today
"ultra-left" course of the C.P. 'shout' against its ultra-right course because the Stalinists are still not resigned to setting them up again with salaries. Trotsky founds for the second time the Fourth International with members whom he has fortunately just brought to shelter in the Second International. The bureaucrats quarrel over the ever fewer paid posts and disguise their quarrel behind an alleged struggle for this or that correct Leninist line. These ridiculous half-and-half organizations, small parasites of the greater spongers, are not the heirs of the Third International, nor its carrion crows. They are going under with it, as they were only capable of living off it. But for them also the revolutionary workers have no tears to shed. To speak for once with the original superman against all the present-day supermen of the C.P. and its offal, the workers can only - and not without satisfaction - say: "What falls shall furthermore be kicked."
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Propaganda against parliamentarism among the working class was for a long while extremely difficult. The assumption that the worker too, or his confidant, must take part in the work of law-making, in order that the laws to be passed may have regard for the interests of the class, has grown into a nice, comfortable habit. And it is quite as well known as regrettable that no one more than the worker hangs on to old habits, conservatively and without insight—in fact, he clings to them even long after the bourgeoisie has thrown them back into the lumber-room. This holds of all phenomena of society, whether in the field of general culture, of custom and morality or of politics. The special field of politics—parliamentarism—naturally forms no exception; for here there asserts itself not only the lack of independent movement on the part of the working class, but a quite imposing array of forces by which, when the social milieu gives rise to such a movement, it is held up. Parliamentarism—that is, the doctrine that the economic laws of a society are controlled by oratorical battles—is of course not only a doctrine, a philosophy, but an eminently practical matter; practical, that is, for those who conduct these oratorical battles—the members of Parliament, Congress, or whatever the law-making institution may be called in the different countries. For them, the Parliament is exactly the same thing that Heaven and God are for a parson. As soon as people refuse to believe in the existence of Heaven and God, the parson's existence also collapsed. Heaven and God are thus questions involving the livelihood of a certain group of people; and just as everyone is interested in the maintenance of his existence, so also are the uniformed God-champions. Apply this example to parliamentarism, and we have the whole truth.

The circumstance, however, that something is "true" is by no means any assurance that this something will forthwith come into its own, without further ado. In the first place, this is prevented
by the fact that on the side of the deceived and misled the general possibility of perception and hence the course of the revolutionary class movement is too slight, while on the other side science, whose task it should be to serve as a medium of perceptions, stands wholly in the service of class rule. The more the possibility of perception developed in our civilization, the more the stories of heaven and God could be recognized as a fairy tale, the greater was the amount of "science" put forth in order to bring into question the fruits of this recognition.

The history of parliamentarism is, to be sure, younger and briefer than that of theology, but resembles it in all its features. And of course, in the last analysis, both - parliamentarism and theology - are children of the same mother; that is, children of the belief that someone or other -- excepting ourselves -- will free us from which the communist parties were born. Their mission here - for extremely subtle proofs, which they set down in theses. The brief er than that of theology, but resembles it in all its features.

Just as the clergy in the age of enlightenment had to resort to much more refined means for keeping their little sheep in the fold, so also in times of extreme economic distress and the impossibility of a compromise between the ruling and the suppressed class the champions of parliamentarism had to rack their brains for extremely subtle proofs, which they set down in theses. The establishment and propagation of these proofs fell to the historical lot of the Communist International, in its various sections.

The world stands in an epoch of advanced revolutions, a process from which all parties were balls that go with it: - they must embrace the revolution. Since, however, embracing the revolution and acting in accordance therewith does not guarantee a full bourgeois existence, the functionaries of the sects must look for an occupation which they can find time to carry on in addition to their party work and the exercise of which does not conflict with their revolutionary profession of faith. They become - in addition to paltry editors and party secretaries - parliamentarists. Now even tho it may be true that the professional parliamentarists have enough time left over for performing their party work, still it is not such an easy matter to avoid conflicts arising from their revolutionary profession of faith and their parliamentary duties. In this extremity, none other than "science" had to spring to the rescue. It first of all gave birth to the most ridiculous word-monstrosity in the political thesaurus: "revolutionary parliamentarism".

No great amount of philological knowledge is needed in order to understand what an unmerited protective covering was acquired by parliamentarism and what a calumny was perpetrated on the concept "revolutionary" by this combining into a single phrase of two concepts merging into a word which in their essence are nothing short of mortal enemies. Naturally, the reason for the invention and exploitation of this word-monstrosity was not that the beneficiaries of the communist party movement would not have been content with plain parliamentarism or had actually assured themselves that this "revolutionary parliamentarism" would really lend force to the proletarian class movement. Rather, the invention was necessary for the reason that the counter-revolutionary career of parliamentarism, as far as concerned the class-conscious part of the awakening masses, took the form of a fairy tale, and therefore logically the parliamentarians were looked upon as counter-revolutionaries. Now since one could not very well be a revolutionist and a counter-revolutionist at the same time, -- and because especially one did not want to be such, -- parliamentarism, the counter-revolutionary institution, was given the predicate "revolutionary". In other words, an attempt was made to juggle away the essence of a device with a well chosen qualifying word. And it can not be disputed: the attempt was successful.

How could such an attempt succeed? To give a complete answer to this question would be to unravel the whole problem of the labor movement from A to Z, in order to observe in all its parts the influence which has been exerted by the paid functionaries upon the organized and unorganized mass, and which has culminated unmistakably in the maintenance and consolidation of the bourgeoisie ideology. "Somebody or other will do it for us who of course is more clever than we are, and whom we are just too stupid to criticize; somebody who knows everything and can do everything". Naturally, this somebody can also revolutionize the Parliament or Congress, the counter-revolution in actuality. This state of fact -- that is the blind belief in the most impossible capacities of some "great" man or other -- is not so laughable as the mention of it appears; for it was nothing less than a state of fact, and as such had enormous, disastrous consequences for the working class.

