

BOOM WITH TWELVE MILLION UNEMPLOYED

The year 1935 witnessed a notable upswing of industrial production in a number of countries, and particularly in the United States. With the beginning of 1936, a downward movement again set in which in the U.S.A. lowered production by 10 to 15 percent and brought the number of unemployed to over 12 millions. The business optimism created by the upswing of 1935 is again on the decline.

As compared with the month of October 1934, the output of means of production in the U.S.A. for the same month of 1935 had increased by 92 percent, tho in the consumption-goods industries the increase amounted to only 7 percent. This increase in producers' goods is attributable to the replacement of fixed capital--a matter which had become necessary but to which no attention was given in the long years of crisis--and is likewise evidence of the intensified technical rationalization of the enterprises, as indicated by the fact that the number of unemployed and the production have increased simultaneously. There was no expansion of fixed capital, no important new investments. And since the beginning of 1936, the number of orders of machinery for the existing enterprises has again declined. The continuance of capital accumulation is accordingly out of the picture.

The rise in production was accompanied by an improvement in the way of profits. What M.C. Taylor has had to say on this point with reference to the situation in the United States Steel Corporation holds also for a number of other capitalist enterprises: "In the light of the depressed conditions which prevailed during the four years prior to 1935, in which profits fell short of an amount sufficient to cover full depreciation provisions and other general charges, the improved results should be found more encouraging. They demonstrate in no small way the effectiveness of intensive administration and economies successfully instituted thru the united efforts of the entire staff in an endeavor to bring about profitable results." Even tho the profits have risen, still the absence of new investments shows that a profitable basis for the further progressive accumulation is not present. And so the light boom of 1935 is doomed to be nipped in the bud. The promising and much cited rise in the value of stocks, though bound up with the increase of profits, is after all founded more upon the speculative hope of future earnings, for which, however, no basis exists. Optimism on this point can hardly be very great even in capitalist circles, in view of their impassioned attacks upon Roosevelt's projected taxing program. Col. Leonard B. Ayres emphasizes that the proposed tax measures "must operate to reduce

dividends". The burden to be imposed upon industry by the proposed corporation tax is too slight, however, to serve as an alibi for the failure of a new boom to make its appearance or to justify its failure to keep on growing. The only success so far attending the endeavors to reestablish profitability has merely been a reduction of the losses. Capital was no longer compelled to live on the reserves which it had heaped up in the years of prosperity. The losses which had to be covered from these reserves amounted in 1932 to approximately 8.8 billion dollars, according to the Department of Commerce; in 1934 to only 1.6 billions and in 1935 there were even slight surpluses. The fact that the proposed tax measures are expected to lead to a stripping of the reserves is an indication that no one is expecting much from the future. The next thing in order is a continuation of the technical rationalization and of the concentration of capitals, mergers such as that of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, etc., against all protests of the small stockholders, and without any improvement whatever in the general condition of society. There will be a growth in the number of unemployed, and the general impoverishment will become greater. "Booms" in the permanent crisis accelerate the decay.

- - - - -

THE "VICTORY" IN SPAIN

The revolutionary wave which in Spain has been alternately advancing and receding since 1930, tho as a general trend growing stronger, has again led to a defeat of the reaction and to the victory of the "progressive" forces. After the deposing of Alfonso XIII in 1931, a republican government was formed in which the Socialists also were represented. This government, with Zamorra as prime minister, directed itself forthwith against the workers, under the well-approved slogan of "law and order". In the elections of November 1933, the parties of the Right received the majority; a government of the Center was formed which did away with the unessential reforms of the previous government and operated in the interest of all the country's reactionary elements. In 1934, Spain experienced a great wave of strikes which, however, proved of no avail. The movements directed against the reaction culminated in the bloodily suppressed October uprising. The lack of unity among the ruling classes themselves brings in its train one government crisis after the other. The elections of February 16th resulted in a victory for the newly formed "People's Block", composed of Republicans, Socialists and Communists. The governing functions were taken over by

the left-republican bourgeoisie; the power is in the hands of people who are unwilling to use it in favor of the workers, and so are compelled to employ it against them. Azana and his cabinet represent the interests of bourgeois society and are enemies of the proletariat. They have made a few unessential concessions to the workers, such as the liberation of political prisoners (who, of course, can be arrested again tomorrow,) in order to calm the masses temporarily until the state power is sufficiently reconsolidated to prevent any real change of the workers' situation. In this connection they are being supported by all shades of socialists and communists. Workers are still being fed with bullets, and are called upon to observe law and order.

