spirit into the old craft unions. It is a consequence of capitalist development, that in founding new industries and in replacing skilled labor by machine power, it accumulates large bodies of unskilled workers, living in the worst of conditions. Forced at last into a wave of rebellion, into big strikes, they find the way to unity and class consciousness. They mould unionism into a new form, adapted to a more highly developed capitalism. Of course, when afterwards capitalism grows to still mightier forms, the new unionism cannot escape the fate of all unionism, and then it produces the same inner contradictions.

The most notable form sprang up in America, in the "Industrial Workers of the World." The I. W. W. originated from two forms of capitalist expansion. In the enormous forests and plains of the West, capitalism reaped the natural riches by Wild West methods of fierce and brutal exploitation; and the worker-adventurers responded with as wild and jealous a defense. And in the Eastern States new industries were founded upon the exploitation of millions of poor immigrants, coming from countries with a low standard of living and now subjected to sweatshop labor or other most miserable working conditions.

Against the narrow craft spirit of the old unions, of the A.F. of L., which divided the workers of one industrial plant into a number of separate unions, the I.W.W. put the principle: all workers of one factory as comrades against one master, must form one union, to act as a strong unity against the employer. Against the multitude of often jealous and bickering trade unions, the I.W.W. set up the slogan: one big union for all the workers. The fight of one group is the cause of all. Solidarity extends over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labor towards the unorganized immigrants, it was these worst paid proletarians that the I.W.W. led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the I.W.W. who taught them how to fight; who raised relief funds all over the country; and who defended their cause in its papers and before the courts. By a glorious series of big battles it infused the spirit of organization and self-reliance into the hearts of these masses. Contrary to the trust in the big funds of the old unions, the Industrial Workers put their confidence in living solidarity and the force of endurance, upheld by a burning enthusiasm. Instead of the heavy stone-masoned buildings of the old unions, they represented the flexible construction, with a fluctuating membership, contracting in time of peace, swelling and growing in the fight itself. Contrary to the conservative capitalist spirit of trade unionism, the Industrial Workers were anti-capitalist and stood for Revolution. Therefore they were persecuted with intense hatred by the whole capitalist world. They were thrown into jail and tortured on false accusations; a new crime was even invented on their behalf; that of "criminal syndicalism".

Industrial unionism alone as a method of fighting the capitalist class is not sufficient to overthrow capitalist society and to conquer the world for the working class. It fights the capitalists as employers on the economic field of production, but it has not the means to overthrow their political stronghold, the state power. Nevertheless, the I.W.W. so far has been the most revolutionary organization in America. More than any other it has contributed to rouse class consciousness and insight, solidarity and unity in the working class, to turn its eyes toward communism, and to prepare its fighting power.

The lesson of all these fights in that against big capitalism, trade unionism cannot win. And if at times it wins, such victories give only temporary relief. And yet, these fights are necessary and must be fought. To the bitter end? - no, to the better end.

The reason is obvious. An isolated group of workers against an isolated capitalist employer, might make equal parties. But an isolated group of workers against an employer, backed by the whole capitalist class, is powerless. And such is the case here: the state power, the money power of capitalism, public opinion of the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers.

But does the working class back the strikers? The millions of other workers do not consider this fight as their own cause. Certainly they sympathize, and often collect money for the strikers, and this may give some relief, provided its distribution is not forbidden by a judge's injunction. But this easy-going sympathy leaves the real fight to the striking group alone. The millions stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, when the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one undivided unit.

The matter will be different, of course, when the mass of the workers really consider such a contest as directly concerning them; when they find that their own future is at stake. If they go into the fight themselves and extend the strike to other factories, to ever more branches of industry. Then the state power, the capitalist power, has to be divided and cannot be used entirely against the separate group of workers. It has to face the
collective power of the working class.

