason that they escaped. Everybody, including the police, knows that they are to be found in the ranks of the "Revisionists" or extreme Zionist nationalists who have never concealed their liking for "direct action" and terrorism. Needless to say, they are very vocal, but hardly convincing, in proclaiming their innocence and talking of "Marxist calumnies". Yet the fight against the Arabs, a fight in which all means may be employed, is one of the guiding principles of Revisionism which has justly earned the name of Zionist Fascism. And it deserves to be noted that the Tel Aviv outrage was preceded by statements from authoritative Revisionist sources which are near to advocating the employment of terrorist tactics. In a statement on the situation in Palestine, made on Sept. 9, 1936, Vladimir Jabotinsky, Duce of Jewish Fascism, said: "During the first weeks of the struggle, the exercise of restraint served a useful purpose. It showed that the Jew, when armed, is content to defend himself and does not attack and try to revenge himself. For this reason, I vetoed all thoughts of retaliation; but now I consider it my duty to proclaim that I have withdrawn my veto".

This unmistakable signal for terrorism was supplemented a few days later by a statement from the Viennese organ of the Revisionists, the "Nation", referring to the situation in Palestine: "It happens nowadays that Jewish newspapers in Palestine publish reports, hidden away in small type between unimportant news, of Arabs killed here and there in Palestine, of Arabs wounded, of Jews arrested and accused, etc. Jewish papers published outside of Palestine go even farther in hiding facts. They talk of Arabs being killed by Arabs. What is the good of all this eyewash? Is it our fault that the world forces us to go its ways? The world today understands no language but that of guns, machine guns and pistols. Now we too begin to learn this language. Let it not be forgotten that ours is a talented people. We have already learned many lessons. The time has come to learn the language of fire and blood". The shots in Tel Aviv provide the echo to this incitement.

The Jews are no chosen people. They are, in one respect, like other nations under capitalism, so much so, that there is even a Jewish brand of Fascism. This may surprise the casual observer who is inclined to regard Fascism as a kind of Anti-semitism, or, at least, as bound up with Anti-semitism. But it must be remembered that classical Fascism, that of Mussolini, was never anti-semitic. Fascism is an international epidemic, although in each case profoundly nationalistic. Its roots are basically the same in all countries, and is worth noting that the epidemic has not stopped at the doors of the ghetto or at the border of Palestine.

The principle germ-carriers of Jewish Fascism are everywhere the lower middle classes, although Fascist tendencies are not confined to them alone. Since the war, almost everywhere they are caught between two fires. On the one hand, they are finding it more difficult to escape pauperism; but nothing horrifies them more than the thought of becoming proletarians. This, however, is their fate. In striving to escape from it, their hatred turns against the working class. They look back upon history, to the past that never returns; and because they struggle against their inevitable submergence in the great mass of the proletariat, they are the easy prey of every demagogue who promises them the return of the Golden Age. This is the peculiar function of Fascism, itself born of the same urge, which lures them with its shrill war-cries of "national unity" and "common welfare". Instead of achieving unity with the lower classes, they permit themselves to dream of rising to upper social strata. But the paradise to which the Pied Piper of Fascism leads them inevitably turns out to be the servile state in which the middle classes are crushed and exploited as never before. The Jews have not been able to avoid this contamination.

Their abnormal situation favored the spread of the disease. To the fearful economic need to which they are subjected in all countries of eastern Europe, and in Germany, are also added national persecution, the withdrawal of political rights and even brutal physical terror. While the class-conscious workers among them take part in the social struggle of these countries with a view to solving their own national problem as a by-product of the victory of Socialism, the pressure to which they are subjected generates an inflated nationalism among the numerous petty-bourgeois elements. The fact that many countries which heretofore absorbed Jewish emigrants are now closed to them (U.S.A., Canada, South America), creates the impression that Zionism is the only solution and Palestine their "Promised Land". To them, immigration into Palestine means hopes of a better future. Each time Zionism shows itself to be incompatible with reality, the more the demagogues find a fertile field. To the desperate masses, all kinds of quack medicine is appealing. Take for instance the plan recently proposed by the Revisionists which provides for the settlement in Palestine "on both sides of the Jordan" of one and a half million Jews within the next ten years. Obviously this widely advertised plan, which is presented with much ballyhoo, is manifestly absurd. Yet Jabotinsky is hailed as a Messiah by many of the impoverished eastern Jews who cling to every straw.

In regard to Palestine itself, the majority of the Jews who come here are sincere in proclaiming the need of a "restratification" of the Jewish people. By turning former traders, middlemen and "air"-men into productive agricultural and industrial workers, the social structure of the Jewish people will be profoundly altered; the Jews are to be "Normalized", to use the current phrase. This idea, which is essential to Zionism, as to every other nationalism, is often supplemented by vague concepts of a socialist society in Palestine. But there is another group of immigrants composed of traders, middlemen and other unproductive elements unwilling to adjust their lives to the new conditions. To this latter group, Palestine is merely a haven in which to continue their parasitic role. This group within the Jewish community and the Zionist movement, struggling to preserve its identity as being distinct from the working class, is the social basis of Jewish Fascism.

Jabotinsky stands for a "revision" of official Zionism which he accuses of "national treason" and - "Marxism". The methods are always the same... The Revisionists accuse the Zionist Executive of "being the agency of Arab and supposed British, rather than of Jewish, interests". They are nationalist diehards, hundred percenters. To

them official Zionism is "the renunciation of Zion". Their minimum program provides for the establishment of a Jewish State on both sides of the Jordan, i.e., including the mandated territory of Transjordan, and based on a Jewish majority in the country.

Firmly convinced "that there can be no spontaneous reconciliation with the Palestine Arabs, neither now nor in the future", Jabotinsky rejects the idea of a political parity between the two peoples and demands the creation of a Jewish military force as an indispensable condition for the realization of his aims. "Zionism is impossible without a Jewish Legion...The whole Jewish people must become a people in arms."

The setting up of this Legion is also declared by the Revisionists to be "a prime necessity for the security of the British Empire". At the same time, they declare themselves ready to proceed "with, without or against the British". This flexible formula hides a pro-Italian tendency which has of late become more marked. The military formations of the Revisionists (strangely enough their shirts are brown) are regarded as the nucleus of the Legion whose purpose it is to break by force the opposition of the Arabs to Zionist penetration and to establish a "fait accompli" and possibly more than one.

It has often been remarked that there exists a close resemblance between the phraseology of Zionist Revisionism and that of German National Socialism. But the resemblance is not only one in words. The Revisionists fight "the increasing preponderance of the workers' organizations". They protest against the subsidies given by the official Zionist movement to settlements maintained by the Jewish workers. They insist that private initiative is more important than public funds. The Zionist labor movement is accused of "intransigence and lust of power", "unnecessary insistence on social conflicts", "dogmatic application of the class struggle theory which derives from Europe". All this is the more absurd since every objective observer is forced to admit that extreme nationalism is the beginning and the end of the policy pursued by the Jewish Labour Federation in Palestine. This policy is made completely subservient, in theory as well as in practice, to Zionist nationalism and renounces everything remotely connected with independent class politics. In spite of these well-known and unassailable facts, the ultra-moderate trade unions which make up the bulk of the Zionist Labor Party, are accused by the Revisionists of Marxist and Bolshevik tendencies as well as of "sacrificing ideals to the golden calf." Compulsory labor arbitration is demanded in order to ensure the "subordination of all particular interests to the prime necessities of national unity."

