NOTE

1. Radical Periodicals in America, 1890-1950, published by Yale University Library, 1964, states erroneously that council Communists “never affiliated with any major party,” and that the “great majority of its members were former members of the German Sozialistische Arbeiter-Partei.” However, council communism was the program of the first west-European Communist parties before they were changed into parties of the Leninist type to fit them into the Third International. As regards the American group, none of its members had belonged to the Sozialistische Arbeiter-Partei, which held a position midway between social democracy and Bolshevism. The few Germans in the American group came from the German council movement. The large majority were native workers, and those with a political background came either from the Industrial Workers of the World or from the left wing of the Proletarian party—the most “American” of the three Socialist groups that had vied for Russian acceptance as the “official” Communist party.
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WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

In communism, the process of production is no longer a process of capital expansion, but only a labor process in which society draws from nature the means of consumption which it needs. No longer are values produced, but only articles for use. As an economic criterion, the necessity of which is undeniable, since both production and the productive apparatus must be made to conform to the social need, the only thing which can still serve is the labor time employed in the production of goods. It is no longer the 'value' but the calculation in terms of use articles and the immediate labor time required for their production which is the necessary form of expression of a regulated communist economy.

And so, from the standpoint of Marxism, the Russian experiments in planned economy are not to be rated as socialistic. The Russian practice is not directed according to communist principles, but follows the laws of capitalist accumulation. We have here, even though in modified form, a surplus-value production under the ideological camouflage of "socialist construction." The wage relation is identical with that of capitalist production, forming also in Russia the basis for the existence of a growing bureaucracy with mounting privileges; a bureaucracy which, by the side of the private capitalist elements which are still present, is strictly to be appraised as a new class appropriating to itself surplus labor and surplus value. From the Russian experience no positive conclusions can be drawn which have a relation to communist production and distribution. It still offers only examples of the way in which communism can not be developed.

The decisive problem of a communist economy do not come up until after the market, wage labor, money, etc., have been completely dispensed with. The very fact of the existence of the wage relation signifies that the means of production are not controlled by the producers, but stand over against them in the form of capital; and this circumstance further compels a reproduction process in the form of capital accumulation. This latter is, by the Marxist theory, beside and because of its validity as a law of crisis and collapse, at the same time the reproduction of misery, and hence also the Russian workers pro-
The productivity of the Russian workers increases faster than their wages; of the increasing social product they receive a relatively ever smaller share. To Marx this relative pauperization of the working population in the course of accumulation is only a phase of the absolute pauperization; it is only another expression for the increasing exploitation of the workers, and to denominate this as the "growth of socialism" is after all hardly possible.

The gist of the Bolshevist "theory of socialization" may be sketched as follows: With the revolutionary overthrow, i.e. the expropriation of capital, the power over the means of production and hence the control over production and the distribution of the products passes into the hands of the state apparatus. This latter then organizes the various branches of production in accordance with the national plan and puts them, as a state monopoly, at the service of society. With the aid of statistics, the central authority computes and determines the magnitude and kind of production, as also the apportionment of the products and producers.

The concept that the mere centralization of the means of production in the hands of the State; as regards the producers, however, nothing has changed. No more than under capitalism do they themselves exercise the command over the products of their labor, for they still lack the control over the means of production. Just as before, their only means of livelihood is the sale of their labor power. The only difference is that they no longer require capital to deal with the individual capitalist, but with the total capitalist, the State, as the purchaser of labor power.

In the mind of the Bolshevist theoretician, as in that of the Social Democrat, money is the instrument which has already made production "ripe for socializing"; the only thing left to do is to give a "socialistic" form to distribution. The decisive aspect of the matter here is the organizational-technical side of the production process; the side developed by monopoly capitalism or to be copied from it, instead of the truly basic factor of communist economy: the economic relation between production and producer.

The conception that the mere centralization of the means of production in the hands of the State is to be regarded as socialization precluded the practical employment of an accounting unit in keeping with a communist mode of economy. Centralized power over social production and distribution admitted of no form of accounting by which an uninterrupted economic process was possible as a substitute for money economy. The Russian attempts at a natural economy during the period of "war communism" completely miscarried. Money accounting had to be re-established.