The "victory" in Spain is a victory of the labor fakers. The confidence still reposed in these persons by great masses of the workers will be dearly paid for. Nor will the poverty of the farming population be relieved, as this government is incapable of any essential reforms. But even the breaking up of the large estates, which is not at all likely, would leave the workers' situation unchanged, except for increasing the number of their enemies. It is quite impossible as yet to speak of a victory of the workers in Spain. A change of government can mean nothing to them, and that is the most that has yet come about. If the workers were actually to go farther, if they should begin to take up seriously with the socio-economic overturn, they would have to recognize forthwith that their present "friends" are their enemies. The people's-front government is resolved to club them down just as any fascist dictatorship would do, if they should venture to over-step the bounds of the exploitation economy. The struggle of the Spanish workers on their own account has yet to begin; they are still fighting for others and for illusions. They will have to recognize their present "friends" as more dangerous than their enemies of yesterday. The scurvy rabble of the Communist Party "will support Azana's government in the measure in which it holds to its obligations and carries out the program of the People's Front", as we read in the Hundschau of February 27, 1936. Claridad, the social-democratic organ of Largo Caballero, writes: "We shall be on the side of the government to carry out with all necessary firmness the common program". What can really be the program of professional gunmen of capitalism a la Azana? Or what can be expected from such professional labor traitors as Caballero? So long as these people make politics in Spain, it is nonsense to speak of a victory there of the workers.

The People's Block of today will leave capitalist society intact, But sooner or later new uprisings will occur in spite of the Block, for the present government has neither the will nor the power to effect essential economic changes. Apart from the spontaneous factor at work in conditions

of impoverishment and which leads to the creation of mass movements, it is also improbable that the Spanish Syndicalists will continue to leave the field of the labor movement so uncontested to the competing organizations of the Communists and Socialists. The weakness and disunity of the ruling classes themselves, the impossibility of progressive capitalist development in Spain under the present conditions of the permanent world crisis, will sooner or later abolish the present pseudo-democratism in Spain and lead to a new bourgeois dictatorship, unless the working and impoverished masses of Spain take up arms and proceed against the present people's-front government, begin throughout the country with the expropriation of the owners, and exercise the power on their own account. That may come about in case the mass movements slip from the hands of the political trucksters. We may then be presented with the prospect of something more hopeful in Spain than the usual defeat which the workers endure when they restrict themselves to questions of who or what party holds the reins of government.

oooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

- oooooooooooooooooooooo -

oooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

Marx on Social Reform (Selected Essays; p.131)

HOWEVER partial the industrial revolt may be, it conceals within itself a universal soul: political revolt may be never so universal but it hides a narrow-minded spirit under the most colossal form. -- A social revolution may be considered from the standpoint of the whole because, even if it only occurs in a factory district, it is a protest of men against degraded life, because it proceeds from the standpoint of the real individual, because the community against whose separation from himself the individual reacts, is the real community of men, the civic community. -- The political soul of a revolution, on the other hand, consists in the endeavour of the classes without political influence to abolish their isolation from the community and from government. Their standpoint is that of the State, an abstract whole, which exists only in and through its separation from real life, which is unthinkable without the organized antagonism between the general idea and the individual existence of man. Consequently a revolution of political souls organizes a ruling clique in society, in accordance with the limited and doubly-cleft nature of these souls, at the cost of society. -- Every revolution dissolves the old society; in so far it is social. Every revolution overthrows the old power; in so far it is political. -- Without a revolution, socialism cannot be enforced. It requires this political act, so far as it has need of the process of destruction. But where its organizing activity begins, where its proper aim emerges, there socialism casts away the political hull.

WORKERS' COUNCILS.