Is it not obvious that, if anything, this program "derives from Europe"?

The Revisionist organization was founded in April 1925 by Vladimir Jabotinsky, a Russian Zionist journalist, who had organized a corps of Jewish volunteers in Alexandria during the world-war to serve on the Gallipoli front. Even at that early date he stood for power politics, first against Turkey, for some time against England, always against the Arabs and the workers. In 1920, Jabotinsky, then lieutenant, was expelled from Palestine by the British for organizing illegal formations. In 1923 he made a pact, behind the backs of the official Zionist Organization, with the representative of the Ukrainian "White" General and ferocious Jew-baiter Petlyura, for the creation of a Jewish corps within the frame-work of an anti-bolshevist White Guard in the Ukraine. When the intrigue leaked out, violent protests were made by the Jewish labor organizations compelling Jabotinsky to resign from the Executive of the Zionist Organization. This gave the 'enfant terrible' his chance to play his messianic role with a vengeance. He became a "leader" and, copying the Hitler movement, built up a strictly authoritarian and militarist organization based on centralized direction, the "Leader principle", and an incredible cult of the personality of the "Leader".

The adherents of the movement in Palestine, supplemented by recruits from the backward Oriental Jews, carry on a campaign against the Socialist workers which far outstrips even their terroristic offensive against the Arabs. In Palestine, too, the "extermination of Marxism" is on the agenda. Here too the workers' organizations are to be "smashed". The Revisionists' organized strike breakers, their activities resulting in pressure on the wage standard. Parading their Brown-shirts thru the streets, they did everything to provoke the workers. They attacked meetings (a meeting in honor of Brailsford, the English Socialist, was bombarded with stones by their hooligans) and organized gangs to beat up political opponents. Some years ago terrorist groups belonging to their party were discovered in Jerusalem and in Tel Aviv. In 1933 the Revisionist speakers and newspapers conducted an incredible campaign of slander, on the lines of the recent Salengro campaign in France, against Dr. Arlosoroff, then leader of the Labor Party and prominent member of the Zionist Executive. On June 15, the Revisionist Organ culminated its "mud-slinging" campaign by depicting him as a "traitor to the Jewish people, its honor and security". Thirty hours later he (Dr. Arlosoroff) was dead - assassinated in Tel Aviv, the 100% Jewish town.

Similar tactics are employed outside of Palestine. The spread of anti-semitism is welcomed by the Revisionists. They do not fight it. Rather they utilize it to further their own ends. While a wave of persecution and torture swept Germany after the Hitler coup, Jabotinsky made a speech in public in Berlin which was nothing less than a wholesale indictment of the Socialists within the Zionist movement. The aforementioned Hebrew Organ of the Revisionists, the "Hasit Ha'am", 1933, glorified Hitler and presented his movement as a shining example to Zionism. They admire Mussolini and Franco.

In Germany the Revisionists carried out raids on labor clubs. In other countries they perform attacks on Socialists. In other words, the peculiar "spirit" and methods of the Brownshirts are shown to be quite compatible with Judaism. Revisionism proper might be described, to use a mathematical formula, as "Zionism plus Hitlerism", or as "Hitlerism minus Anti-semitism".

In 1925 Jabotinsky was able to muster four followers at the Zionist Congress. In 1933 his followers captured twenty per cent of the total poll and sent forty-five delegates to the Congress. Two years later, they left the Zionist Organization and held a separate convention at which, according to their own reports, delegates representing 700,000 members of the "New Zionist Organization" participated.

The Arab revolt of 1936 was a godsend to these Fascists leading as it did to a wave of chauvinism among the Jews. The Revisionists are doing everything to make capital out of this fact. They are playing a dangerous game, since to them "a world war would be the best chance of realizing the Zionist maximum". Their aim is to become universally recognized as the standard bearers of Zionist intransigence and maximalism. Their slogan continues to be: "Judea must be reborn with fire and blood."

- ABNER BARNATAN -

(Tel Aviv)

----- CHILD LABOR A Class Issue -----

The particular issue that causes so much intra-class conflict among the exploiters from time to time is that of child labor. But the children and youth of the land will continue to be exploited regardless of legislation, protests, and the fine desires of those capitalists whose profit-making does not require the direct expenditure of children's labor-power.

Exploitation of Child Labor is Necessary to Capitalism.

The exploitation of children is a necessary factor in production for profits. Under capitalism, the working class and its children are only a part of the investment capital in the production of surplus value. The labor-power of child workers will be always in demand in capitalist production because its maintenance and reproduction is less costly than that of adult workers. Anything necessary to the production of surplus value cannot be abolished by legislation, but only by a revolutionary working class bent upon changing the relations of production from capitalist to communist relations.

When the framers of the Child Labor Amendment made 18 years the boundary line between childhood and maturity, they had hazardous industries in mind; that is, those particular factories and mills in which the labor-power of children and youth is not so productive.

Under the codes of the one-time National Recovery Act, 100,000 children marched out of mills and factories thruout the country to make places for workers hitherto unemployed because these workers could not successfully bid for the sale of their labor-power at wages at which the children were hired. But American labor embraces more than the industrial scene. Two million children between the ages of ten and eighteen are now listed as working. Industry accounted for only a small proportion of the total. The greatest number, nearly a half million, are engaged in agriculture. Where labor-power is employed on a large scale, children's hands and eyes are important because they are cheaper, and this is why most of the agrarian states oppose legislation prohibiting child labor.

When, over a period of time, the exploitation of

children presents itself to the population in all of its degrading reality, when capitalists themselves can fully view the results of their handiwork--workers with maimed and stunted bodies, mentally subnormal and neurotic,--when such a situation tends to threaten even the existence of capital itself, only then are legislative measures formulated, interpreted, passed upon and enforced. Nevertheless, the gamut of law-making and law enforcement must leave loopholes thru which the politicians eject their interpretation of the law in the interest of those sections of capitalists for whom the labor of children is necessary for their profit-making. In short, the history of child labor legislation reveals the age-old flexibility of capitalist legislation in general, where at times the remedy is worse than the disease.

The visionaries of a haven within capitalism everlastingly rub elbows with politicians in the hope of eradicating this or that over-shadowing feature of capitalist exploitation, but the pious wishes of such "hopefuls" do not allay the affects of capital in its exploitation of the working class and its offspring, as is disclosed from the monotonous history of child labor legislation in this country.

The States' "Legislation" of Child Labor

Every State in the Union has on its statutes laws for the regulation of children's labor. But there are always ways of getting around those laws. An example of this is the amount of tenement home work done by New Jersey children, distributed to them from factories in neighboring states. Thus New York manufacturers who were sending their work to New Jersey to escape the New York regulations against tenement home work, were not subject to the penalties imposed by the New Jersey laws. In this way, they successfully dodged state laws.