Under capitalism, the means of production (mp) and labor (l) appear in the form of fixed and variable (v) capital. The value of v is the surplus value (s). The capitalistic formula of production is mp+v. It is only because mp appears as mp+s, that it is possible to attain s. If v drops out, so does s, and vice versa. What remains is the concrete, material form of mp+s, that is mp+l, the means of production and labor. The communist formula of production is mp+l.

The development of mp and l proceeds in any society; it is nothing other than the "material interaction between man and nature". The other than this "material interaction between man and nature", however, is historically bound up with capitalistic formula of production. If, however, it is only the interest in which society if under capitalism was only the interest in which determined the development of mp+l, here the need for the expansion of capital prevails over the social needs, under communism on the other hand, it is only the social needs which determine the development of mp+l. The formula mp+l presupposes exchange between the owners of mp and the owners of mp+l. For mp to be employed as the tools of the producers, so as to be used for the product mp+l, it is not until mp+l has ceased to confront the workers in its form of capital, when it remains merely as the tool of society and is nothing else, that it is possible to speak of a communist economy. Labor time as the content of reckoning would play a double role in the communist economy:

The apportionment in accordance with a definite social plan maintains the proper proportion between the different kinds of work to be done and the various wants of the community. On the other hand, it also serves as a measure of the portion of the common labor borne by each individual, and of his share in the part of the total product destined for individual consumption. The social relations of the individual producers, with regard both to their labor and to its products, are in this case perfectly simple and intelligible, and that with regard not only to production but also to distribution. (Capital, Vol. I, Page 90-91).

Taking the social average working hour as the computing unit of communist economy, that is, to the quantitative consumption, the quantitative reproduction and the quantitative expansion of the productive forces. Each one of us must determine that quantity of working hours it consumes, so that they can be replaced in the same magnitude. Computation by working hours is not difficult, as all the presuppositions for it have already been formed by capitalist cost accounting. In particular, the capitalistic process of rationalization has developed computing methods which are capable of getting at the cost price both as a whole and also down into the last detail. And while these computing methods are today related to the common denominator of money, their conversion into the working hour is attended by no difficulties.

The production formula of any enterprise, that is also that of society as a whole, is very simple. We have already stated it as follows: mp+l: product. With the aid of the means of production, human labor produces a quantity of goods. We distinguish between two different kinds of social production: fixed and circulating. So we broaden our formula in accordance with this distinction.

\[
\text{mp} + \text{machines, etc.} + \text{raw material, etc.} + \text{labor power} \times 10,000 \text{ working hours} = 70,000 \text{ working hours} = 70,000 \text{ working hours}
\]

Assuming that these figures are applicable to a shoe factory: mp+l: product = 150,000 working hours, or an average of three working hours is consumed in each pair. In this production formula we have at the same time the reproduction formula for simple reproduction. We know how
many labor hours were withdrawn from this factory for the production of 50,000 pairs of shoes. The same number of labor hours must accordingly be restored to it. And what holds for the single enterprise holds also for the whole of society, which of course is only the aggregate of all enterprises. The total product of mp/f of all enterprises. To distinguish the production formula of the single enterprises from that of society as a whole, we select capital letters for the latter. The formula for the social product (SP) then reads: MP(f)/SP. Assuming MP (the sum of all the fixed means of production) to amount to 100 million labor hours, the corresponding sum R to amount to 600 million, and the labor time consumed to 600 million, we have the following for the total product: MP(f)/SP = 100/600/600 = 1/300. Of the total product of 1300 million labor hours, in conditions of simple reproduction, (i.e.- when no expansion of production occurs), we assume that 600 million labor hours are turned over to the consumers in the form of means of consumption.

The application of the social average labor hour as the computing unit presupposes the existence of workers' councils (soviets). Each enterprise comes forward as an independent unit and is at the same time, as we shall show later, connected with all the other enterprises. As a result of the division of labor, each factory has certain products. With the aid of the production formula mp/f, each enterprise can compute the labor time contained in its end product. In the shoe factory taken as an example, the end product (one pair of shoes) contains an average of three working hours. This average time is then subtracted from the total product of each enterprise. This is the labor time contained in the product of an enterprise, insofar as it is not destined for individual consumption, goes to another enterprise either in the form of mg or R, and this in turn computes its end products in labor hours according to the formula. MG will hold for all places of production, without regard to the magnitude or kind of their products.