It might, of course, be objected -- and this has been done quite frequently, -- that in itself it is quite a matter of indifference whether a revolutionist does just on the side: whether he catches butterflies or belongs to a glee-club or casts a ballet into a box. Of course, why should he not also exercise that which in their essence are nothing short of mortal enemies. Naturally, this somebody who knows everything and can do everything. Naturally, this somebody can also revolutionize the Parliament or Congress, the counter-revolution in actuality. This state of fact -- that is the blind belief in the most impossible capacities of some "great" man or other -- is not so laughable as the mention of it appears; for it was nothing less than a state of fact, and as such had enormous, disastrous consequences for the working class.

And if a revolutionist has gone so far as to exercise the right to vote, why should he not also exercise that of being voted for? Superficially regarded, these objections appear quite logical. But they will not hold water when examined in detail. It is examined here that the workers grow politically stale even when they engage, "just on the side", in cultural and athletic clubs or other such organisations not expressly revolutionary in their tendencies. Well, such organizations can not expressly revolutionary in their tendencies. Well, such organisations can not be "revolutionary", or "counter-revolutionary"; they also demand no distinct profession of faith from their members. Otherwise with parliamentarism. If one embraces it, and if one wants to obtain a seat in parliament or congress, one must turn to such people as believe in the possibilities and capacities of this institution. It is out of the Question to read them the Communist Manifesto. Or rather: it can be done if the object in view is exclusively political propaganda, but it can not be done if one wants to win the votes of electors. For good reason the masses with
mentarism" was at first, nothing more than a theory in which the person who can have confidence in everything except himself, in his "philistines," could thus become so quickly and cheaply a revolutionist, then how could the revolutionist, the ordinary worker, not also be a philistine voter? He had, of course, the guarantee that his enthusiasm was not for parliamentarism without circumspection, but for revolutionary parliamentarism. And so, from one "ballot battle" to the next, the membership of the communist sections was and is being educated to the conception that one may embrace both revolution and parliamentarism. Matters went still farther, however, so that quite soon the adherents of the communist sections no longer embraced the one as well as the other, but came to look upon "revolutionary parliamentarism" as the solution. "Without revolutionary parliamentarism no revolution!" That wonder that the communist section of Germany, for example, fell down so miserably: Hitler had actually, with a single stroke, torn away the basis of its revolution-parliamentarism. But before the good old institution had suffered this fate, it had plenty of time to vent its fury, it was able to disintegrate the ideological best part of the working class and to defame individual revolutionaries in the camps thereof; in short, to do a good job. Let us hold in further course to the German example. It was there that "revolutionary parliamentarism" celebrated its greatest triumphs.

Now it is extremely difficult to determine factually, on the basis of certain particulars, in what the difference consisted between theory and practice in the case of "revolutionary" parliamentarism, because, of course, the theory was an absurdity in itself, as absurd as dry water or cold fire or, as previously here defined, revolution. One revolution--one revolution. One revolution! One revolution! One revolution! One revolution! One revolution! This was the slogan. And so it was learned that their theory represented practically two concrete things: exposure of the workers' enemies, and parliamentary speeches. Exposures were naturally something precious, and they have consequently been used by the "revolutionary" parliamentarians, in some cases, as evidence of their strength, to the workers. But strangely enough, they have been applied not only by the workers against the exploiters, but very frequently also by the other party. They have been applied to the workers, and, as shown by Hitler's victory after a great number of parliamentary battles, with much greater success than by the communists. The exposing tactic was accordingly not in itself a revolutionary tactic, and, applied in Parliament, it does not logically make Parliament revolutionary. Generally considered, parliamentarism is simply an empty form, a more or less fine-sounding and highly plausible-sounding illusion, hence propaganda for the next election -- and fifty percent exposure.

Exposures are naturally something precious, and they have certainly been used in the workers' struggles against the exploiters. But strangely enough, they have been applied not only by the workers against the exploiters, but very frequently also by the other party. They have been applied to the workers, and, as shown by Hitler's victory after a great number of parliamentary battles, with much greater success than by the communists. The exposing tactic was accordingly not in itself a revolutionary tactic, and, applied in Parliament, it does not logically make Parliament revolutionary. Generally considered, parliamentarism is simply an empty form, a more or less fine-sounding and highly plausible-sounding illusion, hence propaganda for the next election -- and fifty percent exposure.
That the success of the exposing was much sligher for the communists than for the Nazis has already been mentioned. But of course, this is still not to say how slight it was. Very probably, it was equal to zero. The alternating successes which the communists saw in the increase of the number of seats they held in the various parliaments were certainly attained by way of the enormous amount of individual propagandizing on the part of the army of nameless politicians in the shops and relief stations. That could not be confessed at any price; otherwise the bureaucracy, watching furtive eyes on seats in parliament would have lost every plausible ground on which to stand for election.

But apart from such a question, which cannot be answered in a manner which is wholly satisfactory, there still remains a very essential question, namely: the cost of the questionable success of the exposing. It is well known that the communists in their heyday — that is, shortly before they gave over the field without a struggle to Hitler — had nearly a hundred seats in the Reichstag. Hence from all parts of the country there came together in Berlin the communist forces most highly trained in agitation and propaganda, in order to witness in parliament the flat, stale and unprofitable harangues of other parties. When things were running high, there was occasion once a week for a communist, in a three-quarter-hour speech to conduct communist exposing. The number of times that the communists took the floor and the length of their speaking time was accordingly not left to their own discretion, but was governed in painfully exact manner in accordance with the order of business, which was loyally adhered to by the communists as well. In case, someone persisted in disregarding that order, he could be excluded for one or more sittings. In and of itself, that would have been no misfortune, if his talk had not been correspondingly out.