Only recently New York's Legislature supported a measure designed "to outlaw sale and production within the State of goods made by child labor as a substitute for ratification of the Federal Child Labor Amendment".

Child workers themselves cross state lines in search of work, where state regulations conflict with the necessity which capitalism forces upon the children who must be exploited in order to live. The importation of children from one state to another is a particular feature of capitalism, and cannot be eliminated so long as capitalist relations exist. As many industries have shifted to the southern states, the difficulty of securing adequate labor power has led to the importation of children from northern cities for seasonal work,

such as exists in the canning industry, these children returning when they are no longer needed.

New York City is the worst example of tenement home work. Thousands of boys and girls, some as young as two and three years old, make artificial flowers, sew garments, make cheap toys. Tedious and menial jobs! The State cannot interfere with this kind of child labor because it licenses tenements for home employment and does not employ sufficient inspectors to see that the child labor laws are obeyed.

Industrial capitalists in some states raise the cry of "Unfairness" when their products must compete on the market with those of manufacturers in states where lower child labor standards are permitted. Even though a Federal minimum of wage rates and hours of labor were fixed for children for all the states, enforcement of these laws proved "too slow and inadequate". For this reason Congress and the Federal administration were finally looked to for the remedy.

Federal Legislation of Child Labor

In December 1906 the first proposals for a Federal law was made in Congress to "prohibit the employment of children in the manufacture or production of articles intended for interstate commerce". Ten years later, in September 1917, the Federal child labor law was adopted. Congress sought in this measure to close the channels of interstate and foreign commerce to the products of child labor. After this law had been in operation nine months, the United States Supreme Court passed a decision that the law was not a legitimate exercise of Congress's power to regulate interstate commerce and was therefore unconstitutional.

Following this decision, Congress enacted, in Feb. 1919, as part of the revenue act of 1918 a provision for a tax of ten per cent on the annual net profit of certain establishments which employed children in violation of the age and hour standards laid down in the act. The Supreme Court again held that this law was not a valid exercise of Congress's right to lay and collect taxes.

Only two methods were therefore left to Congress. It must either abandon the object which was sought in the above two laws, or the constitution must be amended so as to give Congress the power which it was believed to have when these two laws were passed. The latter course was taken.

The type of law that Congress would be likely to pass under the Amendment is as follows: it would prohibit

the shipment of interstate commerce of goods produced in mines and quarries in which children under 16 years of age were employed; or in workshops or factories in which children under 14 years were employed, or in which children aged 14 to 16 worked more than eight hours a day or six days a week or between 7 p.m. and 6 a.m.

The Amendment was submitted for ratification by Congress in 1924, rejected by thirty-five states within three years after it was submitted by a two-thirds vote of Congress and revived in State legislatures in 1933 by the N.R.A. Among the 28 states which have ratified the Amendment are many which originally rejected it. As for the record of rejections by States, since 1933 there have been a total of 41 rejections; of these, eleven came in 1933, seven in 1934, nineteen in 1935, and four in 1936. So much for the hopeless attempt to regulate and prohibit the exploitation of children by capitalist legislation.

The Holy Roman Catholic Church!

The Catholic Church is poking its nose into the issue in the hope of stiffening opposition to ratifying the Amendment. The Amendment, if ratified, would "threaten interference with religious education". This reason took hold of the Church's flock of Democratic members, particularly in the New York State Assembly at Albany and prevented ratification by that Assembly. The Catholic Church partially maintains its schools, convents and orphan asylums by the labor of Catholic orphans and by the labor of those children whose parents cannot afford to pay for their training. The Church is up to its medieval trickery of hiding under its religious cloak the real reasons for its existence.

To the Ladies!

At the time woman suffrage was made lawful in this country, the economic specialists staked their hopes on the woman voter. They expected much improvement in social legislation thru the civic zeal of the woman voter and were confident that American women were against "child slavery". But, alas! furthered capitalism left its mark: there is not the enthusiasm on the part of the women for child welfare that "public spirited" individuals anticipated, although feminine philanthropists continue to go about as usual in Polyanna fashion prying into the humble affairs of working mothers. In the fashionable Biltmore Hotel in New York City, Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, recently appealed to 300 business and professional women "to exercise their ancient mercies" by interesting themselves

in those children who are forced to work. The capitalist class is composed of women as well as men; women who do not hesitate to exploit the children of working mothers if such exploitation assures them a life of leisure. The misery of the working class and its children arises from society's division into economic categories. Therefore, any special appeal to either sex as such is useless.

State Maintenance of Children

From time to time there is advanced the idea that the State should take over the feeding and care of the children, and in this way eliminate child labor. Altho this scheme is entirely an illusion, as capitalism needs the family form for its very existence, assuming State maintenance of children to be possible, then the value of labor-power would drop; it would no longer include the reproduction costs. If parents were relieved of the cost of maintaining their children, then in actuality the wages of the parents will be depreciated by way of competition. Childless married men would compete with the fathers of families and share in the wage reduction without being relieved of any burden. Freed of the care of their children, mothers would be forced into the labor market to sharpen the competition there. Childless wives would also be forced into the struggle for work. Male workers would be compelled to compete with women for their living and their wages would be reduced accordingly. So that capitalism gets the labor-power of the women as well as of the men for the subsistence of the two sexes, instead of only the labor-power of the men.

Child Labor Under Communism

We do not oppose child labor. On the contrary, we are in favor of children working. What we do oppose is the ruthless exploitation of both child and adult workers in the production for profits.

In the absence of capitalist relations of production, children will be required to work, but their labor will be a combination of productive labor with instructions, according to different age periods. Training children at an early age to work will be a necessity under communism. It will lay the foundation during tender years for future useful men and women of a society where each individual contributes his share to the total social labor. Freed from the necessity to exploit the labor of children, society will find no need for "demands", above all, such a sentimental one as "Prohibition of Child Labor", a demand arising from the ruthlessness of capitalist exploitation of children, coupled with the sight of children of the capitalist class who are coddled,

(continued on page 21)

WAGES AND PRICES

To conceal the real situation and disguise the manipulations of the exploiting class has always been the foremost task of the capitalist press. A willing and well serving instrument of capitalism, it does not have to try very hard to twist things around in order to make the functioning of our capitalist system difficult to understand. To get a clear picture of the complex structure of the capitalist apparatus thru newspapers is an impossibility. Statements of the press and comments on current events and economic topics only contribute to the general confusion and ignorance. However, disregarding the partiality and comments of the capitalist press, there remain a number of statistics and quotations valuable for individual analysis.

The New York "Times" said recently: "Steel prices put up to offset outlay for higher wages.....Higher wage rates may act to retard re-employment.....Higher wage rates with a shorter working week and no increase in efficiency, whatever they may mean in dollars, must mean less real income for workers....as if the worker could not get more except at the expense of capital; as if the whole question were one of fair distribution of existing income, and as if granting a living wage to the poorest paid workers were primarily a moral or a legislative issue....The real gains of labor must come from an increase in the national output".