When the individual enterprises have determined the average labor time contained in their products, it still remains to find the social average. All enterprises of the same nature, i.e.-turning out the same kind of products, must get in touch with each other. From the individual enterprises of a determinate industry, in a given territory, will be derived the total average labor time for all enterprises of this kind. Of these quotients, we shall later show how to aggregate them. This labor time is then subtracted from the total labor time of each enterprise, and the average labor time of the society is obtained thereby.

If the working hour serves as a measure of production, it must likewise be applicable to distribution. A very clear case is given by Marx (Critique of the Gotha Programme, page 29) - the unit is given by Marx: 'critique of the Gotha Programme, page 29) - "What the producer has given to society is his individual production, what the producer has given to society is his individual product in the form of the social working-day or amount of labor. For example: the social working-day of an enterprise is a day of 8 hours. The same thing holds for all places of production, without regard to the magnitude or kind of their products. The workers cannot, however, receive the full output of their labor. The labor time is not the direct measure for the part of the social product destined for individual consumption. As Marx goes on to explain: "Let us take the words "proceeds of labour" in the sense of the product of labour, thus the co-operative proceeds of labour is the total social product. But from this must be deducted: firstly, reimbursement for the replacement of the means of production used up; secondly, an addition portion for the extension of production; thirdly, reserve or insurance funds to provide against misadventures, disturbances through natural events, and so on." There is left the other portion of the total product which is meant to serve definitely as means of consumption. But before this can go for individual consumption there has to be taken from it yet: firstly, the general costs of administration not appertaining to production; secondly, what is destined for the satisfaction of common needs, such as schools, health services, etc.; thirdly, funds for those unproductive expenses, etc.; in short, what comes under the heading of so-called official poor relief today. (Critique of the Gotha Programme, page 27.)

Those institutions which produce no tangible goods (cultural and social establishments) and yet participate in the social consumption without delay, production and distribution, the final goal of communism, the "taking according to need," is already actualized; their distribution is governed by no economic measure, but by the needs of the persons, or enterprises for general social labor (GSL). Communist accounting is complicated by the existence of these GSL enterprises just as it
was by the varying productivity of the single enterprises. Everything which the enterprises consume must be drawn from the store of the productive enterprises.

Going back to our production formula for society as a whole: 

\( \text{MFA} / a = \text{mass of products, } \text{or (2000 - 600)} / a = \text{mass of working hours.} \)

If the enterprise's productivity is not the same, the mass of products is not the same, and the working time is not the same. If we assign the mixed enterprises to the public or to the productive ones or divide them between the two, but these variations do not affect the clarity of the general view.

The conditions of simple reproduction, with which we have been working so far, are after all only a methodological assumption employed for the sake of simplicity and have no basis in actual fact. Human economy is superfluous. When an enterprise delivers its end products, the products of this sort are no longer conserved in the form of materials, tools, etc., but only in the form of other end products. The labor that produces these new and different end products is paid labor, and hence labor costs are paid in their own kind. A number of variations are possible here, depending on whether we consider the deliveries of current, expressed in working hours, going into the individual consumption. The addition of these parts of all mixed enterprises gives the deficit to be made up by the FIC. If we call this part the general deficit (D), we have a new distribution formula: 

\( \text{FIC} = L - (\text{MFA}/a) - D \) over 1/\( a \).
terprises are brought into GSL production, distribution by means of labor money grows less and less, and rushes on to its own abolition. Fixing the factor of individual consumption is the task of social bookkeeping. On the credit side of the social bookkeeping, let us say, the debit side the MUA, Re, and is. "Bookkeeping has control and abstract summary of the economic process," says Marx, "becomes the more necessary to the extent that the process functions on a social scale and loses its purely individual character. In the capitalist distribution of production, the control over production is handled by the social bookkeeping, and still more necessary in co-operative production than in capitalist production." This bookkeeping under communism is social bookkeeping and nothing else. It is the central point of the economic process, its production without the producers or the enterprises. The social bookkeeping is itself only an enterprise of the GSL type. Its functions are: the registration of the objectivity course of the productive process, the fixing of the P10, the control over production and distribution. The control of the labor process is a purely technical one, which is handled by each enterprise for itself. The control exercised by the social bookkeeping extends only to accounting for all receipts and deliveries of the individual enterprises and watching over their productivity.