In its revolutionary struggles, the working class needs organization. When great masses have to act as a unit, a mechanism is needed for understanding and discussion, for the making and issuing of decisions, and for the proclaiming of actions and aims.

This does not mean, of course, that all great actions and universal strikes are carried out with soldierlike discipline, after the decisions of a central board. Such cases will occur, it is true, but more often, thru their eager fighting spirit, their solidarity and passion, masses will break out in strikes to help their comrades, or to protest against some capitalist atrocity, with no general plan. Then such a strike will spread like a prairie fire all over the country.

In the first Russian revolution, the strike waves went up and down. Often the most successful were those that had not been decided in advance, while the strikes that had been proclaimed by the central committees often failed.

The strikers, once they are fighting, want mutual contact and understanding in order to unite in an organized force. Here a difficulty presents itself. Without strong organization, without joining forces and binding their will in one solid body, without uniting their action in one common deed, they cannot win against the strong organization of capitalist power. But when thousands and millions of workers are united in one body, this can only be managed by functionaries acting as representatives of the members. And we have seen that then these officials become masters of the organization, with interests different from the revolutionary interests of the workers.

How can the working class, in revolutionary fights, unite its force into a big organization without falling into the pit of officialdom? The answer is given by putting another question: if all that the workers do is to pay their fees and to obey when their leaders order them out and order them in, are they themselves then really fighting their fight for freedom?

Fighting for freedom is not letting your leaders think for you and decide, and following obediently behind them, or from time to time scolding them. Fighting for freedom is partaking to the full of one's capacity, thinking and deciding for oneself, taking all the responsibilities as a self-relying individual amidst equal comrades. It is true that to think for oneself, to think out what is true and right, with a head dulled by fatigue, is the hardest, the most difficult task; it is much harder than to pay and to obey. But it is the only way to freedom. To be liberated by others, whose leadership is the essential part of the liberation, means the getting of new masters instead of the old ones.

Freedom, the goal of the workers, means that they shall be able, man for man, to manage the world, to use and deal with the treasures of the earth, so as to make it a happy home for all. How can they ensure this if they are not able to conquer and defend this themselves?

The proletarian revolution is not simply the vanquishing of capitalist power. It is the rise of the whole working people out of dependence and ignorance into independence and clear consciousness of how to make their life.

True organization, as the workers need it in the revolution, implies that everyone takes part in it, body and soul and brains; that everyone takes part in leadership as well as in action, and has to think out, to decide and to perform to the full of his capacities. Such an organization is a body of self-determining people. There is no place for professional leaders. Certainly there is obeying; everybody has to follow the decisions which he himself has taken part in making. But the full power always rests with the workers themselves.

Can such a form of organization be realized? What must be its structure? It is not necessary to construct it or think it out. History has already produced it. It sprang into life out of the practice of the class struggle. Its prototype, its first trace, is found in the strike committees. In a big strike, all the workers cannot assemble in one meeting. They choose delegates to act as a committee. Such a committee is only the executive organ of the strikers; it is continually in touch with them and has to carry out the decisions of the strikers. Each delegate at every moment can be replaced by others; such a committee never becomes an independent power. In such a way, common action as one body can be secured, and yet the workers have all decisions in their own hands. Usually in strikes, the uppermost lead is taken out of the hands of these committees by the trade unions and their leaders.

In the Russian revolution when strikes broke out irregularly in the factories, the strikers chose delegates which, for the whole town or for an industry or railway over the whole state or province, assembled to bring unity into the fight. They had at once to discuss political matters and to assume political functions because the strikes were directed against Czarism. They were called soviets; councils. In these soviets all the details of the situation, all the workers' interests, all political events were discussed. The delegates went to and fro continually between the assembly and their factories. In the factories and shops the workers, in general meetings, discussed the same matters, took their decisions and often sent new delegates. Able socialists were appointed as secretaries, to give advice based on their wider knowledge. Often these soviets had to act as political powers, as a kind of

primitive government when the Czarist power was paralyzed, when officials and officers did not know what to do and left the field to them. Thus these soviets became the permanent center of the revolution; they were constituted by delegates of all the factories, striking or working. They could not think of becoming an independent power. The members were often changed and sometimes the whole soviet was arrested and had to be replaced by new delegates. Moreover they knew that all their force was rooted in the workers' will to strike or not to strike; often their calls were not followed when they did not concur with the workers' instinctive feelings of power or weakness, of passion or prudence. So the soviet-system proved to be the appropriate form of organization for a revolutionary working class. In 1917 it was at once adopted in Russia, and everywhere workers' and soldiers' soviets came into being and were the driving force of the revolution.