Undoubtedly there is some truth in these statements, but what here is truthful has nothing to do with the question posed at present. True, higher wages and correspondingly higher prices do not increase consumption; on the contrary, there might result a fall in consumption since many workers and middle class people do not get an increase in income. And those workers who are fortunate enough to get wage increases may, after all, not be able to buy more commodities because, according to the theory of bourgeois economists, higher wages are met by higher prices. Hence the struggle for higher wages appears to be senseless since the working class does not seem to gain anything at all. This is precisely what the capitalist press has in mind with its twisting and confusing but nevertheless cleverly advanced phraseology.

What is the real issue? At closer analysis there are a few conspicuous deficiencies in this capitalist theory of wages and prices. Referring to the steel industry,

it will be noted that wages were raised almost without struggle. Due to the grand-scale armament defense programs, the steel industry could hardly fill the recent orders pouring in from everywhere. The supply--altho the steel output in the last year has been tremendous--could hardly satisfy the demand. Raw materials, too, (necessary for the steel industry, as scrap iron, copper, lead, tin) went up considerably. Under these circumstances, price increases were natural. Labor trouble, disturbing this prosperity boom, would be disastrous at this moment. To avoid trouble and loss of profits, wages were raised. Capitalism, in order to assure a smooth functioning of its industries for the near future, in this case could afford to give a little of its increased profits to labor. As mentioned before, it could also afford to raise the price since steel is very much in demand at present. Nevertheless, to let the workers know what is waiting for them if they keep on asking for higher wages, the theory of higher prices due to higher wages was brought to their attention. Labor's situation, however, is somewhat different. We recall that prices in the food and clothing industry--industries where the workers mainly invest their money for life necessities--went up long ago, and continue to rise. Precisely because of these higher prices of their life necessities, workers in other industries were forced to demand higher wages also.

The capitalist is not so wicked or greedy that he does not want to give a living wage to labor; as a matter of fact, it is of interest to each capitalist to give as many life necessities to his workers as possible in order to keep them fit for the more and more intensive work they are required to do with the growth of the productive apparatus. But each capitalist is also interested in raising his own profitability, and if possible at the expense of other capitalists. Therefore, if the prices for food, clothing and shelter can be kept down, so much the better, because in that case the wage earning class can be satisfied with less money. However, if prices for the consumption goods of the workers should rise and force them to demand higher wages, the capitalists will fight with all means at their disposal in order not to reduce their profits.

The capitalist press also stresses the point that higher wages are justified only if there is sufficient increase in efficiency and national output. While we do not refute this conception, we like to refer to the fact that both these conditions were fulfilled to a great extent last year before the present strike wave for higher wages set in. According to official statistics, the total Net Profits of several main industries for the first nine months of 1936, in comparison to the same time in 1935,

were as follows:

	1936	1935
Steel	\$62,300,000	\$7,500,000
Machinery	18,400,000	8,700,000
Food	97,400,000	75,800,000
Textiles	2,500,000	1,100,000

Against this tremendous gain in profits, we have the following figures for labor:

Employed in:	Nov. 1936	Nov. 1935
Steel	841,100	719,900
Machinery	985,600	854,500
Food	758,500	716,200
Textiles	1,707,600	1,631,000

with the following pay rolls:

Steel	\$23,252,000	17,039,000
Machinery	25,117,000	19,779,000
Food	16,429,000	14,415,000
Textiles	27,621,000	25,563,000

If we bring these figures in relation to each other, we see that although average wages were about 10% higher in 1936 than a year before, capitalism succeeded in raising its net profits by an average of 50%. How high the actual output in commodities was these figures do not reveal. However, since it was possible to increase the profits so tremendously (with approximately only 10% more workers), there is reason to assume that the productivity (compare the figures of the machine industry) has grown immensely.

In another corner of the capitalist press--in the "Business Section" that is seldom read by workers--we find the following interesting statement: "...An advance such as occurred in 1936 has always been characteristic of a period in which consumption and business activity were recovering rapidly, after a depression period. For this disproportionate rise, the reason is perfectly well known. It has been only to a relatively small degree a result of the increased consumption of better times.... Primarily, it has measured the great change since the early Thirties in the world's agricultural production; particularly the recurrence of short crops such as always follows prolonged abundance; this action of Nature being emphasized by the official program of restricted acreage in this country".

Here we approach the state of reality much closer. Supply and demand, abundance of goods and restriction programs play a decisive role in the determination of the market price. It was Marx who gave us a clear

picture of the functioning of capitalist society. He started from the conception that commodities--or new values--are created by labor power only. Price is nothing but the monetary expression of value; the conversion of value into price by which commodities are expressed as quantities (hours) of social average labor. Commodities sell at their value, or in other words, in proportion to the quantity of labor realized in them in the production process. In calculating the exchangeable value of a commodity, we must add to the quantity of labor last employed, the quantity of labor previously worked up in raw materials, and labor bestowed upon the means of production. However, the real value of commodities is subject to the fluctuations of the market, namely, supply and demand. If supply and demand would equilibrate, which very rarely happens in reality, the market price of a commodity would coincide with its real value. Thus, according to the laws of supply and demand, commodities sell in the market sometimes below, sometimes above their real value.

Wages constitute only a part of prices, that is, a part of the value (or price) of the total labor time employed. The total value--in terms of money--goes partly to labor in wages, partly to the capitalist in profits. If the exploiting class is forced to give a greater share in wages to labor, its own share, the profit part, will be reduced. This would, however, broadly speaking, not affect the prices of commodities, or their values, since the labor time incorporated in a given amount of commodities has not changed thru this process.

Capitalists, by economic laws, have to raise their profitability constantly, and since the most productive enterprise realizes the highest profits, and maximum output means maximum returns, they are compelled to increase continuously the productivity by installing newer and better machinery, improving management and extracting greater efficiency from the workers. Only by enlarging the output and decreasing the cost of production can capitalists attain the required rate of profit. Because wages constitute a part of the production cost, the exploiting class has to cut down also in this direction as much as possible. Under these circumstances, labor will be forced to fight again and again for higher wages in order to acquire the necessities of life. To quote Marx: "...a struggle for a rise of wages follows only in the track of previous changes and is the necessary offspring of previous changes in the amount of production, the productive powers of labor, the value of labor, the value of money, the extent or the intensity of labor extracted, the fluctuations of market prices, dependent upon the fluctuations of demand and supply, and consistent with the different phases of the

(continued on page 21)

SHOP DELEGATES AND WORKERS' CONTROL

The article below, by Maurice Chambelland, appeared some time ago in "Revolution Proletarienne" (Paris). It deals with the question of shop delegates from a trade-unionist point of view. Our opinions differ from those stated below, but we find the views of the author, as they are related to a concrete problem in France, interesting enough to give them some space in the C.C., if for no other reason than to show that even from a trade-union outlook the problem of shop councils becomes a very important one.

