

apparent in the attitude of the Trotzky Fourth International in the Italian-Ethiopian war, when it calls for the defeat of Italy in favor of Ethiopian victory. How much greater will be the influence of this fear on the policies of these groups if their own democratic country is threatened by the fascist or National Socialist enemy. And when the fascist enemy is strengthened or assured of victory by the class struggle against the internal bourgeoisie, we can safely predict that these groups will recoil from the consequences of such action. But the war will intensify suffering and misery until they are unbearable, and eventually forces the masses to resist. Then it becomes clear that the immediate enemy is within the country. The resistance of the working class grows and leads to mass movements. Then it will become apparent to what extent the essential character of this mass movement is understood by the workers, for on this largely depends the outcome of the movement. The more the workers realize that mass movements, directed and carried out by the workers themselves, are not mere actions of misery and desperation, but at the same time contain all elements of communist society, the more revolutionary will these movements become. They then aim directly at the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the workers' councils.

The task of the revolutionary workers, inseparable from the task of the working class as a whole, is clear. He who has freed himself from the magic formula, general strike, as the first step in the social revolution, who has finished with Leninism and its "defence of the independence of oppressed nations", who realizes that the prevention of war is possible only if the working class seizes power, and who is indifferent whether the internal bourgeoisie or the "enemy" are victors in the war, for him the matter is clear.

The workers in all countries, freed from the old movement with its democratic and other illusions, have only one goal: the development and strengthening of the independent mass movement of the workers in the whole world--in peace as well as in war--until the masses of the proletariat have seized all social functions and thus build the communist society throughout the world.

(Taken From RAETE KORRESPONDENZ)

#####

Order from Council Correspondence:

Rätekorrespondenz, (theoretisches-und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung.) Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland).

Einzelnummer 10 c

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

On the Communist Party

Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?

*Critical Remarks on the Reflections of
MAX NOMAD*

"The New Middle Class"

State Capitalism in America?

Vol. II

No. 7

JUNE 1936

\$1.00 YEARLY

10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

I.

During the world war small groups in all countries arose, convinced that out of this ordeal of capitalism, a proletarian revolution must ensue, and they were ready to prepare for it. They once more took the name of communists, forgotten since the old times of Marx in 1848, to identify themselves from the old socialist parties. The Bolshevik party, then having its center in Switzerland, was one of them. After the war had ceased, they united into communist parties standing for the proletarian revolution, in opposition to the socialist parties who supported the war politics of the capitalist government; and represented the submissive, fearful tendencies in the working class. The communist parties gathered all the young fighting spirit in its ranks.

Contrary to the theory that not in a ruined but only in a prosperous capitalistic country the workers could build up a true commonwealth, the communists put forth the truth that it was the very ruin of capitalist production which made a revolution necessary and would incite the working class to fight for revolution with all its energy.

Opposing the social-democratic view, that a parliament chosen by general suffrage was a fair representation of

society and the basis of socialism, the communists put forth the new truth, stated by Marx and Engels, that the working class, to attain its aims, had to take power entirely in its own hands, and had to set up its own dictatorship, excluding the capitalist class from any share in the government.

In opposition to parliamentarism, they put forth, following the Russian example, the soviets or worker's councils.

In the defeated Germany, November 1918, a vigorous communist movement sprang up and united the Spartacus group and other groups which had secretly grown up during the war. It was crushed the following January by the counter revolutionary forces of the socialist government. This prevented the rise of an independent, strong communist power in Germany, animated by the spirit of a highly developed modern proletariat, therefore the communist party of Russia entirely dominated the young rising communist groups of the world. They united in the Third International, which was directed from Moscow. Now Russia remained the only center of world revolution; the interests of the Russian state directed the communist workers all over the world. The ideas of Russian Bolshevism dominated the communist parties in the capitalist countries.

Russia was attacked by the capitalist governments of Europe and America. In defense, Russia attacked these governments by inciting the working class to rebellion, by calling them to world revolution - a communist revolution, not in the future, but as soon as possible. And if they could not be won for communism, then at least for opposition to the policy of their governments. Hence the communist groups were forced to go into parliament and to go into trade unions, to drive them as an opposing force against their capitalist governments.

World revolution was the great battle cry. Everywhere in the world, in Europe, Asia, America, among the oppressed classes and the oppressed peoples, the call was heard and workers arose. They were animated by the Russian example, feeling that now thru the war, capitalism was shaken from its foundations, that it was weakened still more by the economic disorders and crisis. They were just small minorities, but the masses of the workers stood waiting, looking with sympathy towards Russia, hesitating still because their leaders said that the Russians were a backward people and because the capitalist papers spoke of atrocities and predicted an inevitable and rapid breakdown. These very infamies of the capitalist press, however, showed how much the example was hated and feared.

Was a communist revolution possible? Could the working class conquer power and defeat capitalism in England, France and America? Certainly not. It had not the strength that was needed. Perhaps in Germany only.

What ought to have been done then? The communist revolution, the victory of the working class, is not a matter of a few years; it is a whole period of rising and fighting. This crisis of capitalism could only be the starting point for this period. The task of the communist party was to build up the power of the working class in this period step by step. This perhaps is a long way, but there is no other.