The complementary proof was given in Germany. In 1918, after the breakdown of the military power, workers' and soldiers' councils in imitation of Russia were founded. But the German workers, educated in party and union discipline, full of social-democratic ideas of republic and reform as the next political aims, chose their party- and union-officials as delegates into these councils. When fighting and acting themselves, they acted and fought in the right way, but from lack of selfconfidence they chose leaders filled with capitalist ideas, and these always spoilt matters. It is natural that a "council congress" then resolved to abdicate for a new parliament, to be chosen as soon as possible.

Here it became evident that the council system is the appropriate form of organization only for a revolutionary working class. If the workers do not intend to go on with the revolution, they have no use for soviets. If the workers are not far enough advanced yet to see the way of revolution, if they are satisfied with the leaders doing all the work of speechifying and mediating and bargaining for reforms within capitalism, then parliaments and party- and union-congresses, -- called workers parliaments because they work after the same principle -- are all they need. If, however, they fight with all their energy for revolution, if with intense eagerness and passion they take part in every event, if they think over and decide for themselves all details of fighting because they have to do the fighting, then workers' councils are the organization they need.

This implies that workers' councils cannot be formed by revolutionary groups. Such groups can only propagate the idea by explaining to their fellow workers the necessity of council-organization, when the working class as a self-determining power fights for freedom. Councils are the form of organization only for fighting masses, for the working class as a whole, not for revolutionary groups.

They originate and grow up along with the first action of a revolutionary character. With the development of revolution, their importance and their functions increase. At first they may appear as simple strike committees, in opposition to the labor leaders when the strikes go beyond the intentions of the leaders, and rebel against the unions and their leaders.

In a universal strike the functions of these committees are enlarged. Now delegates of all the factories and plants have to discuss and to decide about all the conditions of the fight; they will try to regulate into consciously devised actions all the fighting power of the workers; they must see how they will react upon the governments' measures, the doings of soldiers or capitalist gangs. By means of this very strike action, the actual decisions are made by the workers themselves. In the councils, the opinions, the will, the readiness, the ~~hesitation~~, or the eagerness, the energy and the obstacles of all these masses concentrate and combine into a common line of action. They are the symbols, the exponents of the workers' power; but at the same time they are only the spokesmen who can be replaced at any moment. At one time they are outlaws to the capitalist world, and at the next, they have to deal as equal parties with the high functionaries of government.

When the revolution develops to such power that the State power is seriously affected, then the workers' councils have to assume political functions. In a political revolution, this is their first and chief function. They are the central bodies of the workers' power; they have to take all measures to weaken and defeat the adversary. Like a power at war, they have to stand guard over the whole country, controlling the efforts of the capitalist class to collect and restore their forces and to subdue the workers. They have to look after a number of public affairs which otherwise were state affairs: public health, public security, and the uninterrupted course of social life. They have to take care of the production itself; the most important and difficult task and concern of the working class in revolution.

A social revolution in history never began as a simple change of political rulers who then, after having acquired political power, carried out the necessary social changes by means of new laws. Already, before and during the fight, the rising class built up its new social organs as new sprouting branches within the dead husk of the former organism. In the French revolution, the new capitalist class, the citizens, the business men, the artisans, built up in each town and village their communal boards, their new courts of justice, illegal at the time, usurping simply the functions of the powerless functionaries of royalty. While their delegates in Paris discussed and made the new constitution, the actual constitution was made all over the country

by the citizens holding their political meetings, building up their political organs afterwards legalized by law.