At the unity congress at Toulouse, when we were faced with the choice between the electoral program of the Popular Front and the plan of the C.G.T. (french trade unions)--a choice that was finally not made because of the unanimous resolution--we declared that we could rally to the Plan (of the C.G.T.) as against the treacherous publicity stunt of the Popular Front, under the condition that the Plan would be made complete with the institution of shop delegates.

The self-styled "realistic" authors of the Plan had not thought of that. There was not a word in the Plan about shop delegates. I deposed before the Plan commission the following text: "There shall be instituted in each concern or shop of more than fifty workers a representation of the personnel under the following form:

1. Trade union shop delegates (the word "trade union" was added at Jouhaux's insistence) having as their function the watching over the application of the collective agreements and the social law, and particularly concerning the length of work. The power of the delegates shall apply to all questions interesting the personnel of the establishment, especially hiring and dismissal.
2. 'Safety' trade union delegates whose task shall be watching over the hygiene, and protection against accidents."

Less than three months later, in June, the shop delegates were officially instituted, first by the Matignon agreement, then by the law of the 24th of June, 1936.

In my study of the role and future of the shop delegates, today a living reality in all our shops, I shall not consider the historic and juridic aspect of the question.... We want to consider the question in its present aspect, from the practical angle and try to see clearly in the future. Here is something very important. It is a question of the organization and action of those who were the inspirers of the June days. In June, our labor movement was transformed. Even after unity (between the French Federation of Labor and the C.P. trade unions) it remained a movement where organizations of government employees, railway men, post office workers, teachers and workers in the public services had a marked preponderance. The industrial workers were small in number. In view of this, our trade union movement was not very representative. A true trade union movement ought to be based especially on the forces of production; it should unite, above all, the industrial proletariat.

But it was different after June. Industrial workers entered our unions by the millions. There is no factory today that has not its trade union organization and its shop delegates.

Delegates Inside the Establishments

As you know, the notion of "trade union delegates", that is to say, delegates appointed by trade union organizations, was not kept. The Matignon agreement and the law on collective bargaining stipulated that the shop delegates should be elected by the entire personnel. This is better. The shop delegates are really the direct and genuine representatives of the workers.

The elections are held by means of the secret ballot. The secret ballot offers the worker the possibility to manifest freely his opinion. This must be conserved. The workers who do not belong to the trade union can vote and can be elected. There is nothing wrong about either. Imagine a reversal of the situation. Supposing that tomorrow we are given trade-unionism with the fascist sauce. We shall be happy to dispose of the possibility of expressing our opinion and acting in our place of work, outside of the fascist trade union organization.... That does not mean that in the present elections the trade union organization of the factory should not do its best to elect its candidate.

House Committees

The law says that every establishment including more than ten workers ought to elect a delegate and a deputy delegate... This applies as well to establishments

composed of several shops or services...It would have been best to have advised immediately the delegates of the various categories to constitute among themselves a permanent organization that would bring them together periodically. In other words, we should have created, and we must create now, house committees. One day a month the delegates of the various categories will get together to examine grievances in each service, as well as general grievances...The house committee can be administered by an office. I think we must oppose the notion of a "general delegate" springing up in certain establishments. In the "Parisian Book", at the large Paul Dupont print shop, two general delegates were created for the entire establishment. They have not touched their tools since June. They are really "permanent"...but for the boss' benefit.

We must oppose the notion of "delegates general" because the trade union effort should be a "collective" effort and not an individual effort, no matter how much confidence is placed in a militant. On the other hand, forming the house committees, we should avoid dualism with the trade union organism that might exist in the establishment. In the place where I work, we solved the problem by deciding that men of confidence or collectors for the trade union, or trade unions, who are not personally elected as delegates should nevertheless sit in the house committee, alongside of the delegates. Thus the house committee is at the same time the meeting of the delegates and the inter-union committee of the establishment.

The Work of the Delegates

The law says that the delegates "present to the management individual grievances that might not have satisfied immediately..." Now that there are shop delegates everywhere, we must make our comrades understand that, in their interest, they ought to abandon all direct individual grievances. We should not give the boss the opportunity to divide in order to rule. Individual grievances should be presented to the delegate of the category....who should present the disputed point to the house committee. Thus each worker and each category will profit by the total support given by the personnel to grievances individual and collective, recognized as justifiable by the house committee. It is understood that we must persuade rather than oblige; authoritarianism should be carefully avoided in the relation between the delegates and their electors.

It would be useful to specialize some members of the house committee in the periodic inspection of the establishment, and adjustment with the management of such matters as ventilation, heating, wardrobes, water closets

and showers, as well as safety devices. It would be useful to have a delegate specialize in the matter of work, --accidents and their adjustments.

The meeting of the house committee will occupy itself also with the following general grievances:

1. the enforcement of wage scales established by the collective agreement; the establishment and the respect for piece rates; the verification and the mitigation of production timing.
2. enforcement of the 40 hour week, and the policing of overtime work.
3. the organization of vacations.

All of this is accomplished normally in collaboration with the unions, since responsible union members sit in the house committee....Trade union recruiting is one of the principle tasks of the shop delegates. They need here the utmost of suppleness; they must avoid the creation of "cells" hostile to the trade union organization. This suppleness is just as important when dealing with members of the "Christian" or autonomous unions. Nothing must be done that would make a worker permeable to maneuvers by the boss.

The Shop Delegates and the Unions

What the delegates have to do in their shops is in fact no different from what the trade union organization has to do there. The tasks of the shop delegates and the trade union mix. Indeed, the delegate should inspire and organize the trade union in his shop....The institution of shop delegates is in a way the realization of the idea of "trade unionism in the place of work".. But how does our trade union machine work here? What are the relations between the shop delegates and the trade union organizations? If we look closely at what is happening in the Paris region, we shall notice misunderstandings that threaten to compromise this rebirth of trade unionism. (Chambelland gives a number of instances of the callous indifference and officiousness shown by the trade union offices to the shop delegates who came with grievances. He describes the several ways in which the delegates are responsible for their misunderstandings with the unions; impatience, striking with little provocation, dealing with the boss without trade union support.)

What Remedies?

The simplest way of ameliorating these relations is to plainly apply in our unions the rules of worker democracy...The trade union membership in certain trades has become too large for general assemblies. The largest hall in Paris would not suffice for some Parisian unions; and if this were possible, we should not really have there a general assembly but a huge meeting where general discussion and the power of free choice are succumbed before disgusting demagoguery.

Our trade unions should try a formula which will permit them to assimilate without any trouble the movement of trade union delegates. It is the shop delegates who are now the base of the trade union. How can we apply here our old principle, according to which the trade union organization should be directed from below and not from above?

What Can Replace the General Assembly?

An annual or semi-annual congress of shop delegates preceded by serious deliberations by each house committee. All enterprises will be able to exercise the strength of the trade unions completely. The shop congresses are the formula of the future so long as they can deliberate regularly and administer the organization directly and not be just simple consulting assemblies. Each industrial branch should be given an autonomy sufficiently large to be able to exist...A liaison between the house committees is indispensable in facing the concentration of the boss victoriously. The executive commission of a local committee is formed: from half a dozen militants elected by the general assembly of trade unionists living in the locality; by a representative of each trade union section of any enterprise of that locality.