Thus in order to deliver one three-quarter-hour exposing speech per week, there assembled in Berlin alone — not to speak of the odd dozen provincial parliaments, which likewise swallowed a large number of good agitators — some hundred party functionaries (mainly party workers, who were then not called party editors), who were trained to speak available for any real party activity. If each of these functionaries had held only one meeting each week and if each of these meetings had been attended by only a hundred people — certainly a modest figure for Germany, while exposing all conceivable listeners in speeches extending over one hour and thirty minutes. That is, the performance of each functionary would have been double that of the entire communist fraction in the Reichstag. In other words: the functionaries of the Reichstag fraction could have conducted two hundred times the amount of exposing if they had shifted their field of action from the Reichstag into the country. This numerical example may be applied also, if one likes, to the other parliaments. It would then be seen how much time was squandered by the parliament-thirsty communist bureaucracy, time which might have been employed in providing a systematic revolutionary education of the working class.

It may be objected that certain exposures were in violation of law and that the exposing conducted in parliament, even if unlawful, remained unpunished. Theoretically, that is correct, but practically quite without significance; for precisely in which the communists were preaching the necessity of revolutionary parliamentary activity from the end of the war to the present time, the propagandistic opportunities in Germany were ample. In case, however, a decisive exposing speech had once really been made, then the bourgeoisie had only to clamp down on the newspapers in order to deprive it of any effect beyond the few listeners in parliament.

As a matter of fact, in the history of the german Reichstag there was only one solitary exposing speech to which success was generally attributed. It was the speech of Karl Liebknecht (1912) against the corruption which had arisen in the business connection between the army and its cannon-furnisher Krupp. To this example of exposing there might possibly be added the nicely memorized phrases that Philipp Scheidemann delivered in the Zabern military scandal; but this exhausts the list of all the exposing which the bourgeoisie found painful. And the success? The officers involved were pensioned at the cost of the tax-payers or "fell up the steps". And yet it was precisely in the year 1913, hence in the midst of the exposing campaign, that the Social Democracy, by which this later exposure was conducted, for the first time granted financial means to prussian-german militarism.

But of course, one may say, the communists are not social-democrats. And that is correct. For while the social-democrats still for a time shamefully opposed the war, among the communists this false shame has already quite vanished. In proof of this, there is no need to go back to the offer which Clara Zetkin at that time made in the Reichstag to the German Reichswehr. "We have only to refer to the statement of the german delegate Wilhelm Pieck some weeks ago on the situation of the world at the present time. He said, verbally: 'A war conducted by a country with democratic government against a country with fascist government is a noble war, and the communists should take part in it.' Perhaps the communists have the opportunity to have the exposing campaign, that the Social Democracy, by which this later exposing was conducted, for the first time granted financial means to prussian-german militarism.
first brought together in an article by a Reichstag member and offered to the rote Fahne for publication. The paper declined publication on the ground that it would be prejudicial for high treason. Therefore, a Reichstag member to take over the responsibility for the rote Fahne the day on which the "exposure" was to appear was likewise declined, without any reason being given. Then it was made to lay bare the beginning of the Cuno government by way of a "Little Inquiry" addressed to the Reichstag. The communist fraction, however, forbade the member in question to present the "Little Inquiry". A few days later came one of the "little sessions" frequent at the time. In the joint session of the fraction and of the central committee of the Communist Party preceding this discussion it was decided, in spite of the pressure of two deputies and against their votes, that the fraction speaker was to mention the "Hindenburg program" and so it was done. All which we feel in duty bound to expose in order not only to show how little effective parliamentary exposures are, but also how little subjective will is involved behind the objective parliamentary fraction. That, then, still remains over of the utopian theory of exposing? Nothing but a veil behind which those parliamentary bourgeois conceal themselves who need the votes of anti-capitalist, but still innocent proletarians, or else the votes of those who had already tried all the other parties and been disappointed. This latter sort, which unquestionably made up the majority of the communist voting parliament, finally landed with Hitler.

Let us now turn to the cases of "parliamentary support of extra-parliamentary actions", which by the side of the exposures are to furnish the justification for the entrance of communists into bourgeois parliaments. For this purpose, let us imagine that a communist parliamentarian-makers have for some reason or other come into actions. It is not to be assumed that this happened because a parliamentarian made a speech. Actions of the workers have a more material basis than the mere effect of a speech. The reason, however, which led an action determines also its direction and its means. Actions in connection with a strike, for example, proceed in the direction of winning the strike. They pass beyond their initial character when the ruling class, through economic or political pressures, demand other means of offensive and defense. If in a strike the situation for the workers is favorable—that is, if they have a good prospect of attaining the immediate goal—they will leave off with a mere strike, and the best parliamentary speech ever delivered will not result in so much as the stirring of a mouse. On the other hand, when the prospects were bad, there has never been a case in which the parliamentary speeches of the communists were able to convert such unpromising undertakings into promising ones. Here also let us take an example from the more recent history of the labor movement. When in March 1921 the uprising which goes by the name of the "March action" took place in Central Germany, it was so far "supported" by the communist Reichstag fraction as one of its speakers called on the workers to "seize arms wherever they can be found". Now it is well known that this central-german uprising was strictly an armed affair, and logically the workers took not only arms where they could find them, but also things which were necessary to them for the struggle with the white guardists. Naturally, the workers had the arming action already long behind them at the time the call for it came from the parliamentary field. Scope, course and fate of the uprising remained also absolutely unaffected by comments, which later received their most attentive reading from the German judges. The nature of the uprising made it a sort of guerilla struggle, and this in turn determined its scope and course. The workers' struggle was naturally resulted in group-forming, and these groups in turn forced the workers, who, thronging entirely upon their own resources, could not pay the slightest attention to communist speeches in the Reichstag. And because they could not, and therefore quite reasonably did not, they were dubbed bandit ringleaders in the party press. Such the nature of parliamentary support of extra-parliamentary actions. It reveals itself, exactly like the exposing, as a bluff, the dishonorable nature of which is not perceived by the uncritical worker and for which he therefore falls.