In the same way during the proletarian revolution, the new rising class creates its new forms of organization which step by step in the process of revolution supersede the old State organization. The workers' councils, as the new form of political organization, take the place of parliamentarism, the political form of capitalist rule.

2.

Parliamentary democracy is considered by capitalist theorists as well as by social-democrats as the perfect democracy, conform to justice and equality. In reality, it is only a disguise for capitalist domination, and contrary to justice and equality. It is the council system that is the true workers' democracy.

Parliamentary democracy is foul democracy. The people are allowed to vote once in four or five years and to choose their delegates; woe to them if they do not choose the right man. Only at the polls the voters can exert their power; thereafter they are powerless. The chosen delegates are now the rulers of the people; they make laws and constitute governments, and the people have to obey. Usually, by the election mechanism, only the big capitalist parties with their powerful apparatus, with their papers, their noisy advertising, have a chance to win. Real trustees of discontented groups seldom have a chance to win some few seats.

In the soviet system, each delegate can be repealed at any moment. Not only do the workers continually remain in touch with the delegate, discussing and deciding for themselves, but the delegate is only a temporary messenger to the council assemblies. Capitalist politicians denounce this "characterless" role of the delegate, in that he may have to speak against his personal opinion. They forget that just because there are no fixed delegates, only those will be sent whose opinions conform to those of the workers.

The principle of parliamentary representation is that the delegate in parliament shall act and vote according to his own conscience and conviction. If on some question he should ask the opinion of his voters, it is only due to his own prudence. Not the people, but he on his own responsibility has to decide. The principle of the soviet system is just the reverse; the delegates only express the opinions of the workers.

In the elections for parliament, the citizens are grouped according to voting districts and counties; that is to say according to their dwelling place. Persons of different

trades or classes, having nothing in common, accidentally living near one another, are combined into an artificial group which has to be represented by one delegate.

In the councils, the workers are represented in their natural groups, according to factories, shops and plants. The workers of one factory or one big plant form a unit of production; they belong together by their collective work. In revolutionary epochs, they are in immediate contact to interchange opinions; they live under the same conditions and have the same interests. They must act together; the factory is the unit which as a unit has to strike or to work, and its workers must decide what they collectively have to do. So the organization and delegation of workers in factories and workshops is the necessary form.

It is at the same time the principle of representation of the communist order growing up in the revolution. Production is the basis of society, or, more rightly, it is the contents, the essence of society; hence the order of production is at the same time the order of society. Factories are the working units, the cells of which the organism of society consists. The main task of the political organs, which mean nothing else but the organs managing the totality of society, concerns the productive work of society. Hence it goes without saying that the working people, in their councils, discuss these matters and choose their delegates, collected in their production-units.

We should not believe, though, that parliamentarism, as the political form of capitalism, was not founded on production. Always the political organization is adapted to the character of production as the basis of society. Representation, according to dwelling place, belongs to the system of petty capitalist production, where each man is supposed to be the possessor of his own small business. Then there is a mutual connection between all these businessmen at one place, dealing with one another, living as neighbors, knowing one another and therefore sending one common delegate to parliament. This was the basis of parliamentarism. We have seen that later on this parliamentary delegation-system proved to be the right system for representing the growing and changing class interests within capitalism.

At the same time it is clear now why the delegates in parliament had to take political power in their hands. Their political task was only a small part of the task of society. The most important part, the productive work, was the personal task of all the separate producers, the citizens as businessmen; it required nearly all their energy and care. When every individual took care of his own small lot, then society as their totality went right. The general regulations by law, necessary conditions, doubtlessly, but of minor extent, could

be left to the care of a special group or trade, the politicians. With communist production the reverse is true. Here the all important thing, the collective productive work, is the task of society as a whole; it concerns all the workers collectively. Their personal work does not claim their whole energy and care; their mind is turned to the collective task of society. The general regulation of this collective work cannot be left to a special group of persons; it is the vital interest of the whole working people.

There is another difference between parliamentarism and the soviet system. In parliamentary democracy, one vote is given to every adult man and sometimes woman on the strength of their supreme, inborn right of belonging to mankind, as is so beautifully expressed in celebration speeches. In the soviets, on the other hand, only the workers are represented. Can the council system then be said to be truly democratic if it excludes the other classes of society?