Thus the local committee can call a meeting and organize the shop delegates...The tasks of the local committees among other things consist in giving out food supplies in the event of a strike.

With reference to this, what has happened? Local committees have generally fallen under the influence of parties whose militants seized most of the positions of local "permanents" to the detriment of trade unionism...Education in theoretical and practical trade unionism must be developed to the maximum.

The Future of the Shop Delegates?

To be sure the bosses did not accept shop delegates willingly. The bosses have felt that their authority in the matter of work would be limited and reduced. It is certain the bosses will multiply their efforts to render difficult the normal functioning of the law and the application of collective conventions. We must show the shop delegates the importance of their role and indicate to them the elasticity of their powers...A thousand circumstances in the life of the shops lend themselves marvelously to the realization of worker control. But they must use their greatest initiative. Thus they will acquire the capacity of administration. Thus they will be able tomorrow to have the enterprises "turn" in the trade union region.

CHILD LABOR.-(continued from page 11)

overfed, trained at an early age to class distinction, with an aversion to work. For that future society, the demands, protests and legislation attempting to "prohibit" child labor, all the issues concomitant to the exploitation of the working class and its offspring, will form only a part of the historical epoch that was capitalism.

WAGES AND PRICES.-(continued from page 15)

industrial cycle, in one word, as reaction of labor against the previous action of capital". (Value, Price and Profit).

The need of capitalism to increase continuously its profitability on the one hand, and the growing impossibility of granting the masses a fair existence on the other hand, will sharpen its contradictions and difficulties. The capitalist press might try to dope the workers with cleverly worded phrases, but the urge to live is greater and cannot be nourished permanently with phraseology.

- - - - -

NOTES ON PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITS

Private property of the means of production was the greatest revolutionary power history has ever known. Since the beginning of industrial production (about 1800) the capitalists' desire and need for bigger profits turned out to be the great magician capable of changing the surface of entire continents in less than 100 years. Capitalism learned to master the forces of nature and to put them into its service. Its strivings for profits distributed huge amounts of commodities over almost all parts of the globe and, simultaneously, was instrumental in the tremendous increase of the population. The population of Europe, for instance, was estimated in 1800 at 187 millions; in 1910 there were 447 millions, and in 1915 already 462 millions.

Such a rapid growth was possible only on account of the fast development of the means of production which, in turn, changed also the human relationship. Industrial production specialized the labor process; workers no longer toiled for themselves but for society; they became tools in the hands of profit-hungry capitalists. Private property created vast armies of wage slaves against which chattel slavery is but child's play. "The bourgeoisie has created quite different wonders than Egyptian Pyramids, Roman waterworks and Gothic cathedrals". (Communist Manifesto). The desire for profits was the great motor in this development. But not the desire for profit alone. The capitalists, individually or united, constantly wage war against each other for the greatest possible part of the profits which the working class is able to create. The desire for profit is simultaneously a struggle about the profit. (To illustrate this point, let us assume the following: ten capitalists wish to share the total profit of 100. If they could reach some agreement, they would allot to each one ten units; but because they cannot agree--this is beyond their will power on account of some deeper rooted facts--they try to snatch as much as possible. Some might get 20, while the weaker might get only 5. That is why we said they fight also about the profit.)

The fight about the profit is, at the same time, a struggle for the preservation of capital. As a result of these struggles, we record the formation of trusts and monopolies which means that the struggles continue on an enlarged scale and disrupt from time to time the entire organism of capitalist economy.

In order to understand the rapid tempo of the social

development, it is necessary not to forget that profitability is the basis for capital production. Profitability demands alertness on the part of the individual capitalist to assure a certain profit level. How high must this level be? We may remark here that the level is determined by the social average rate of profit (of all capitalists). Some capitalists realize more than the average, some less--the total profit divided by the number of capitalists gives the average. Those capitals which remain below the average are not profitable and are bound to collapse first at the beginning of a crisis.

To assure the average profit, therefore, is the main object of any capitalist while those who realize more are interested to retain that position. We may refer to the not altogether insignificant fact that it is not greediness on the part of the capitalist to assure at least the average profit. There are other more far reaching motives. It is an empirical fact that an enterprise which realizes annually 3% profit, while the average profit demands 8%, becomes within a relatively short time unprofitable and goes bankrupt.

The necessity to gain the average profit compels every enterprise to continuous improvements of the means of production as, otherwise, it might be left behind unfit to carry on the competitive struggle. It is like a race, but a race which knows no end and whose pace increases with each cycle.

Aside from these facts, the problem of the average rate of profit can also be approached from another angle, namely, from the viewpoint of the productivity within the factories. One can easily visualize that the factory with the lowest production cost (overhead) produces not only more cheaply than others but realizes also the greatest profits. The most productive enterprise realizes the highest profits. This does not mean that it also produces the greatest amount of commodities, but it merely indicates that the cost is lowest. If we would compile the production cost of all enterprises and would compare them, we would recognize many variations which radiate around a certain index. In other words, the productivity of all enterprises radiates around the social average productivity.

Seen in this light, struggle for average profit is nothing else but the struggle for the social average productivity; and because each enterprise must assure for itself that average profit in order to continue production profitably, it is simultaneously forced to keep in line with the attained social average of productivity.

The most important factor to raise the productivity of the labor process is the installment of newer and better labor saving machinery. With them, the workers can turn out more products--the productivity per worker increases. Although this results at first in a price increase for raw materials and other means of production, this increase is compensated by the greater mass of finished products which means that the price for the single product falls. The improved technical composition of capital, therefore, enlarges the mass of products, but at the same time decreases the cost per single product. This antagonistic development forces upon the capitalist the necessity of finding new markets.

We see that the struggle for the average profit and average productivity leads directly towards the struggle for markets. And just as little as the struggle for the average rate of profit could be traced back to the capitalists' greediness, just as little can the struggle for markets--whose climax is the imperialist war--find its origin therein. Not the greediness or wickedness of the capitalists is responsible for misery and war, but rather certain laws of motion imminent in the capitalist system of production. It is an actual life necessity for capitalists to fight other private property owners, within the factories and on the open market, for the required profit rate. As long as it is possible to wage these competitive struggles with peaceful means, so long will capitalism pursue a policy of peaceful expansion. However, should it become impossible to continue profitably such a policy, or should the contradictions become unsurmountable, then the differences lead to open warfare. And again, not because the capitalists are blood-thirsty, but because the "country"--that is, capitalism as a system--is actually endangered.