Extension of the strike, ever more widely, up to a general strike in the end, has often been advised as a means to avert a defeat. But to be sure, this is not to be taken as a truly expedient pattern, accidently hit upon, and ensuring victory. If such were the case, trade unions certainly would have made of it repeatedly as regular tactic. It cannot be proclaimed at will by union leaders, as a simple tactical measure. It must come forth from the deepest feelings of the masses, as the expression of their spontaneous initiative; and this is aroused only when the issue of the fight is or grows larger than a simple wage contest of one group. Only then the workers will put all their force, their enthusiasm, their solidarity, their power of endurance into it.

And all these forces they will need. For capitalism also will bring into the field stronger forces than before. It may have been defeated and taken by surprise by the unexpected exhibition of proletarian force and thus have made concessions. But then afterwards, it will gather new forces out of the deepest roots of its power and proceed to win back its position. So the victory of the workers is neither lasting nor certain. There is no clear and open road to victory; the road itself must be hewn and built through the capitalist jungle at the cost of immense efforts.

But even so, it will mean great progress. A wave of solidarity has gone through the masses, they have felt the immense power of class unity, their self-confidence is raised, they have shaken off the narrow group egoism. Through their own deeds they have acquired new wisdom what capitalist means and how they stand as a class against the capitalist class. They have seen a glimpse of their way to freedom.

Thus the narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But now the workers themselves must change. They have to take a wider view of the world, from their trade, from their work within the factory walls, their mind must widen to encompass society at large. Their spirit must rise above the petty things around them. They have to face the state; they enter the realm of politics. The problems of revolution must be dealt with.

J. H.
of organization. During the spontaneous uprisings, committees of action (councils) take form, since the forming of such organs is out of the question; and these present the organization of any struggle whatsoever, and their fate depends on the development of this struggle. The extension of the struggle is at the same time the unfolding and centralizing of the council organization. A defeat may destroy it, until a new outbreak again brings it into existence. The necessarily small labor groups under the conditions of illegality can at most exercise influence upon these spontaneous organizations, never determine or directly lead them. Their activity presents the organizational problem. The extent of the struggle is never determined or directly led by them. Their activity.

A present as the determining factor. The more their compulsory action of the masses. But even tho we radicalization and centralizing of the council organization.

What holds for the revolution, holds also for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The workers have no more need of a special machinery of suppression than they have of a special political organization by the side of the councils. The special political organization is, after all, only an indication of the unripeness of the revolutionary situation - an indication of the impossibility of the overthrow of capitalism. The councils must alone have the economic and political instruments of power in their hands -- and in fact they have those instruments, provided that they do not voluntarily turn them over to a special body. The existence of two different centers of power can only lead to the elimination of one or the other. The councils organize the dictatorship, as later on they also organize production and distribution. They can not tolerate a special power beside themselves, for such a condition is a sure sign of their future impotence. The councils can only assert themselves and become the basis of the social organization when they can assert themselves as the exclusive instrument of power. "All power to the councils" is not the council movement is the yardstick with which the conscious application of the class forces can be measured. The councils arise only in the revolution itself, we too reject. In any movement proceeding from the working class the main emphasis must be laid on the formation of workers' councils. The significance of a mass movement is not to consist as much in the material successes which it attains, but in whether and to what extent it succeeds in applying the class forces thru its councils.

The labor movement which is consciously interested in the development of the movement of labor and which can be denoted as new we too regard as composed of those still very small groups "which see the essential part of the struggle for emancipation in the independent action of the masses"; the goal of whose striving is not the power for themselves, but for the class, not party power but council power. H.W. too, in his critical remarks, shares our conception, and takes a different position for the first time in his treatment of the relation of the organized labor movement to the mass movement. Of course, it is only in case the arguments of the Dutch group are to be regarded as a concrete analysis of the present-day situation -- which apparently is not the case -- that they are open to H.W.'s reproach of not being concrete. As a "broad perspective" capable of dispensing with more detailed treatment, that analysis has its validity.