The control of production in the society of free and equal producers does not come about through persons and authorities, but is conducted through the public registration of the objective course of the productive process; that is, production is controlled through reproduction.

The different industrial organisations turn their production budgets over to the enterprise which conducts the social bookkeeping. From all the enterprises, the enterprise's cost budget is in one form flow to the enterprises; new ones in another form are given out by them. Each conveyance of goods is recorded in the general social bookkeeping by an endorsement, so that the debit and credit accounts of any particular enterprise at any time can be seen at a glance, revealing in this way whether and to what extent the productivity of the enterprises is flowing smoothly. Shortage and excess on the part of any enterprise becomes visible and can be corrected. If an enterprise is unable to maintain its productivity, if that productivity declines, then the other enterprises, even though they work beyond the s.a. production time, cannot over the shortage of the first one. The comparatively unproductive enterprise is unable to reproduce itself, the malfunction becomes visible and can be remedied by society. The control of the GSL enterprises runs parallel in part with that of the productive ones. It results from the material production, through the registration of the articles turned over to them and the receipt of labor money of the GSL enterprises, however, goes to society "gratuitously", so that for these enterprises the credit factor is lacking in their bookkeeping. The control over productivity will probably only be possible with the aid of comparative investigations.

While under capitalism the category s.a. labor time is dependent on "value", in communism it is only a matter of the labor money involved in goods turned out. And while social productivity under capitalism has to be regulated by the market, which involves a gigantic waste of the social forces of production, in communism the lowering of the s.a. production time is a conscious, socially-regulated act. It leads s.a. production time to the production time of production. If, for example, an enterprise has lowered its means of production at 100,000 labor hours, and if we assume that these instruments have a ten-year span of life, then 10,000 working hours are to be added yearly to the productive force of the enterprise. If the products of this enterprise are connected with the products of other enterprises, and the control of the social bookkeeping which is conducted by each enterprise, then in the process of reproduction it can fashion better or more machines and thus increase its productivity, which in practice means expanding the productive apparatus without the expenditure of extra labor. The reproduction time for this enterprise has changed. Since the s.a. reproduction time is observed, the only change is in the productivity of this enterprise. The s.a. production time of the capital with which the enterprise is connected always remains the same as the reproduction time of this enterprise since the means of production, too, flow in a continuous stream through all the enterprises. The lowest social reproduction time blends again and again in the process of production with the s.a. reproduction time.

The different industries turn their production budgets over to the enterprises which conduct the social bookkeeping. From all the enterprises the enterprise's cost budget is in one form flow to the enterprises; new ones in another form are given out by them. Each conveyance of goods is recorded in the general social bookkeeping by an endorsement, so that the debit and credit accounts of any particular enterprise at any time can be seen at a glance, revealing in this way whether and to what extent the productivity of the enterprises is flowing smoothly. Shortage and excess on the part of any enterprise becomes visible and can be corrected. If an enterprise is unable to maintain its productivity, if that productivity declines, then the other enterprises, even though they work beyond the s.a. production time, cannot over the shortage of the first one. The comparatively unproductive enterprise is unable to reproduce itself, the malfunction becomes visible and can be remedied by society. The control of the GSL enterprises runs parallel in part with that of the productive ones. It results from the material production, through the registration of the articles turned over to them and the receipt of labor money of the GSL enterprises, however, goes to society "gratuitously", so that for these enterprises the credit factor is lacking in their bookkeeping. The control over productivity will probably only be possible with the aid of comparative investigations.