The struggle of the capitalists to lower the cost of production goes hand in hand with the expansion of production. Capitalists improve the means of production because they must seek to increase the output. But the starting point of this process, as we have seen, was the struggle for average productivity and for this reason improvements are life necessities for capitalism which it cannot escape. If a capitalist does not follow the trend of technical development, his business will soon operate below the average rate of productivity and is bound to go bankrupt. He must improve his machinery because this alone enables him to lower the cost price for each commodity produced and permits him to remain in the "contest". Hence, improvement and expansion of production is the method under which the various capitals fight for preservation. The faster the technical development proceeds, the more aggressive the capitalists are in their endeavor to exploit the new devices;

only to increase manifold the output, thereby cheapening the value of the product again. A vicious circle, but whose progressive development no capitalist can retard. Along with technical development goes a tremendous waste of labor power. If Ford, for instance, increases the productivity in his factories by the introduction of better machinery, he thereby raises, at the same time, the average productivity. This means that all other automobile factories not only lag behind Ford in productivity, but that also their rentability has decreased. In relation to Ford, their invested capital for means of production has been depreciated; and although they may work at top speed, their profits begin to shrink. This tendency in the fall of the rate of profit can be overcome only by introducing the same-(or better) new devices than the competitor has introduced. Naturally, this requires an immense outlay in new capital. We see that technical development under capitalism very often means destruction of machinery that could not be termed old or worn, yet it has become old and outclassed because it does not fulfill the requirements necessary to guarantee the average rate of profit. This "moral depreciation" of machinery is the greater the faster technical develops. The capitalists, of course, anticipate such "depreciation" and build up big reserve funds. But because these funds must exceed the actual technical depreciation caused by the production process, the social waste of labor power is enormous.

A European paper said: "The enemy of fixed capital is the rising number of technical improvements and inventions which, although they help to raise the cultural level of humanity, are more destructive to economic life than is generally anticipated. How many goods are being produced never to be used! Of how much use value was a machine that had to be replaced by a more productive one, to the respective factory? We can see this process of depreciation in almost all enterprises, and we begin to recognize the enormous waste of labor and capital destruction the "machine age" has created. For some industries it has become increasingly difficult to build large enough reserve funds to replace depreciated models".

The tempo of industrial development is not only determined by technical improvements but also by the amount of profits which the workers create (by profits we understand here dividends, interest, etc.). The amount of profit, expressed in money, exceeds the amount of wages paid, probably by more than double. All profits are divided into at least two parts: one goes into the consumption fund for the capitalist, while the other is reinvested in order to realize during the following production cycle still greater profits. That part which

cannot be profitably reinvested in his own enterprise is loaned to banks or traded at the stock exchange from where it flows back into the production process of other capitalists, only to return again in the form of dividends or interest to the first capitalist.

Inasmuch as profits add new capital to the production process, they are a socially necessary function. Capital which fights for the average rate of productivity receives from the capital investing "public" the needed 'ammunition', and the fight for the preservation of the fixed capital simultaneously there becomes a struggle for investment capital.

So long as the banks have a superfluity of money, it is cheap; i.e., credits and loans have a low rate of interest. But with increasing production activity, the demand for capital grows and the rate of interest rises, or money becomes dearer. Climbing of the interest rate indicates not only a shortage of investment capital, but also that capitalists are competing among each other to get it at the most favorable rates.

It is of great importance not to lose sight of the social function of profits. It reveals that the tempo of development depends to a great degree upon the amount of capital that is seeking investment. The greater the disposable amount of profit, the more intense is the technical development. In other words: under capitalism the process of production is the more profitable the less the wage-earning class consumes. The less the wage earners consume, the more is left for the capitalist class. The more they have at their disposal, the better they can wage that necessary struggle for the preservation of capital.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

NOTICE

In the production of the "OUTLINE STUDY COURSE IN MARXIAN ECONOMICS" technical difficulties have delayed us and we cannot ship copies until April 3rd.

Subscribe for your copy NOW. This is a limited edition. Price - 50 cents per copy.

TROTSKY AND PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.

Leon Trotsky fell into an error within an error. To him present "proletarian dictatorship" in Russia is more real and hence more characteristic than some vague dictatorship of the workers that shall arise in the future. Thus we have it that in Russia there is a workers' dictatorship and secondly, this supposed dictatorship is representative. That this "living example" should color his conceptions of the future forms of workers' rule is, to him, a matter of necessity. What indeed could be more indicative of things to come than the thing that has already come.

Mirroring the Russian set-up, for him, the struggle for power must proceed, in the order of their importance, with first the party; by a distant second, the unions; and last and least important, the councils. The "spontaneous factor" is properly accredited, but without the iron will, the tried and experienced, the semi-military-party, everything not only may, but must be, lost. From all of which must inevitably arise the intransigent "line", though he would insist it is only the principle that is adamant; there must also arise the bureaucratic organization; the indisposition to admit mistakes in order to avoid affecting the organization's prestige and finally, there must arise great, greater and yet greater leaders who must respectively commit great, greater and yet greater stupidities and blunders.

In his travels, Gulliver discovered the Empire of Blefuscu. Trotsky looks thru the spyglass of his theory and finds a proletarian form of rule in Russia. The story each tells is equally entertaining and valid. For first of all things it must be established that the proletarian dictatorship (and upon this point history itself has given the ruling) can mean only a power which is grounded upon a production level permitting the introduction of economic plenty, abundance and surplus. It is a power which can assume actuality in the world-wide and communistic sense only after capitalism has run its gamut of development.

If it is taken into account that proletarian power rests, not upon the human will but like capitalist dictatorship, upon a specific level of industrial development and the resultant market conditions, (which

have priority to "will" and which determine what the human relations to production should be) then one will seek the evidence of power in the level of development, in the concomitant mode of production, in the mode of exchange.

Indeed, scientifically, there is no other way to explain an economic and political system except by an investigation of how things are made (how great, if at all, is the social division of labor) and how, if at all, these things are exchanged. Only from such an investigation evolves the information of whether exchange values are being produced, whether labor-power is exchanged for wages, whether capital is accumulating, and whether surplus-value is being appropriated. One cannot guess at a social system and insist upon having caught a right (as if by divination) against another's wrong. A system is explained by its economic mechanics and dynamics, or it is not explained nor understood.

The Simple is Too Profound

Incapable of grasping these simplicities, Trotsky snubs them out of existence by ignoring them. The truly great can only be concerned with the profundities.

This is the stage of imperialism, and countries have developed unevenly. A backward country may capture power and this may facilitate the capture of power in a more advanced country. Capitalism is an international system. Now, when workers have captured power in a backward country, while waiting for others to come to their aid, is not that a proletarian dictatorship?

When workers have captured power on the Fiji Islands, what is the world significance of such a power? It is that workers have captured power on the Fiji Islands. No more and no less.

Trotsky's is the dramatized way of looking at revolution and social processes. A general strike in a highly industrialized country has more significance from the point of view of world revolution than the capture of power upon a Fiji Island as large as one-sixth of the earth. The capturing of "power" when there is no power (industries) in a country that is ripening for capitalism (as in Russia) is the taking out of insurance that the workers are undertaking the governmental tasks of the bourgeoisie, under and not above a bourgeois system of production. It is precisely the uneven development of countries that makes for these undesired but inescapable anomalies.

It is not precluded that in the event of another such

backward October, the workers of the "West" will come to the aid in time. That is not the question here, (which, by the way, is not one that will ever be determined theoretically). The point here considered is that since the West did not come to the aid of the Russian workers, what does that make of the present Russian regime, and how does Trotsky contemplate this regime.