The working class must learn to ask: "What is the parliament (or congress)?" and not as hitherto: "Who represents my interests in the Parliament (or Congress)?" At best, the Parliament is the means with which there can be undertaken a suitable distribution of the sphere of power and interests between the individual capitalistic rivals. In effect, then, an instrument for settling the conflicts of interests within the ruling class itself, and hence a means of strengthening the ruling class. To grant to the suppressed class, by way of parliament, any political or economic advantage whatsoever, would merely mean to give back to the working class, without a struggle, what the exploiting class daily rancusses from it with great pains and no little danger. Anyone who considers the ruling class and especially its parliamentary acolytes as "soft", let him calmly keep on voting. Anyone, however, who has no illusions regarding the essence of capitalism, leaves the babbling bourgeoisie to themselves and forms with his class comrades an army which doesn't treat with the bourgeoisie but brings it low. W.T.

**ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM AND COUNCIL COMMUNISM**

For many years the left communist groups have been referred to as the anti-parliamentarians because they were opposed to parliamentary participation and parliamentary activity. They are still in large measure led by that name and even refer to themselves as the Anti-parliamentary movement. During the reformist era of capitalism this was correct as it differentiated them from the parliamentary socialists in the labor movement. The controversy between these two sections raged about the question as to which was most effective in getting reforms—legislative action in parliaments or direct action and strikes on the economic field. The struggle between the opposing ideas and tactics dates back to the first international, and even before.

During the upwelling period of capitalism, when it was expanding and developing, it was possible to grant concessions to the working-
class because of the increase in productivity and the resulting increase in profit. These reforms, however, were seldom granted without much struggle. There were victories and defeats in both wings of the movement and the economic and political organizations grew and developed with capitalism. The controversy as to which was most effective of these activities continued.

The present period of capitalist decline, however, is one in which generally no concessions are possible for the working-class. Further, we have definitely left the era of democracy, the era of free competition. This democracy which served the conflicting interests of small capitalists during the developing stage of capitalism, is now no longer compatible. Monopoly capitalism in a period of permanent crisis, where the short waves of upswing and "prosperity" are the exception and where capitalist crisis is the general rule, finds dictatorship and organized terror the only means to insure it a tranquil proletariat. Democracy, parliaments and the parliamentary organizations become obsolete and in fact cannot be tolerated. There parliamentism still remains, it only indicates that the general world crisis has not attained sufficient depth. The unquestionable tendency throughout the capitalist world is toward fascism and the dictatorship of the monopoly capitalist class.

This development also renders the controversy of the parliamentarians in the movement with the left communist groups obsolete as well. The name "anti-parliamentary" therefore is historically outworn and should be discarded. In its place the better title, council communism should be adopted as it designates as a name the major difference between the old labor movement and the new labor movement. This difference on the role that organization plays in the class-struggle and in the proletarian revolution is of increasing importance, while the question of parliamentary activity is of decreasing secondary importance throughout the world movement. The name of council communism has been adopted by some groups and is used extensively in our literature. It should be used by all left communist groups who adhere to the international council communist movement. This new movement growing up in the new historical period in which we live, holds that the proletarian revolution is a class question and it devotes its efforts to aiding the working-class to carry through its historical revolutionary role, a task in which the old labor movement failed.

In contra-distinction to the old party form of organization, universally common to the parliamentary politicians in the old labor movement, the new labor movement holds that the soviets, the workers' councils are the real fighting organizations of the working-class.

**************
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planned-economic aid, which may also be denoted as adaptation economy, has nothing to do with Marxism or Socialism. Nationalism now stands against nation. Because I realize this, I am ready to make theoretical and economic sacrifices. The national sentiment and the national interests are themselves realities of which one speaks not only on formal occasions. Nor are we justified in overlooking the fact that the spread between the selling prices of our agricultural products and the prices which we pay on the world market is too great. The agricultural products have increased their price from 20 to 25 percent, while the purchasing prices for metal wares, machines, lime, building stone, fuel, oil, clothing and textiles have increased by 24 to 92 percent. Agriculture is in need of constant help. The trade unions must comprehend also their new tasks in the new epoch.

To be sure, the workers shall not be deprived of their right to strike, but it has to be considered whether a strike may endanger the whole nation, as was the case with the meat market workers' strike of last year. At that time we stood the first test and then simply ended the strike. We must find new forms, in order that the economy as such may be preserved in the present situation from useless struggles.

... In the concert of nations we blow the old shawm of peace. It is true that our faith in enduring peace, in disarmament and in the power of the League of Nations, etc., has been disappointed. Nevertheless, we hope that the great countries will recognize our will to neutrality and will not deny us the right to live. We want with all our united strength to develop and strengthen the productive forces in the country and the people, to draw the whole people with us into labor and to have Denmark for the people.

Now what is the L.S. movement, and what does it want? In the year 1930 the big landowner Knud Bach, the leader of the movement, gathered about him a number of his compars, and together they started this Danish peasant organization in which, so perfectly after the German model of the Nazi movement, everything is combined in perfect harmony: by the side of the count, the ordinary country worker; by the side of the larger or smaller peasant, the director of the corporation. According to its literature, the L.S. aims to be a pure "trade-union" movement. This literature gives as the reason for this aim that the working class as a class, that by the pacific and legal party it has also the trade unions which hold in check the "hundred-percent" politicians. All the peasant politicians have betrayed the peasants; the peasants must therefore have a trade organization of their own and also venture to make use of the same means of struggle as the working class; and it would surely be a paradox if Minister Stauding, who came up out of the trade movement, should venture to take action against a production strike on the part of the peasant. These big land-owners, who call themselves "the people" or "the nation" as a mask for 'Nazis, are enabled to represent their standpoint in three daily and three weekly periodicals. The movement itself has a so-called council of 24, in which are seven representatives of the meat market, seven of the dairy farmers, and ten others. The movement is the local representation of the state of society, which is the fundamental law of Denmark. In one of their programmatic leaflets they come out consequently in so far as possible, a fair wage for good work, together with a wage determined by the economic conditions and also a flexible currency, in the main a depreciation of the krona.