While under capitalism the category s.a. labor time is dependent on "value", in communism it is only a matter of the labor money involved in goods turned out. And while social productivity under capitalism has to be regulated by the market, which involves a gigantic waste of the social forces of production, in communism the lowering of the s.a. production time is a conscious, socially-regulated act. It leads s.a. production time to the production time of production. If, for example, an enterprise has lowered its means of production at 100,000 labor hours, and if we assume that these instruments have a ten-year span of life, then 10,000 working hours are to be added yearly to the productive force of the enterprise. If the products of this enterprise are connected with the products of other enterprises, and the control of the social bookkeeping which is conducted by each enterprise, then in the process of reproduction it can fashion better or more machines and thus increase its productivity, which in practice means expanding the productive apparatus without the expenditure of extra labor. The reproduction time for this enterprise has changed. Since the s.a. reproduction time is observed, the only change is in the productivity of this enterprise. The s.a. production time of the capital with which the enterprise is connected always remains the same as the reproduction time of this enterprise since the means of production, too, flow in a continuous stream through all the enterprises. The lowest social reproduction time blends again and again in the process of production with the s.a. reproduction time.

By way of summary, it may be said:

The basis of the s.a. reproduction time is the s.a. working hour. This category is already valid even in capitalism. Even now the individual differences find no expression in the commodity, for the product is converted on the market into money; that is, transformed into the general commodity, by which all individual differences of labor are abolished. In communism, it is the s.a. reproduction time which embraces within itself all individual differences of slow and experienced workers, of capable and less capable, of manual and intellectual labor. The s.a. reproduction time turns the social reproduction time into such, as something special, does not exist. Like the laws of nature, which merely bring out what is general in the particular phenomena, without existing as actual laws, the s.a. working hour, which in the concrete sense has no existence, embodies what is general from among the enormous diversity in the material interaction of society.
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THE FUTURE OF THE GERMAN LABOR MOVEMENT.

Any speculation regarding the possibilities of the German labor movement must take into account, not merely the size of the various movements within Germany, but the structural transformations in modern society. This change in the economic setup, together with the political consequences, is likewise the indispensable key to the complete understanding of fascism.

In the present crisis, the monopolist form of economy develops within itself stagnating tendencies directed economically against the laissez-faire principle and politically against "formal democracy". The process of capital concentration, which continues during the present crisis as a spur to all social groups, though it is only the working class which can be moved into a genuine opposition to the existing order. The economic dependence of the middle class allows it no policy of its own; it develops only a backward ideology, since any social advance brings with it the downfall of this class as a special group.

In practice, fascism can only be appraised. The policies of the existing economic system can not be subordinated to the fascist ideology, and the louder that ideology cries, the more surely it also destroys itself. Being incapable of bringing about a revolutionary change in the economic system, fascism is compelled to follow laws which simply force the impoverishment of the middle class as well. The fascist movement must of necessity, in the course of development, shrink to a fascist state apparatus which has openly to defend the interests of the economically strongest groups against society as a whole. Practically, fascism can only be appraised as the expression of the political necessities of the monopolistic groups during the crisis. It is nothing other than the compulsion to permanent terrorism against the working class; this compulsion results from the fact that the further endangering of industrial profits by social unrest can no longer be tolerated, since the already insufficient profit brings into question more and more the continued existence of the economic system. Fascism, furthermore, has to wage the class struggle against the class struggle which it denies, so as to prepare the "nation" for the imperialistic clashes to be expected.

As a result of the conflicts of interest within society - conflicts deniable only in words, not in reality - fascism may change its leaders and symbols, but it may even under certain circumstances, as a result of new social upheavals, give place to a neo-democratic regime. But practically, this transformation would be nothing more than an exchange of leaders and symbols, since even the restored "democracy" would be compelled to adopt harsher polices. Even a democratically "denazified" state apparatus would have to protect the existing society with the necessary means, which today are means of terrorisms. Without still the differences between fascism and democracy, it may still be found that these social forms, with the structure of the present system, have only the same possibilities of action, since politics is always dictated by the economic necessities.
From this standpoint, any struggle for democracy is only a pseudo struggle. And for this reason, such a struggle is quite out of the question for the workers and can only be conducted by those groups which are willing to play capitallistic politics, that is, merely want to govern. This fight will not even be decided by the "fighters", but by the processes within the party. The realization of its program, the demand that the present economy is still capable of further progressive development can feed the illusion of a new democratic era.

In Germany also, the real class struggle will not turn on the question of democracy, and all attempts to erect a new labor movement on this basis are doomed to fail. The efforts of the socialist movement to get a new lease of life through the so-called "partyification of its program", the objective impossibility of turning history backward. The demand for the rehabilitation of democracy is no less laughable than the faith of the fascists in the restoration of the "good old times".