Trotsky makes a logical equation: the workers in Russia have captured power, hence there is a proletarian dictatorship in Russia. Even the premise for such an equation is false without introducing the peasants and their aims and the petty urban bourgeoisie with their aspirations. Nor is it correct to say that the workers without these classes or against them have conquered in October. But Trotsky sees the question of workers' power not, first, in its economic mollifications but in its phenomenal outlines. "A thing is because it seems".

But did not the workers under the Bolsheviks take power? Surely a hard and fast question calculated to dissipate any false ideas. But asking this question is but another way of saying: did not the workers enforce, by armed might, the new relations to production? To pose the question is to receive the answer: They did not. For new socialistic relations to production were not established even if the former aristocracy and few but concentrated capitalists were expropriated. To insist that nationalization of industry and state control of banking is in, and by, itself a socialist measure, is to approve of what Mussolini and, to an ever increasing extent, Hitler claims for themselves. What is pertinent is whether there is abundant industry that comes into possession of the armed workers.

The Russian Revolution, in the historical sense, was the capture of the factory-yard of the world without managing to capture the factory. Yet there remains another point to consider. On Nov. 7, 1917, the Russian proletariat defeated its enemies and retained its guns. Subsequently the "International" and "Buddenny's Cavalry" were heard far and wide. Speeches concerning Socialism were promulgated from all platforms. What was the meaning of all that?

The meaning is that the proletariat, because of its propertylessness, does not, like the young bourgeoisie, establish its economic power first and then proceed to capture state power, but must act conversely. And it is this necessity that stands behind the "weak link" that has determined immature, though necessarily

justifiable, efforts at the capture of power.

Correctly construed, when the Russian workers acted, it was the world's workers acting where they could, (in Russia) because they could not yet act where they would (in industrial countries). When this backward effort succeeds, the power is both real and enigmatic. It is hinged so completely upon the mood of workers in other lands that with them it is positive, without them - negative.

The proletarian dictatorship is no mere matter of avenging oneself upon ones enemies. What is involved in the essence of such a dictatorship is the destruction of the former system of production (not as Lenin insisted: the destruction first of the state and that act is all-sufficing. Russia has illustrated that the old state can be destroyed but the old system remains), and the "freeing" of the productive capacities.

Since proletarian dictatorship is the same as an unhindered path to plenty and material equality, the former rich having been expropriated, there may logically be different forms of that dictatorship; but for it to be a workers' dictatorship in the first place, the requisite remains that this path continues, in the main, unobstructed. When a proletarian dictatorship rests upon a capitalist economy (surplus value and its appropriation, capital accumulation) and finds it necessary in the interests of its economy to enforce and produce not plenty for the workers but poverty (relative pauperization), not material equality but ever expanding inequality, one may ask, how can such a dictatorship be proletarian?

It is actually maintaining that a particular capitalism is socialism because its founders endeavored to be followers of Marx. The proof presented cannot therefore be the system but the integrity of the leaders.

Trotsky does not see capitalism in Russia, for to admit that would be admitting that other Russian workers, now either dead or dying in Verkhny, Uralsk, were right and that he was wrong. It would be both personally and politically embarrassing to the "Old Man" and then it may well be that his ignorance of Marxian economics prevents him from calling things by their name.

Trotsky looks not upon the new capitalists in Russia but upon the memory of his conquests for Socialism. It is therefore small wonder why the assassin face of Stalin is more vivid to him than the exploitation of the Russian masses. And where are these new capitalists in Russia, pray?

What is a capitalist? It is as childish to say that a capitalist is a man with a lot of money as that he is a fellow with a big waistline. A capitalist is an agency by route of which capital accumulates. He is of the class, secondly, that receives greater material means from production. In other words, in a system where the accumulation of capital goes on and where there are people who gain more than most other people, such a system bespeaks the presence of capitalists. To the system itself it is not pertinent whether the capitalist is the sole and titular owner of an industry or whether he shares it equally with a hundred others; whether he owns privately a billion dollars or a measly two hundred thousand rubles, and only a couple of servants.

What is the Proletarian Dictatorship?

The proletarian dictatorship is not a substantial and finished product like a workers' club or the Palace of Soviets; it is a process which, like all social processes, assumes definite forms only to the immediate and momentary onlooker. The Marxist must seek in this process the complete unfolding of the entire social highway over to the point of Communism. The proletarian dictatorship does not end until what is now the most backward colonial country turns socialist. Such a gamut provides for many variations in power-form, for set-backs and for temporary defeats. For the very first effort at Proletarian dictatorship to provide a guidebook to power is surely a bit of laughter fit to peal thru the ages. But such are the conceits of the "great" of whom with the passing of Lenin and Trotsky and with the real advent of workers' power there shall be none left.

That the very term "proletarian dictatorship" has by now become objectionable to the masses is hardly to be questioned. Thanks for this is naturally due the Comintern for what it has done with this power while it existed in hot-house form, and what it has done since the defeat of the Russian proletariat. Indubitably, a new term will evolve to replace this odious one.

How a false theoretical estimate must lead to bad tactical and organizational conclusions is classically demonstrated by Trotsky's pathetic efforts to defeat Stalin by organizing the world revolution.

From "corrupt workers bureaucracy" and Bonapartism, there poured the resultant "lines" respectively of reforming the Comintern and of building a new Comintern. The failure of both efforts is too glaring to

be debated. The entry of his little crew into the slough of the Second International was the move of a frustrated man. But this frustration did not entirely fail to give rise to some wisdom, for with these uncertain moves came the realization of more possible forms than the Leninist whereby the workers may take over and "unleash" industry.

Now Trotsky may no longer be reckoned among the Marxists. He was a "great" man who cannot fit into the picture of a great multitude, which is the picture of this day.

The fiction of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia is, for Stalin, a means to kill class conscious workers and to set up a machine of world wide counter revolution; for Trotsky it is a self-defeating word-laden labyrinth. To Marxists, the present Russian regime is State Capitalist. It remains their duty to expose this prostitution to those workers who rightfully aspire to and struggle for a cleaner and healthier society.

- H. Smith -

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

This publication has justified its aim and continues to present the world's most significant thought and action. This journal dares to print what the uniformed mighty condemn.

Subscription-\$1.50 yearly, U.S.A.
(8 months - \$1.00)

Subscribe now.

P.O.Box 44, Station O,
New York City, N. Y.

IN GERMAN - RAETEKORRESPONDENZ

Herausgegeben monatlich von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommuniten, Holland; enthaelt aufschlussreiche Artikel ueber die Arbeiterbewegung und sollte fuer jeden unserer Freunde und Genossen von interesse sein. Einzelheft 10c durch uns zu beziehen.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

Anarchism and the Spanish Revolution

The Economic Organization of the Revolution

Nature and Significance of Overproduction

The Character of the Present Crisis

NEW BOOKS

The Revolution Betrayed . . . The End of Socialism in Russia

The Recovery Problem in the United States

Vol. III

Nos. 5 & 6

JUNE 1937

Also YEARLY

10c A COPY