The council system embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx and Engels, more than half a century ago, explained that the social revolution was to lead to the dictatorship of the working class as the next political form and that this was essential in order to bring about the necessary changes in society. Socialists, thinking in terms of parliamentary representation only, tried to excuse or to criticize the violation of democracy and the injustice of arbitrarily excluding persons from the polls because they belong to certain classes. Now we see how the development of the proletarian class struggle in a natural way produces the organs of this dictatorship, the soviets.

It is certainly no violation of justice that the councils, as the fighting centers of a revolutionary working class, do not include representatives of the opposing class. And thereafter the matter is not different. In a rising communist society there is no place for capitalists; they have to disappear and they will disappear. Whoever takes part in the collective work is a member of the collectivity and takes part in the decisions. Persons, however, who stand outside the process of collective production, are, by the structure of the council system, automatically excluded from influence upon it. Whatever remains of the former exploiters and robbers has no vote in the regulation of a production in which they take no part.

There are other classes in society that do not directly belong to the two chief opposite classes: small farmers, independent artisans, intellectuals. In the revolutionary fight they may waver to and fro, but on the whole they are not very important, because they have less fighting power. Mostly their forms of organization and their aims are

different. To make friends with them or to neutralize them, if this is possible without impeding the proper aims or to fight them resolutely if necessary, to decide upon the way of dealing with them with equity and firmness, will be the concern, often a matter of difficult tactics, of the fighting working class. In the production-system, insofar as their work is useful and necessary, they will find their place and they will exert their influence after the principle that whoever does the work has a chief vote in regulating the work.

More than half a century ago, Engels said that thru the proletarian revolution the State would disappear; instead of the ruling over men would come the managing of affairs. This was said at a time when there could not be any clear idea about how the working class would come into power. Now we see the truth of this statement confirmed. In the process of revolution, the old State Power will be destroyed, and the organs that take its place, the workers' councils, for the time being, will certainly have important political functions still to repress the remnants of capitalist power. Their political function of governing, however, will be gradually turned into nothing but the economic function of managing the collective process of production of goods for the needs of society.

- J. H. -

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION of the nineteenth century can not draw its poetry from the past, it can draw that only from the future. It cannot start upon its work before it has stricken off all superstition concerning the past. Former revolutions required historic reminiscences in order to intoxicate themselves with their own issues. The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead in order to reach its issue. With the former, the phrase surpasses the substance; with this one, the substance surpasses the phrase.

---Proletarian revolutions criticise themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course; come back to what seems to have been accomplished, in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meanesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth, and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects --until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out: "Hic Rhodus, hic salta!"
Marx; The Eighteenth Brumaire; p.14.

BOOK REVIEWS

Conze, Edward. - The Scientific Method of Thinking.
An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism.
Chapman & Hall, Ltd., London. 1935 (168pp., 58)

Conze's elementary introduction to dialectical materialism is well designed to meet a long-felt need in the labor movement for a popular and yet scientific presentation of the marxian method of thinking. Even if his book does not offer much that is new theoretically, except in the choice of the examples, still it is of great value for the education of workers, especially because of its exemplarily clear and simple language.

After emphasizing the necessity of scientific method for the control of nature and society, Conze explains the main postulates of the materialist dialectic: the necessity of concrete thinking, regard for the unity of opposites, the viewing of all things as in process of motion, and the recognition of the contradictions by which all motion is determined. Conze's interpretation of these propositions is based on expositions from the contemporary political and economic scene and is fully adapted to the general understanding. Special attention is here devoted to the contested leader-mass problem, and Conze represents the view that however low the degree of consciousness involved, the mass is after all capable of safe-guarding its interests. The acceptance of this assumption would make it easier to understand the historical development.