The attempts of the various communist groups to build up illegal movements in the old party style show that they thoroughly share the illusions of the socialist movement. Nothing has changed as regards the idea held by these groups as to the role of the party. What was once legal shall now continue to function illegally in the same form. They completely fail to see that the old party movement was just an expression of formal democracy, and could not exist nowhere else. The party is bound up with democracy, the one spirit of the C.P. - the spirit which has completely failed to see that the old party organizations are doomed to collapse from its own senselessness. Thousands of fanaticalized party hang-overs drifted into the concentration camps for distributing illegal literature, doing nothing more than the phrase "Hands off the Soviet Union". The fluctuations in membership was peculiar to the C.P. The S.P. was composed of old fellows, incapable of changing, while the C.P. was largely composed of younger elements which instead of convictions had only uniforms to change. These made it possible for the C.P. in all the easier to abandon the illegal activity of the movement when the campaign of despair, but served merely to justify the C.P. in the eyes of the local officials who already knew that the communist "idea" was constructed on the fact that the capitalist system is basically temporary. The real reason is still clear only to the party, the restoration of democracy and all attempts to erect a new labor movement embraced on party principles exist nowhere else. The party is bound up with democracy, the one spirit of the C.P. - the spirit which has completely failed to see that the old party organizations are doomed to collapse from its own senselessness. Thousands of fanaticalized party hang-overs drifted into the concentration camps for distributing illegal literature, doing nothing more than the phrase "Hands off the Soviet Union". The fluctuations in membership was peculiar to the C.P. The S.P. was composed of old fellows, incapable of changing,
valid only in words; namely, that the Revolution is not a party matter, but the affair of the class.

To avoid going off into empty speculations regarding the coming German labor movement, it must be realized that the period of disintegration of existing society constitutes a new historical epoch which follows its own laws and not those of the past. The old party movement which regarded itself as the decisive factor of the revolution was only a symbol of aspirational character with the working class, the cannibalistic mother devil in the crisis. The setting in of this new epoch is necessarily bound up with the end of democracy and hence with the end of the previous labor movement. The past, to be sure, still weighs upon the present and lends to the building of neo-socialist, neo-communist and other such "neo" organizations, but all traditions must yield in the face of the changed circumstances. The world crisis is still in its first stage, the process of disintegration has only begun. The further this process advances, the more must the terrorism against the workers be sharpened. But this terrorism serves for the political education. In the course of development, fascists will be compelled to destroy its own organizations; nature sets a limit even to the greatest joy in choruses. Fanatical fascists cease to be fascists. Resignation kills individuals, but not classes. Every attempt of the workers to ward off their impoverishment will be combated in the manner in which rebellions are put down. Thus even the most backward workers will be compelled, in order to save themselves, to act as if they were conscious revolutionists. Every assembly of workers becomes a reservoir of revolutionary energies. The worker, member of the illegal organizations will not permit any degree of control for the masses. In contrast the creation and workers councils they will create their own form of organization and their own leadership. And it is only in these first beginnings and their quantitative growth that the revolutionary movement can be discerned.

The tempo of this development is determined by that of the period of disintegration. Unless there occurs a sudden and rapid deepening of the crisis or unless a new war fundamental changes the whole world picture, nothing much of a surprising nature in regard to the labor movement will happen in Germany in the near future. Of a restoration of the labor movement upon the basis of the old, nothing of the sort need be looked for. So that, as far as concerns the party movement, one will have to deny its very existence. It is impossible to conceive of any way in which it could set itself up as a quite special group, since the movement is identical with the working class. Perhaps it will work as a force which will be more surprisingly than did the fascists, that movement will one day snatch the power into its hands.

The October Issue of the MODERN MONTHLY contains, between other interesting articles, a criticism of the American Workers Party, by Paul Mattick, from the viewpoint of the council movement. Also a critique of Lewis Corwin's book, "The Decline of American Capitalism" from the standpoint of over-accumulation.