Furthermore, to H.W., the exposition of the Dutch group regarding the mass movement were rendered "obscure" for the reason that they are not concerned with bringing forth a new "organizational apparatus", but a new "vital principle". We too regard this substitution of a "vital principle" as very much out of order. One need not always seek for a new "organizational apparatus", to replace things which one has recognized as no longer serviceable. Things are not replaced; they disappear, and new ones take form. We agree with H.W. that "any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible without a suitable organization", and we see in this "vital principle" of the Dutch group nothing more than new organizational forms. The councils are the organization of the revolution and that of the new society after their victory. Though prior to the revolution they may be possible only temporarily, take form and again disappear, and have no possibility of developing a permanent apparatus, still after the taking over of power as well as in the actual revolutionary process they become the machinery of social organization. Under the capitalist dictatorship, the conclusion of the proletarian revolution, the working class has no possibility of shaping for itself revolutionary, permanent forms...
sense of the class movement; it is of practical importance only in the narrower sense of the relation of the working class with the organizations to the class struggle. The revolutionary as well as the indifferent worked for Capital, the ones willingly, the others against their will. The ones carried on the struggle against Capital, the others went along with Capital. One group waited for wage increases, the other struck for them. Both these attitudes were possible only because wage increases were possible and necessary and were in conformity with the interests of Capitalism, however strongly resisted by the individual capitalist. Reformism, even when it was aggressive and denoted the attained stage of proletarian class struggle, had to move within a capitalism the end of which was beyond the range of vision -- except in theory, which must first become actuality in order to seize the masses. The indifferent workers merely sought to safeguard their advantages and interests in another and cheaper manner -- precisely by means of their indifference -- since they were still less in a position to see beyond the mighty capitalist system. The proletarian class itself is a product of Capital; it forms and grows with the growth of the capitalist system. In the up and down of capitalist economy it is compelled to activity and made passive; it acts revolutionary and reactionary out of necessity. But in all situations it is constantly present "in itself" and endeavors to act "for itself". One would do better, instead of making use of these limited formulas, to investigate the grounds by which the working class in different situations is moved in one case to take a revolutionary stand and in another to remain completely passive. But the passivity also is a form of action and invalidates the formulation in question, which has to restrict itself to the comparatively meaningless ideological attitude of the workers in order to justify itself at all. In reality, the class is never "lifeless", tho it often lives on its inactivity. From the isolated standpoint of ideological maturity one may work with formulas, but such a procedure does not suffice for characterizing the whole class movement.

II

With the other sections of the article on the rise of a new labor movement we are, on the whole, in agreement, and we refrain from repeating the points there brought out, in which our own views are embraced. We are in accord with the Dutch group when it states that the "movement of labor assumes in the workers' councils the form whereby it is in a position to master the social forces". And to us also "the growth of the mass move-
ment has disappeared from the mind as well, or until it has reached also its subjective end. The passing of the movement as a tradition at windmills depends on so many different and yet interdependent factors that the point of time for it can not be definitely fixed. Our only consolation on this point is the certainty of the objective untenability of those ideas and impossibility of objective re-gression, as well as the tempo of capitalist decline, which of course is no less rapid than the capitalist upswing. The momentum attained by the capitalist move-ment as a result of the previous development precludes for the further development any long and relatively static periods.

We further share the view of the Dutch comrades regarding the reasons of the present impotence of the labor movement and regarding its decline by reason of this impotence. The old labor movement is not only no match for the power of capital, but has itself become a part and expression of this capitalist power. The capitalist class must be opposed by the class front of the proletarian. The organized labor movement was neither an instrument, nor a symbol, nor a form of a genuine class movement, nor, even if it had been so, would have been capable of such a thing. It constantly championed group interests, and it was only to such conflicts that the movement was organizationally adapted. The end of the old labor movement was necessarily involved with the capital concentra-tion in the decline of capitalism. The class struggle against the capitalist system, which was in its most radical form, has thus become the only objective possibility.