They demand also the setting aside of the class state created by Marxism and Liberalism. The main idea which hovers before the directors of the L.S. movement is an agricultural cartel over the whole of Denmark. In order in the first place to be able to fix the prices within the country and then for products going abroad, whenever there is an opportunity to deliver enormous quantities of butter. It is also necessary to make the country ready to countries abroad. When the state is neutral, of course, to the full extent possible. Besides, it is clear to the L.S. that it is only by way of a national revolution, thus setting aside the class state which has created again, that the condition seems to a turn for the better, which has already happened, and countries like Italy and Germany are path-breakers for the new revolution.
The danish working class under-estimates this new movement, and comfort is found in the circumstance that after all only 35,000 people were present, whose votes are not decisive. It is also said that many farm workers were given double pay for taking part in the demonstration, tho privately they favor democracy. In reality, this is a camouflaged Nazi movement in which the danish National Socialist Labor Party is working with a view to the goal.

The parliamentary parties have treated this movement and taken a stand with regard to its demands. The demands have been rejected, but the negotiation itself was no sign of strength on the part of the parliamentary parties and the rejection merely helps the L.S. in its propaganda. The L.S. has now proceeded to the so-called valuta strike; that is, the goods delivered to the members are not to be paid for until later, even tho they may have received money which might be used for that purpose. From the purely democratic point of view, all this is illegal, to be sure, but the government doesn't dare to proceed against the movement. The motto of the Social Democracy -- "Democracy, lay on our-- is put into practice only against the proletariat who once venture to go their own ways in the class struggle. As regards the goal, moreover, Stauning and Knud Bach are at one. Both want the autarchic policy to the full extent in which this is possible in the age of world monopoly and so far as permitted by the country's scant raw materials. And because of his realization of this situation, Stauning is willing to make economic and theoretical sacrifices, as he said at the last party congress; that is, the sacrifices are to be made by the workers, and profit of a suffering farm economy. The only point of difference concerns the methods.

The Third International in the Opinion of the Bourgeoisie

The bourgeois-liberal MANCHESTER GUARDIAN (August 2, 1935) writes:

"What Karl Marx said of the Democrats in his day is true of the Communists in our own day - that they emerge from the most shameful defeat with looks of triumph on their faces. The Communists who make up the Third International tried to capture the trade unions in various European countries, but they failed miserably. Then they tried to set up rival trade unions, but they failed again. They talked much about direct action and armed rebellion, but in all the big historic battles on behalf of the working class the general strike that repelled the German counter-revolution in 1920, the Austrian and Spanish insurrections last year - the Communists were hardly to be seen. Only when direct action was altogether senseless did the Communists take it, as in the futile German insurrections of 1921 and 1923 and the mad Estonian revolt of 1924. Even when in Germany they had a large following, thanks to the mistakes of the Social Democrats, they were unable to do anything that was not harmful to the working class. They helped reaction into power directly and indirectly. They taught the Nazis lessons in demagogy, violence, and political cynicism. They were the allies of the Nazis in the assault on democratic institutions. One might have thought this week's congress of the Third International in Moscow would take some stock of the ruin it has brought about, but not at all; the congress explains amid much cheering that despite minor errors - there must, of course, be some "Leninist self-criticism" - the Communists were always fundamentally right and everybody else always fundamentally wrong. Perhaps the future of Europe will be with some form of Communism, but that it will never be with the Communism of the Third International is made much more certain by that International itself and its congresses in Moscow than it would ever be made either by Hitler or by Mussolini."

Critical Remarks Concerning
"The Rise of a New Labor Movement"

The article which appeared in the C.C. (August 1935) under the above title was an attempt to bring before the revolutionary workers the essential features of the new labor movement now in process of development. The C.C. stands open for all expressions of opinion which may be regarded as serving to clarify the question thus broached. We begin by presenting some critical remarks which seem to us worthy of consideration.

I find passages in your work that strikes me as well thought out and correct; particularly the disquisitions concerning the mass uprising, which in virtue of its inner tendencies and the conduct of the bourgeoisie passes beyond itself. Nevertheless, on this point also I wish to present a few observations; but I will follow your own exposition.

On the whole, it seems to me that your work, in spite of various good features, is written too far aloof from any real and concrete movement of the working masses on the actual present-day field of struggle, and that its results have been arrived at more thru speculative, so-to-say "philosophical" after-thought instead of thru serious analyses of the present class situation in the various countries, or investigation of the given state of capitalist economy and politics on the national and international fields. This becomes clear as early as where you speak of the working class as a "lifeless thing". Such a statement is simply false. For the working class even today is a quite "active" force in the social development. Its support of the Social Democracy in various European countries, in the United States its entry into the trade unions bought by Roosevelt -- such things, among others, are after all a socially very effectual, tho to us extremely uncomfortable bit of "activity." For the workers accomplish in this way, however badly, a bit of reformist class action, attracts their (socially ever smaller) share of the product which they themselves create. This "activity" has a quite determinate, even tho conservative, effect in capitalist reality. A revolutionary passive class is not a "lifeless thing";
the it is true that its activity is, in the first place, relatively weak and, secondly, goes in a direction which does not consciously lead to a communist struggle. Unconsciously, however, even a reformist policy in which class interests are represented contributes a certain sharpening of the crisis. We have nothing whatever to do with the German experience. As has shown for Italy and as the German experience also has thought, is not the blow directed against a class standing at the threshold of revolution, but precisely against its reformist action, which at a certain stage of monopoly capital and in connection with a certain sharpening of the crisis becomes intolerable to the bourgeoisie, already struggling for its economic existence and which sees itself attacked in its substance by reason of its own economic contradictions while it may be true that reformism -- which, nevertheless, has been carried on and tolerated by an entire class -- has at a certain level a capitalistic function, it still at the same time forms an inner contradiction of capitalism, somewhat in the same way as does the competitive struggle between agricultural and export industry. But it is quite possible that capitalism in various countries will go to pieces precisely by reason of these manifold inner contradictions. Thus it is much more probable that german fascism will collapse than that it will be overrun by a revolution. The revolutionary struggle will probably not occur until after the collapse (cf. also the Russian revolution).