According to the "Militant" (#37) the organisational unity of the whole group is close at hand. The political chauvinism of both groups will be very happy, and they will be able to combine under the name of "American Lenin", the former and present Priest Muste is not so bad. Together they will fight for the American kind of a revolution, and celebrate the memory and bones of American Bourgeoisie rebels dead 150 years or more.

The whole matter is a joke, only indicating that by this merger they hope to stop the disintegration going on in both groups. It is of no importance to the working class, and as a matter of fact the workers ignore both of the "only ones". Divorced or combined, they have no future as their only weapons are outworn traditions which may still continue part of the workers, but never really influence them.

Practically it may be summed up as an expression of the sound policy "for bigger and better business". As long as it is not positive that this unity will actually take place, it is not worthwhile to deal with it at great length. We will come back to this question in the first of the future issues of the C. C. 0.

BE WISH TO ANNOUNCE:

A Monthly Organ of The International Communist Workers' Council Movement.

"LIVING MARXISM"

A monthly magazine to be published beginning Jan.1,1935. "Living Marxism" will be unique insofar as it will not be restricted by party interests, will not serve the interests of any parasitic democracy, or be obsessed by leader fetishism. It will deal with vital problems of international economics and will be a weapon to work with such material which will be of value in the revolutionary struggle for Communism. It will publish the never-mentioned opinions of Marxists like Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Karl Liebknecht, Anton Pannekoek, Hermann Gorter, and many others. "Living Marxism" has correspondents, revolutionary workers, and writers in almost every country. It will be able to present objective reports of the situations in the various countries, and on international scale. It will also bring forward the economic works of Henry Grendon and others, of the greatest importance for the international proletarian class movement, which have been ignored and suppressed by the "official labor fakirs".

It will be published by the United Workers' Party of America in collaboration with the Groups of International Communists in Holland and Denmark, and the Council Movement in Germany, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. We can expect no help from the "official labor movement", so we ask for your support and subscription. Write to United Workers' Party - Chicago, Ill.
The present strike wave is characterized by defeats and betrayals. The workers suffer defeats because of their insufficient and treacherous organizations on the one hand, and because the capitalist class and its state cannot permit a victory to the workers on the other. Capitalism in the period of general crisis, must combat to its fullest extent any attempt by the workers to improve their conditions. Victory for the workers would mean endangering the position of capitalism. Every strike is practically lost in advance.

But this does not exclude the necessity of workers fighting every onslaught on their living standard. We must take part in every one of these struggles, and encourage the worker to fight, because the present strike wave in spite of its shortcomings is more important than the whole of the "official political movement" at this time. The fact that these strikes are destined for defeat or betrayal does not mitigate the revolutionary value of the struggle. We may point out that on the basis of the present labor movement no victory is possible, but we have to fight in all these labor struggles as they are, and not as we might want them. We must strive to hinder the labor fakers from using these strikes to their own advantage, and this is best done by the most active on the actual strike front.

The fight for existence is the fight of today; and the struggle for a new society can only grow out of these daily struggles. As these day to day struggles increase, and as the worker gains experience from the defeats, the fight changes its quality and becomes revolutionary leading to the overthrow of the present system. A communist may criticize and condemn the character of the strikes and the organizations involved, but he must take part in the strikes and fight, for this is the shortest road to revolution in the declining period of capitalism.

ANNOUNCEMENT: -- Do not fail to get the next issue of Council Correspondence, consisting of ten separate articles on this subject, prepared jointly by the Group of International Communists of Holland. It is an exceptional and comprehensive history and analysis of Bolshevism. There will be only a limited amount of copies available, so order yours now!

We recommend the next pamphlet to be published by: Polesie Publishers 673 Broadway, New York City, "THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM", 25¢.

A critique of Sidney Hook's "Interpretation of Marx" by Paul Mattick. It is written from the view-point of the United Workers' Party of America, and deals with almost every aspect of revolutionary Marxism. Should be in the hands of every Marxist.

To be published soon by United Workers' Party: -- "WHAT NEXT FOR THE AMERICAN WORKER" -- A pamphlet dealing in a simple manner with the needs and future of the American labor movement.

We still have some copies of: "World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution" -- 10¢ "Bolshevism or Communism" -- 5¢.

UNITED WORKERS' PARTY -- 1604 N. California Ave., Chicago, Ill.