Even tho the source of reformism - the capitalist up-swing - was dried up, and the capitalist decline mirrored only the unavoidable end of the reformist move-ment, it was still possible to fight the reformist propaganda. The possibility of organization without the possibility of reform gave rise also to the neo-reformism of post-war time, until fascism came to look upon the existence of even the most incompetent working class organizations as burdensome and dangerous, and set them aside. The indirect subordina-tion of the workers to the interests of Capital by means of reformism has been followed by the direct subordination thru fascism. So that one may no doubt say with the Dutch comrades that the organized labor movement as hitherto existing has found its historical end. It can not be formed anew. The thing with which we are concerned, in connection with the coming revolutionary conflicts, is the movement of labor. This movement of labor, which already represents the class

an empty phrase, but inexorable necessity. Any devia-tion from this principle is a step toward the emascula-tion of the councils and thereby to putting obstacles in the way of the communist struggle.

As to whether we shall succeed, - we are, of course, only a part of the working class, and without special interests, - in putting our principle into practice in its pure form: that is a question by which the principle itself is not affected. One does not always attain the thing that he aims for. But because too many oppo-site forces work counter to the objectively possible goal - forces which may succeed in turning the goal aside - it is well for that very reason to hold unwaveringly to the maximal program. If by reason of the situation the councils are compelled to have resort to special measures not always in conformity with the final goal, which is not clear even to themselves, in order to exist at all, or if the councils fail to take proper account of the objective situation and fall back into a policy which must bring about their own end: that is regrettable, and will compel us also to flexibility and tactical maneuvers which can not yet be defined in any general form. All that has to be reckoned with, one is obliged, prior to their occurrence, and as long as possible, to stand all the more consistently for the maximal program and to fight for it. There are enough backward forces, and there is no need to help them to victory; the more concessions are made to these, the more backward they become. To use ones art to make the impossible possible: "in order to make the possible possible." It is only when one renounces intrusion into the real struggle, because history goes other ways than one desires, that one has forfeited the name of revoluti-onist. What the group has had to say on these questions is no doubt insufficient: how the class is capable of living freely for itself, how it can fashion in the councils the instrument of suppression which assures the council dictatorship etc. (We too must refrain from going farther into these questions at this place, but shall deal with them in special articles.) Of one thing, however, we are assured; namely, that the arguments advanced by H. Y. are only stop-gap affairs which bring the solution of the problem not a single step forward. His own answer to the question which he proposed is, as a matter of fact, merely a rechristening of old things which he had already regarded as out of the way. His proposals are nothing but new names for the old party conceptions, and the considerations by which they are supported must then likewise fall back upon the old arguments of the previous labor movement. Once more a clear communist program is objected to on
the ground, that, to be sure, it is fine and lovely in
theory, but that practice compels to watering it. Once
more the existence of the middle strata, the backward-
ness of the farmers, etc., must be made to bear the
blame for one's own inconsistency, tho in reality it is
precisely because of the backwardness and enmity of these
strata that the full measure of revolutionary consist-
ency and unambiguity must be maintained. These groups
can not be hoodwinked by means of a shrewd policy; their
activity can only be prevented and, if necessary, com-
bated by force. The more the amount of resistance, the
more unambiguously must the revolutionary program be
represented. The first concession compels to a series
of concessions; in the end there will be nothing left
of the original design. When, as will undoubtedly be
the case, concessions are forced upon the revolu-
 tionary movement, that is bad enough; but to make of these
possibly necessary concessions a matter of principle
and set them down in a program is equivalent to drawing
back from the attempt at radical solutions and is a
release into the old leadership policy which claims
to be able thru "shrewdness" to fashion history after
its own desires.