What you say about the necessity and the course of the proletarian action and its council form is in many respects correct, but not sufficiently concrete. How does the development look from this point of view? You speak of a "leap in the unfolding of the class struggle". This phrase stands there as if you had succumbed to a hegelian belief in miracles. For after all, "leaps" in the historical development have always been the result of the most manifold molecular processes. It would be our task to investigate the general conditions and various given disadvantages by capital as well as those existing more particularly to the proletariat as a class which are effective in this respect in the present-day situation in the various countries.

You make your exposition still more obscure with something to the effect that a revolutionary mass thrust will not bring forth a new "organizational apparatus" but a "vital principle". In the first place, I fail to understand what this "vital principle" is supposed to be, and, secondly, how such a concept can be set in the place of organization. When you reject the hithe existing "organizational apparatus" of the capitalist State, I accept it. Wherever it exists, you are on good ground. And when you grant that, on the other hand, the mere organizational form of the councils is still far from guaranteeing any class-conscious action, you are again right: any belief to the contrary, in my opinion, will be council mysticism. You can hardly deny, however, that without suitable organizations any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible. When the fighting proletariat in the course of its experiences on the field prescribed for it by the class enemy process, i.e., council and bolshevist organizations, you are on good ground. And when you grant that, on the other hand, the mere organizational form of the councils is still far from guaranteeing any class-conscious action, you are again right: any belief to the contrary, in my opinion, will be council mysticism. You can hardly deny, however, that without suitable organizations any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible. When the fighting proletariat in the course of its experiences on the field prescribed for it by the class enemy process, i.e., council and bolshevist organizations, you are on good ground. And when you grant that, on the other hand, the mere organizational form of the councils is still far from guaranteeing any class-conscious action, you are again right: any belief to the contrary, in my opinion, will be council mysticism. You can hardly deny, however, that without suitable organizations any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible. When the fighting proletariat in the course of its experiences on the field prescribed for it by the class enemy process, i.e., council and bolshevist organizations, you are on good ground. And when you grant that, on the other hand, the mere organizational form of the councils is still far from guaranteeing any class-conscious action, you are again right: any belief to the contrary, in my opinion, will be council mysticism. You can hardly deny, however, that without suitable organizations any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible. When the fighting proletariat in the course of its experiences on the field prescribed for it by the class enemy process, i.e., council and bolshevist organizations, you are on good ground. And when you grant that, on the other hand, the mere organizational form of the councils is still far from guaranteeing any class-conscious action, you are again right: any belief to the contrary, in my opinion, will be council mysticism. You can hardly deny, however, that without suitable organizations any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible. When the fighting proletariat in the course of its experiences on the field prescribed for it by the class enemy process, i.e., council and bolshevist organizations, you are on good ground.
there objectively and accurately. The old continues to live on also
in people's minds. I am thinking of a collapse of German Fascism,
and of the fact that then a dozen parties would be able to
swoop down on the workers: bolshevist and centrist and reformist
currents of divers hue, and by the side of these various groupings
which want to begin from the ground up and which can still not by
a long shot be clear regarding everything essential, it seems to
me that your attitude makes it impossible to exert the highest
degree of influence upon this chaotic situation, or - at least
makes such action much more difficult. Communists need an organiza-
tion (theoretically, and I think, even a second, analogous organizati-
on of an industrial cast), an organization which, to be sure,
on the inside makes impossible all steam-roller methods and leader-
ship role, but which as a strictly coherent instrument can become
effective internationally scale, then in the first place you leave the field
of workers, but as if it existed beside the workers. It is sure
unifying and internationalizing only locally limited centers of experience for which it becomes
second time into the swamp. And secondly, you form in substance
those groups are likewise parts of the class, the most advanced por-
tions. Their organization will accordingly seek to take an active
part, in whatever concrete forms, in all mass struggles. It can
hardly take a position to one side, in order afterwards to draw
theoretical conclusions.

Committees of action, councils, etc. are the most general
forms of the class organs. The ripeness of the struggling masses,
which have to obtain these organs by great exertion, is manifestly
not in the lack of parties etc., but in the circumstance that in
their struggles they try themselves out and finally thrust upon
the political line which the most advanced of these organizations
embodies. This organization, which must certainly not be called by
the name "party" and will also be fundamentally different from
what is now so called, can enormously accelerate the maturing
process of the masses, in that it impels to the maximal unfoldment of
forces. But during and even after a seizure of power there will
still be backward elements leaning to other parties of the same
backward character, parties with which we shall accordingly have to
settle accounts. You will perhaps say: in that case we shall form,
in addition to the dozen, the thirteenth party. But such a viewpoint
is false. For we embody other principles, other conceptions of or-
ganization, and our work will have a different form, and must
become effective, and that in the highest possible measure.

Furthermore, you quite overlook, in the main, the field of

struggle as to which the working class has no choice. Not only in
the sense that you make no attempt to sketch the many-sided and enor-
rously contradictory picture of present-day capitalism which you fail to investigate its features. But also in the sense that of all
the general and fundamental matters you emphasize only one thing: the capitalist struggle for profit. That this struggle has,
however, in the first place, a definite, varying economic structure of capita-
ilis as its basis, and a greater still more quickly changing field
of political guarantees as its second sphere of action, - all that
fails to enter your range of vision. And yet the development of capital-
ism proceeds in the interaction and in the antagonism of

The proletariat is stationed on both fields, on both it must
fight the enemy, must accordingly break up a power apparatus and win
a productive apparatus, and this production apparatus must be funda-
mentally transformed and secured politically anew. The proletariat
can therefore not keep out of this interaction and the antagonism,
must organizationally master both of these apparatuses in the stages
of its revolution (for I speak here of the stages of the perhaps
long continuing decisive struggle, not of what will come later).
That is to say: Political councils as instruments of proletarian
class power, economic councils as organs for the taking over of the
seats of production and for bringing them into action not alone
with a view to so-called work of construction, but also adapted to
the conditions of the continuing class war, with the proletarian
people as they are in reality. Or in other words: Communist organi-
ization on the line of socialization and on the line of the conquest
of power (industrial organization and political organization).

