

Dear Comrade Chaubien. Thanks for your letter of August 22. Allow me to revert the sequence and ~~to~~ to treat first the article contra Rubel. I knew his Pages choisies ~~for~~ formerly but had not given much attention to it, though in our correspondence he inserted often ethical ~~the~~ dicta and I tried to instruct him ^{form} what Marxism really, materially meant. Now however, when I read the article in Le Monde, it appeared to me that the matter had a greater importance: M. le docteur M. Rubel gloriously defending his thesis before the Sorbonne. So I (already renowned as "Marxologue") took up ^{and studied} the old writings of Marx anew, and found there a far more ^{cogent and} ~~conclusive~~ confirmation of my view than I had expected. Hence I wrote it down; and because I supposed that such theses (in special cases only) are published in printed form, I had to attach to the printed extract in the paper. But I see that you are entirely right ⁱⁿ that it is formally too weak a basis for a criticism. So I will ask Rubel whether ^{and when} ~~his~~ thesis will be printed and published. Then only ~~the~~ part I of my article has to be replaced by another introduction. The matter itself, the true scientific character of Marxian theory, appears to me to be very important, the question of predictions of the future, which is a point of much discussion and many confused remarks, is connected with it.

As to the other ^{point} ~~question~~, ~~my~~ my letter of June 15: in writing it it was not my intention that it should be printed, or rather: it was my idea that it would not be printed, so that I have the ^{remembrance} ~~feeling~~ that it was not written with the ^{great} ~~utmost~~ care. If, however, you think that ~~by~~ some of its parts it ^{may} will clarify the ideas, then I advise to ~~select~~ select and print these parts only, in order that my remarks ^{shall} not occupy too much space. I ^{have the impression} think that the exposure of my views in "Workers' Councils" may give a ^{broader and} ~~more precise~~ general ~~and~~ basis. I will send you a reprint of one of its chapters which ^{has} been prepared and published by our English friends of the T. L. P. There is something abrupt in it, since ~~my~~ the arguments are based on the former chapters that ^{are} ~~are~~ ^{here} missing; but the ^{T. L. P.} comrades ^{apparently} had the idea that just for the passive unrevolutionary English workers a ~~little~~ ^{discussion} bit ^{may be a} ~~very~~ healthy stuff.

I have the impression that we stand at opposite extremes of opinion about proletarian class action, both by emphasizing ^{each} ~~its~~ ^{different} ~~sides~~. Always the fact appears that some ~~of~~ ^{stand out} ~~the~~ ^{or} ~~persons~~ ^{come forward} in activity, in speech, in courage, in clearness of vision, in rapidity of action; these ^{persons together} ~~combined~~ ^{or} constitute an actual avant-garde ~~which~~ ^{we see appear} in every action. They become ^{factual} leaders; they ^{may} ~~include~~ the activity of the masses, and by their broader view can give good advice ⁱⁿ ~~for~~ the actions. When ^{they} ~~combining~~ ^{with established programs} into fixed groups or parties (these fluid relations become petrified). Then as leaders *ex officio* they feel themselves responsible and wish to be followed and obeyed. At the other side ^{we see that} ~~it appears~~ in all massal or revolutionary actions there appears a deep common feeling, not clearly conscious, ^{as shown by the fluctuations in taking part in the action} but based on very real conditions, ~~and~~ ^{the} securing unity of action needed for positive results. (The ^{and lasting} real gain of progress for society consists in what ^{the} ~~working~~ ^{total class, the} masses change in their inner character (^{losing their servility;} independence, defiance) and this takes place ~~only~~ ^{only} by their own activity and initiative, not by following others. Between these two points of view the practice of the class struggle may take all kinds of intermediate ^{grades} or combined forms.

There may still be made a remark on massal actions. Looking at the present life conditions in our Western countries it may seem (and is widely accepted) that such massal actions ever more become impossible and unnecessary. Impossible because of the enormously increased ^(and violence) power of the governments backed by big capital. (~~It~~ ^{should be} if an industrial region ^{is} in the hands of the workers ^{an atom} ^{one} ^{as well as} ^{political rights} bomb may destroy it). Unnecessary because working and living conditions, for the working class become ever better and more secured (see USA). Yet we are ^{certainly} ~~convinced~~ that the threat of capitalism is heavier ^{now on} ~~the~~ impending destruction ^{of mankind} ~~and~~ ^{is} ~~more dangerous than ever~~ ^{before} ~~of~~ ^{the} world-war is ^{the} most important ^{side of form} ~~and~~ ^{is} ~~threatens~~ ^{intellectuals and trades people as well as workers} the entire population, ~~not only~~ ^{not only} the workers, though ^{the latter form} ~~they~~ ^{are} the most numerous part. So massal actions will be necessary more than in the past; and they loose their strict class character ^{such as they had in} ~~of~~ the past (Belgium, Russia). They are the only ^{way} ~~form~~ in which the ~~majority~~ masses of the peoples may ~~and~~ ^{exhibit} ~~their will~~ ^{take action} in what constitutes their life-interest. Yet you never find them mentioned, ^{with} ~~not~~ ⁱⁿ political discussions and papers, ~~not~~ ⁱⁿ ^{socialist} ~~revolutionary~~ reviews. Is it the fear to be identified with Russian communism? Or, more generally, the fear of all leading groups for the working masses taking action themselves?