H.W.'s political councils by the side of the economic
ones (why separate, anyhow, what practically is quite
inseparable ?) are a restoration of the previous party
policy which asserted that the party dictatorship real-
izes that of the masses and is identical with the
dictatorship of the class. On this point we reject H.-
W.'s warning to the effect that if we reject his position we thereby "leave the field to the
other organizations which for the moment are still
capable of action" does not move us, since we have no
desire to compete with these organizations for follow-
ing among and control over the masses. We do not
wish to persuade the masses to follow us, but to pro-
mote an independent movement. We do not wish them
to follow us and not the others". We say: "Follow no one, but
only your own interests and necessities." These neces-
sities are also ours, so that the framework of the coun-
cil movement suffices us for our own activity. Until
the councils arise, we are of course compelled to form
in separate groups, but this defect can not be con-
tverted into a quality. We must disappear as a special
organization as soon as the masses shape for themselves
their organization in the councils. Our place is in
the councils, not by the side of them.

In no case can one make concessions here to H.W.'s
conception.

III

In addition to the questions discussed above, the Brus-
elses thesis (C.C., Vol. I; No. 11) brought still others up
for consideration: the questions of centralism and of
state-capitalist tendencies. The question of centralism
has already been touched upon by H.W. in his critical
remarks, and the article on the new labor movement is
as a matter of fact weakened owing to inadequate treat-
ment of this problem. The practical demand of the
Brussels thesis for more thorough organization of the
work groups and illegal formations to the end of safe-
guar-them and making them more effective, for the
establishment of international connections and better
coordination, for the working out of programmatic direc-
tives with a view to clarification and orientation in
the interest of a more unified and rational procedure-
such demands are likewise represented by us in the
fullest measure. The criticism directed at them by the
Dutch group (C.C., Vol. II; No.1), and which takes the form
of an objection to the centralization necessarily in-
volved in this coordination, comes to us as a complete
surprise. All that we have been able to gather from the
Brussels theses on this point are the simplest practi-
cal and obvious steps for the solution of the tasks with
which we are faced. The sceptical "Al the Fifth or
Sixth International" on the part of the dutch group
strikes us as uncalled for and having reference to other
matters not referred to, for the Brussels theses them-
selves do not justify such an objection. The independ-
ence of the work groups is not abolished by bringing them
organizationally together; rather, without such organi-
ization any work group is sooner or later doomed to death.
Independence and centralization are opposites, but
nevertheless unavoidable ones. The marxist doctrine
of the unity of opposites should alone suffice to indi-
cate the uselessness of the "for or against" argument.
Practically, the Dutch group also cannot help doing
what the Brussels theses propose, unless it should quite
renounce any truly revolutionary work at all. Its fear
that the following of the Brussels proposals would lead
to a dictatorship of the central apparatus over the
groups, thus restricting their independence, is the fear
of life itself. One can not reject things merely because
they involve dangers; one must work in the conditions
such as they are and try to carry thru in them and in
spite of them.