That appears to me necessary as a basic orientation, and from
it now follow the further questions of the momentary beginning, of
the momentary working methods, of the momentarily possible cooper-
tion, etc. My remarks are intended merely as suggestions and points
for discussion. As an actual, practical preliminary question I
pose the following: What do you think of the building up of an
international cooperation for the purpose of forming a picture, as
concrete and comprehensive as possible, of the present-day eco-
nomic and political reality in the various countries? In other words:
How shall we shape for ourselves a general perspective, resting on
the investigations of facts, and into which can be built a discuss-
ion of the questions of further organizational construction, of
tactics, etc.? Our knowledge of the enemy we want to overcome is
of course quite inadequate, so that he surprises us again and again.
These things appear to me, therefore, not only the most important
at present, but also those regarding which an understanding is first
possible.

H.W.

---

Please Notice

In a forthcoming issue of the C.C. we will publish an answer to the
above criticism. We will also publish a critique on the Theses
which were adapted by the Brussels Conference as reported on in
#11 of the C.C. Don't miss reading this discussion.
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The intellectual middle class, the engineers, scientists, technical employees, etc., are a necessary part of industrial production; quite as indispensable as the worker himself. Technical progress, in replacing workers by machines, tends to increase their number. Therefore their class interests and their class character must be of increasing importance in the social struggles.

Their growing numbers reflect the growing importance of science and theory in the production of life necessities. In a communist society all will partake of scientific knowledge. In capitalist society it is the privilege and the specialty of a separate class, the intellectual middle class.

The members of this class, contrary to the old independent middle class of small business men, live by selling their labor power to the capitalists. Their salaries indicate a higher cost of living and a more expensive education than that of the common workers. In the socialist press they are called proletarians; (indeed, they are not owners of instruments of production) who need must join the workers. But it is only their lower ranks that merge gradually into skilled labor; the higher ranks, by origin and standard of living, by relationship, social standing and culture, feel themselves middle class men, who can rise even to the position of a director, and thus be ranked with the big capitalists. Some of them sympathized with social democracy, but the bulk was filled with the capitalist spirit of striving for a better position for themselves only. In Italy and Germany they form the intellectual backbones of fascism.

What are the social ideals of this class?

They realize that capitalism is not eternal; they already perceive the signs of its decline: in economic crisis, in political revolts and revolutions, in social struggles, in world war. It is not the exploitation of labor that annoys them in capitalism; it is the disorder in capitalism, the anarchy in production that provokes their criticism. Where they rule in the factory, the efficiency of labor by means of strict order and conscious regulation is raised to the highest degree. But outside the factory, in society, where capitalists, stock gamblers and politicians rule, they see the worst disorder and inefficiency, a scandalous waste of human labor, and the inevitable consequence: poverty and ruin for the whole of society.

What they want, therefore, is organization of production, conscious regulation of labor over the whole of society. They feel themselves the spiritual leaders, the class of intellect and knowledge, destined to take over the lead from the incapable hands of the present rulers. In America the ideas of "technocracy" are the first tokens of such a mode of thinking. By a scientific management of the whole of production under a central direction which does away with competition and which divests the individual capitalists from their arbitrary power, the amount of product can be raised to such a height, that there will be abundance for everybody.

This social ideal of the intellectual middle class is a kind of socialism, but it is not necessarily directed against the capitalist class. It does not mean to expropriate them or to take their profits away from them. On the contrary, in deprivating them of their arbitrary power to damage one another, in abolishing the enormous waste, it will raise the productivity of labor to such a degree, that the profits will increase considerably. And at the same time it renders possible an increase and securing of the workers' portion, so that all reason for revolt or revolution is taken away.

It is not a socialism of the workers, but a socialism for the workers; a socialism made by others, also for the benefit of the workers. The exploitation of the workers will not cease, it will be made more rational. With equal justice this social system may be called "organized capitalism".

There is, of course, no place for democracy in this system. Democracy means, at least formally, rule of the mass, of the whole people. But this socialism is founded upon the rule, the leadership of the few, of the intellectual minority. In present-day capitalism the technical middle class are leaders and directors of the labor process; they command the workers. They can imagine an ideal society only with this leading and commanding function preserved and extended. The intellectual class does not admit differences founded on noble birth or riches; but it admits differences in brains, in mental capacity and it considers itself as the class of men with the best brains, selected to lead the great masses of the ungifted common people, destined to be common workers.

Hence the political system belonging to this middle class socialism can never be democracy; it must be the dictatorship of a leading bureaucracy. The socialism once proclaimed as their social goal by the vanguard of the working class, was international. Because they saw production as a worldwide unit process and the class struggle of the workers as the common cause of the working class of all countries. The intellectual class, however, owing to its middle class origin to the close connection with the capitalist class, has a strong national feeling. Moreover, the instrument necessary for the regulation of production exists as power organ of the state. Its socialist goal therefore means a national state socialism. Its rule is the rule of a state bureaucracy, its system of production is state capitalism. International world unity is a far-away dream to them, not a matter of practical ideals.

Some characteristics of the social ideals of the intellectual class are found in social-democracy, especially in its state-socialist program, though its relation of leaders to masses has a more democratic aspect. In German National Socialism some others of these characteristics are perceptible. The tendencies of a class are never reproduced purely in a political party or a political movement. They are the underlying basis, the underground stream, taking its course and growing after fixed laws, determined by class interests, by needs of social development, by the deepest subconscious feelings which the social conditions produce in a class. They are not
adequately represented in the surface phenomena, in the political events, the party platforms, the government's changes, the measures taken, the revolutions, the programs——because in all these the traditions, the existing power factors, the relative force of contesting co-operating classes, groups, parties, play a role. But then always now, the realities hidden beneath the surface break through, upset the old and determine the new ideas and political events. So we have to look into these events for the class forces at work in them just as for the forces of nature we look into the natural phenomena.

Fascism and national socialism the class spirit of the intellectual middle classes appears in its first germs. We see at yet only a common revolt against democracy, with only a faint and vague desire for an economically constructive policy. Nevertheless, the spiritual force of the national-socialist slogans of the intellectual class was sufficient to carry away numbers of workers who saw in it an organizing power against capitalist disorder.