By way of illustrating the proposition of contradiction, Conze selects oppositions like that between capitalist production and social consumption, though without making plain that this contradiction is in need of further clarification by means of the one between accumulation and the need for profit. Conze also refers to the contradiction affecting the labor movement, that between reformism and socialism; his view is that mass organizations are of necessity reformist, and socialist organizations of necessity sectarian. At the same time, however, Conze considers collectively revolutionary actions as possible only in case they are theoretically grasped in advance. In this way, his exposition itself becomes involved in contradictions; for, on the one hand, it ascribes to the masses a correct mode of action in spite of inadequate theoretical recognition, and on the other it denies the possibility of success to any action which is not theoretically grasped. Even though Conze, more than other authors, may attribute great importance to the mass, still after all he holds fast to that position which makes the historical movement dependent on the development of the socialist ideology. On this basis, in considering the unity of opposites and in illustrating

the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-emancipation of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze's frequently literal carrying over of dialectical postulates onto the various problems culminates in the assertion that "scientific thought knows no certainty, but only varying degrees of probability. To be cocksure is to be unscientific". This statement is at the same time its own devaluation, for, assuming that Conze's thought is "scientific", one cannot be "certain" either that "scientific thought knows no certainty". But the limits which Conze set for himself do not permit a more exhaustive critical consideration of his position either on the question of prediction or on the other phases of his book. As what it proposes to be, however, it deserves most extensive attention.

Uphoff, Walter, H. - The Kohler Strike. Its Socio-Economic Causes and Effects. - Chas. H. Kerr & Co.
Chicago, 1935. (139 pp., \$1.50)

Mr. Uphoff's study is concerned with the strike that took place in the Kohler & Kohler firm of Wisconsin in 1934, when it created something of a sensation. This company, engaged in the manufacture of heating systems, bath tubs, earthenware, etc., and employing a few thousand workers, became noted for its allegedly exemplary social policy. By way of life insurance, reduction of working hours, organization of leisure time, and especially thru its support of housing cooperatives, Kohler & Kohler acquired the reputation of being a model of a healthy relation between employers and workmen. The crisis and the long-drawn-out depression made it necessary for the company to cut wages, to introduce rationalization, to turn off workers, and transformed the advantages accruing to the workers from the housing policy into a burden. The NRA and the well-known "Section 7A" led in the Kohler shops, as elsewhere, to the building of a union. Kohler thought to destroy this union by forming a company union. A strike set in for recognition of the union's right to negotiate regarding rates of pay, and for wage demands. It soon destroyed the "Kohler legend". Kohler combatted the workers in the most brutal manner, with ex-

tortion, bribery, terror, death. The causes, development and end of the strike, the role of the neutral legal agencies, the attitude of the workers, are pointed out by Uphoff in all essential details, supported by documentary evidence and illuminated from the most varied points of view. His study is a valuable contribution for purposes of social research.

Council Correspondence recommends:

THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM

A critique of Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx

F.ENGELS : Principles of Communism

A.M.Simons : Class Struggles in America

MARX : Wage - Labor and Capital

25 ¢
15 ¢
10 ¢
10 ¢

Karl Marx, a Biography. By Franz Mehring

The Decline of American Capitalism. By L.Corey

ANTI-DUEHRING

Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science.

By Friedrich Engels

\$ 5.00
\$ 4.00
\$ 3.00

CAPITAL

Vol. I. The Process of Capitalist Production

Vol. II. The Process of Capitalist Circulation

Vol.III. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole.

By KARL MARX 3 Vol., \$ 2.50 each.

Marx: The Eighteenth Brumaire.

Anton Pannekoek: Marxism and Darwinism

K.Marx: The Poverty of Philosophy

K.Marx: The Critique of the Gotha Program

SELECTED ESSAYS; by Karl Marx

A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right

On the Jewish Question

On the King of Prussia and Social Reform, etc. \$ 2.00

Two new pamphlets soon to be out:

THE WORKERS' WAY TO FREEDOM

Outline of Production & Distribution in Communism

15 ¢
10 ¢

Order Books and Pamphlets from :

Council Correspondence, 1604 N. California Ave.

Chicago, Ill.

#####

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Power of the Classes

Class Struggle in War

Second World War Inevitable

The Ideological Preparation for the War

National Independence and Leninism

Prevention of the War

Communism and Religion

Vol. II

No. 6

MAY 1936

\$1.00 YEARLY

10c A COPY