With the advancing monopolization of world capitalism,
the permanent crisis and the period of world wars, the national peculiarities in relation to the proletarian class struggle, and the internationalizing of capital and the world-wide over-accumulation create in all capitalist countries the same objectively revolutionary conditions. In the various capitalist countries the tasks and goals of the workers are not essentially distinguishable. In the United States one has, as a matter of fact, to take the same stand as in England or Germany: the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. Even in the U.S.A., already the possibility of any extensive class struggle in the different countries vanish. The two surpassed Internationals were, in all their aspects, bound up with the structures as the previous Internationals also become impossible. It is for this reason that Trotsky's attempts to resolve a new International into existence strikes one as silly. Nor are we either in a position to form an International which could exercise upon the various groups by giving them the assurance that forces everywhere are working in our direction. Practically, it can no other than assist each individual group in its development. Under the present conditions, it is simply out of the question to form a new International to develop as a copy of the previous ones. The two surpassed Internationals were, in all their aspects, bound up with the presence of democracy in several countries and thus with a relative stability of capitalist economy. Under the present economic conditions, even formal democracy is an impossibility, so that such structures as the previous Internationals also become impossible. It is for this reason that Trotsky's attempts to resolve a new International into existence strikes one as silly. Nor are we either in a position to form an International which could exercise upon the various groups the influence feared by the Dutch comrades. The question of the council international is not at all acute; the matter at issue is the making use of the possible, however limited, international cooperation of our groups. An International does not depend on the resolution to form it, nor is it prevented by an objection. The council-international can, in our opinion, only be the result of a new world-revolutionary wave, and as things stand, today there is no probability of such a wave until after the on-coming new world war has run its course. Or else the international crisis would have to deepen so fast as to paralyze in almost inconceivable measure the capacity for action on the part of Capital; but such an eventuality is less likely than an early war. We share with the authors of the Brussels theses the desire for better international cooperation to the full extent possible, and the organizational and technical matters involved seem to us so obvious that we think they can be left to the correspondence of the different groups. If by reason of objective impossibilities the old labor movement can not arise anew, so also the dangers with which it is associated can not turn up in the new labor movement. No doubt the new labor movement will have its own dangers and unbreakable, but they will not be those of the past one. Such an absolute statement of the demand for independence of the groups as has been presented by the Dutch comrades is not only unmarxist, but practically also impossible. In reality, they also can not help bringing together the national and international work groups and thus giving rise to certain central functions. An practically, even if there had been such a desire on the part of the Brussels conference, it would still have been incapable of transferring to the new labor movement the centralism of the previous one. The thing that is needed is to make centralization possible, without thereby preventing the independent development of the new labor movement. Any central apparatus as well as the individual group the Brussels theses merely reflect the momentary scale of the problems of communism as they have received expression in the previous publications. In the view of this group, the Brussels theses merely reflect the momentary germ practice, which has been willfully elevated to a general theory.

In its reply to the Brussels theses, the Dutch group speaks of two different points of departure by which the conceptions in question are differentiated. It holds that the Brussels theses are based exclusively on the actual problems of the present illegal movement, whereas its own conception is based on the more far-reaching, general attitude to the problems of communism as they have received expression in the previous publications of the Dutch group. In the view of this group, the Brussels theses merely reflect the momentary germ practice, which has been willfully elevated to a general theory.