It is possible that these parties will realize, or try to realize the class ideals of the intellectual class? This class is rather powerless against the capitalist class. The social power of the intellectuals, measured by their number, their class consciousness, their social feeling, is still far below the power which the working class had long ago already attained. The capitalist class in Europe and America is so powerful that it does not need to tolerate any organization or regulation of production beyond its own interests. Its capitalism feels itself extremely threatened and endangered by hard and long crisis, by worker's revolts, by world war, that conditions are different. Then the intellectuals, together with part of the workers, may be called upon to introduce constructive policy, tending towards state capitalist experiments.

Then, however, the working class, rising against the unbearable oppression of monopolistic capitalism, by means of revolutionary movements, should succeed in breaking down capitalist power, what will the intellectual classes do? Then the position will be reversed; the working class, by its mighty fighting power, carries the other discontented classes along with it, in a common assault on capitalism. Then great parts of the intellectual class will join them; they will not be won over by the great socialist and communist ideas, and will consider them as their common cause. In every revolutionary movement in history we see great numbers joining it in a common enthusiasm for ideals other than their own ideals, thereby making victory more easy. But afterwards it appeared that each of the allies interpreted the slogans and aims in his own way, thus causing dissensions and new fights between the former comrades. The same will doubtlessly be the case in future revolutionary movements.

The slogans against capitalism, for socialism or communism, will be——common to the revolutionary classes. But for each class, there is a different form of social organization. The social class has to build up production from below, by their direct hold over the factories, and to organize them by means of their workers' councils into a democratic commonwealth. The intellectual class will try to install a centrally organized state socialism, directed by a leading bureaucracy.

Is not the intellectual class right in this? Is it not necessary that in these most difficult times of fighting and social reconstruction the ignorant masses should be directed by those who have the best brains? Is it not true, that for that period this selected minority class, trained in science, in general and special knowledge, are the natural leaders, up till the time when new generations have been born?

No, this is not true. The organization of society is not a matter of techniques, of scientific knowledge. The techniques of production are excellent already. Capitalism has developed the science of the forces of nature and its application to a high level. This is the domain of the superior knowledge of the intellectuals. An intellectual class trained in the process of production they may apply their brains for the benefit of the community.

But social organization has to deal with other things: with social forces and with the knowledge of social forces. It is an organization of men. And here the intellectuals have no special capacities. What they bring along is only the haughty prejudices of the capitalist class. In social insight, in knowledge of the real class relations of society the intellectuals stand below the working class. Because their mind clings to ideas belonging to a passing period. Because outside of their physical machines, in matters of human relationship, they are wont to deal not with the realities of social life itself, but with their spiritual images, conceptions, theories, abstractions.

Social organization does not depend on qualities of the intellect of a minority. It depends on qualities of character of the whole working people. It is the consolidation of the workers into one unity, through strong moral and economic forces, which can not be commanded by leaders but must grow up in the masses in their fight for freedom.

Thus the social ideals and aims of the intellectuals and of the working class oppose one another. The intellectual class, when it should try to establish some social order, must call upon old instincts of obedience, upon the slave feelings of a bygone humanity. For its state-socialist society it would replace the intellectual with socialdemocratic and party-communist platforms, in union leaders, in the capitalistic ideas of timid and backward workers, who think communist freedom too high for them, and in the beaten remnants of the capitalist force. Then the working class, finding itself opposed by this block, trying under the banner of "socialism against anarchy" to preserve the domination of a ruling class over the working class, will need all its wisdom and all its unity to find and to fight its way to freedom.

J.H.

The U.W.P. will have classes on political economy and dialectical materialism during fall and winter months in Chicago, Buffalo and New York. For information write to U.W.P., 1604 N. California Ave., Chicago, Ill., or to Peter Berck, 4316, 48th Street. Long Island City, N.Y.
To Readers of Council Correspondence

The Council-Communist Press of Chicago will publish a series of important pamphlets in the next six months. Some money is available, but more is needed. You are asked to help in this work by buying a subscription for some of these pamphlets in advance. A few of the manuscripts we are planning to publish are:

- Structure of Marx's Capital
- 50 Years of Marxism
- The Workers' Way to Freedom
- Outline of Production & Distribution in Communism

In November and December we expect to publish one pamphlet which will sell for 10¢ per copy, and one which will sell for 25¢. You can help by sending in one or two dollars now, for which a bundle of these pamphlets will be sent you as soon as they are off the press.

MAIL IN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TODAY

Your attention is called to the fact that the U.W.P. has, in the past year, published a series of pamphlets and the monthly organ 'Council Correspondence'. This work has been carried on by the small groups of Council Communists with very little means at their disposal. The appeal above for your help in getting out more literature warrants your consideration, as this organization is the only one in which there are no paid officials or job-holders who consume the income. Every dollar is used in producing literature of the standard maintained by the party up to now.

With the next issue of the C.C. we will bring into effect the long promised improvements of the C.C., regarding appearance and contents. All improvements depend to a great extent on an increase in circulation. If you wish to see the C.C. continually improving, help to find subscribers and sell it at all workers' meetings. Also send in for the Press Fund.

The Council Correspondence will accept for publication articles containing material, which should be brought to the attention of workers, by writers who are not affiliated with the U.W.P. These articles are signed (initials or full name) to denote that we do not necessarily endorse the views of the writer entirely. All material presented without signature is to be considered as in agreement with the viewpoint of the U.W.P., and, should be taken as the collective work of the members of this organization. We will appreciate suggestions or criticism on any material printed in the Council Correspondence.

Pamphlets:
- "World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution" 10¢
- "Bolshevism or Communism" 5¢
- "What Next for the American Worker?" 10¢
- "The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism" 10¢
- "Marxism or Leninism" By Rosa Luxemburg 10¢
- "The Inevitability of Communism" 5¢
- "Revolutionary Marxism" 5¢
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