Well, one can have a theory for the daily practical struggle, and one can have a theory which takes into consideration longer spaces of time and broader problems. One can also have a theory which embraces both these points of view. The union of the narrower theory of the Brussels theses with the broader one of the Dutch group would go away with the dispute as to which of the two should be given greater importance. The one does not
contradict the other, but is part of the other. Apparently, however, the disquisitions contained in the Brussels theses are not rated by the Dutch group as the necessity of the class in theory at all, but as practical work presented which speaks for itself and nothing else. And then an attempt is made to demonstrate that without theory no proper practice is possible, as if this were all that was needed to dispose of the Brussels theses. Practice appears to the Dutch group not as the necessary counterpart of consciousness, or practice as idle chatter. Theory and practice, consciousness and necessity, are inseparable. Things conceived with false consciousness as badly as with correct consciousness (always within the limits of the social necessities), but one must cease to be human in order to practice without consciousness, without theory. The degree in which theory conforms with the practical needs of the class determines its value for the class, and under certain circumstances a self-satisfied theory may have more practical value than one which tries to embrace in its scope more than the direct necessities. And the choice between these theories is not a voluntary, but a compulsory one. Any theory has to proceed from the actual environment, and the greater the extent to which the theory can be reduced to the direct necessities, the greater its direct effect. The direct effect conditions more than the quality of the theory; it conditions also the life of those who do the theorizing. The circumstance that the theses of the Brussels conference spring from the straight-jacket outlook of German fascism does not diminish their value. The reproach of the Dutch group is based on the still existing social-democratic conception of human consciousness just as the Social Democracy rests on its hopes for socialization in the development of the social-democratic ideology, so the Dutch concedes the communist revolution and communism as possible only when a preponderant mass of the workers have more or less clearly "comprehended" their tasks and possibilities. Here also, consciousness, conceived as ideology, makes history: man first thinks, then he comprehends, and then he acts. But such a conception is in contradiction to the actual historical process, and the senselessness of the thing is shown by the fact that the masses don't comprehend and nevertheless in the last instance act correctly. The revolution is not brought about consciously, if we have reference to a consciousness such as it is today generally understood. The great number of errors in connection between history and class-consciousness result from transferring the laws of the growth of consciousness in the individual onto the class in general. The whole point is that the class-consciousness of the individual, with the neglect of this difference, the Dutch group has been deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem. The class-consciousness is conceived as necessary to which its class-consciousness, however, is something different and is subject to other laws than is the consciousness of the individual. With the theory of this difference, the Dutch group has been deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem. The mass of workers—regardless of the extent to which its class-consciousness, but it is something different and is subject to other laws than is the consciousness of the individual. With the neglect of this difference, the Dutch group has been deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem. The class-consciousness, however, is something different and is subject to other laws than is the consciousness of the individual. With the neglect of this difference, the Dutch group has been deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem.
state-capitalist tendencies of the present time, even tho an equal amount of social-democratic attitudes has been taken up by the Dutch group itself in its discussions with reference to the problem of the development of consciousness. To us also, the Brussels theses have overrated and falsely interpreted the "planned economy tendencies" under capitalism. All the factors brought out by these theses are tendencies actually created thru monopolization and concentration but which work in a direction exactly opposite to that assumed by the theses. Even a state capitalism after the Russian model calls for the revolutionary overturn, the abolition of the present possessing class. The matter that ought to be investigated is whether the Russian example can be repeated in other countries or on a world scale; in other words, whether the coming revolutions might remain stuck in a state capitalism after the Russian model. We do not regard this as possible, tho the grounds for our rejection of the idea shall not be given at this place. However, on the basis of the existing capitalism, it is precisely the "state-capitalist" tendencies and the attempts at "planned economy" which demonstrate with all clarity the impossibility of planned economy on the national as well as the international plane. It is only through revolutionary overturn and the transformation of the present private-property relations that state capitalism could merit consideration. The belief that the present-day capitalism could be converted into state capitalism is opposed to Marxism and to the real turn of events. The very factors brought out by the Brussels theses are an expression of the sharpening of the capitalist contradictions. In earlier numbers of the C.C. we have endeavored to prove that the present-day capitalism and planned economy exclude each other. We do not deny the existence of the capitalist tendencies pointed out by the Brussels conference, but we repeat that these tendencies are working in a direction exactly opposite to that toward which their sponsors are striving. Capitalist planning is the magnification of planlessness. This is the paradox in which reality is figured. 

By way of summary, we may say that we approve (with the state-limitations) the article on "The Rise of a New Labor Movement." At the same time, however, we should like, with H.W., to see the principles there represented worked out into concrete, serviceable directives in which we too shall participate. We reject however, that part of H.W.'s disquisitions which we have denoted as a mere re-statement of the old party ideology with new terms. As regards the desire for the concretizing of the general principles expressed in the first mentioned article, we can not, in relation to our own movement do otherwise than get behind the practical demands of the Brussels conference. Yet at the same time we reject, with the Dutch group, the conceptions thereof. Hence our conference with regard to the further tendencies of capitalist development. While in this respect, however, we see eye to eye with the Dutch group, still we object most strenuously to the idealism expressed by that group with reference to the question of the development of class consciousness. We ourselves want an international working together of all council-communist groups on the basis of a unified program.

The discussion to date must be continued until sufficient clarification has been attained. In subsequent numbers of the Council Correspondence, we shall publish our own proposals, and the questions here broached will be taken up in detail.
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