The Russian Bolshevik leaders did not understand world revolution in this way. They meant it to come immediately, in the near future. That which had happened in Russia, why could it not happen in other countries? The workers there had only to follow the example of their Russian comrades. In Russia, a firmly organized party of some ten thousands of revolutionists, by means of a working class of hardly a million, within the population of a hundred millions, had conquered power, and afterwards by the right platform it stood for and by defending their interests, it won the masses to its side.

In the same way the rest of the world communist parties comprising the most eager class conscious, able and energetic minorities of the working class, led by capable leaders, could conquer political power if only the mass of the workers would follow them. Were not the capitalist governments ruling minorities also?

The whole of the working class which now suffers from this minority rule has only to back the Communist Party to vote for it, to its call, and the party will do the real work. It is the vanguard, it attacks, it defeats the capitalist government and replaces it, and when in power it will carry thru communism, just as in Russia.

And the dictatorship of the working class? It is embodied in the dictatorship of the Communist Party, just as in Russia.

Do as we did! This was the advice, the call, the directive given by the Bolshevik party to the Communist Parties of the world. It was based upon the idea of equality of Russian conditions with the conditions in capitalist countries. The conditions, however, were so widely different that hardly any resemblance could be seen. Russia stood on the threshold of capitalism, at the beginning of industrialism. The great capitalist countries stood at the close of industrial capitalism. Hence the goals were entirely different. Russia had to

be raised from primitive barbarism to the high level of productivity reached in America and Europe. This could only be done by a party, governing the people, organizing state capitalism. America and Europe with their high level of capitalist productivity have to transform themselves to communist production. This can only be done by the common effort of the working class in its entirety.

The working class in Russia was a small minority and nearly the whole population consisted of primitive peasants. In England, Germany, France and America nearly half or even more than half of the population consisted of proletarians, wage workers. In Russia there was a very small, insignificant capitalist class without much power or influence. In England, Germany, France, America a capitalist class more powerful than the world had ever seen, dominated society, dominated the whole world.

The Communist Party leaders, by proclaiming that they (the party) should be able to beat the capitalist class, showed by this very assertion that they did not see the real power of this class. By setting Russia as the example to be followed, not only in heroism and fighting spirit, but also in methods and aims, they betrayed their inability to see the difference between the Russian Czarist rule and the capitalist rule in Europe and America.

The capitalist class with its complete domination of the economic forces, with its money power, its intellectual power, does not allow a minority group to vanquish and destroy it. No party, though led by the ablest leaders, can defeat it. There is only one power strong enough to vanquish this mighty class. This power is the working class.

The essential basis of capitalist power is its economic power. No political laws issued from above can seriously affect it. It can only be attained by another economic power, by the opposing class, striking at its very roots. It is the entirety of the workers who have to come into the field, if capitalism is to be overthrown.

At first sight this appeal to the whole of the working class may appear illusionary. The masses, the majority, are not clearly class conscious; they are ignorant as to social development; they are indifferent to the revolution. They are more egotistic for personal interests than for solidarity for class interests, submissive and fearful, seeking futile pleasures. Is there much difference between such an indifferent mass and a population as in Russia? Can anything be expected from such a people rather than from that class conscious, eager, energetic, self-sacrificing, clear minded communist minority?

This, however, is only relevant if it should be a question of a revolution of tomorrow, as conceived by the communist party.

For the real proletarian revolution, not the superficial chance character of today, is essential, which is determined by the present surrounding capitalist world. The real communist revolution depends on the deeper essential class nature of the proletariat.

The working class of Europe and America have qualities in itself that enable it to rise with a great force. They are descendants of a middle class of artisans and farmers who for many centuries have worked their own soil or their own shop as free people. They therefore acquired skill and independence, capability and a strong individuality to act for themselves, persistent industry and the habit of personal energy in work. These qualities the modern workers have inherited from their ancestors. Dominated thereafter during one or more generations by capitalism, they were trained by the machine to regular intensity and discipline in collective work. And after the first depression there grew in them, during continual fighting, the new rising virtue of solidarity and class unity.

On these foundations the future greatness of the revolutionary class will be built up. In Europe and in America there are hundreds of millions of people who possess these qualities. The fact that as yet they still stand before their task, that they have not yet finished it, that they hardly made a beginning, does not mean that they are not able to perform it. None other than their own power can tell them how to act; they have to find their way themselves by hard suffering and bitter experience. They have brains and they have hearts to find out and to do it and build up that class unity out of which the new mankind will arise.

They are not a neutral indifferent mass that does not count when a revolutionary minority tries to overthrow the ruling capitalist minority. As long as they do not actively take part, the revolution cannot be won; but when they do take part, they are not the people to be led in obedience by a party.

Certainly a party in its ascendance consists of the class' best elements, exceeding the mass as a whole. Its leaders usually are the prominent forces in the party, embodying the great aims in their names, admired, hated, honored. They stand at the front and when a great fight is lost, its great leaders are destroyed, the party is crushed. Knowing this, the secondary leaders, or the party officials, will often shrink from the supreme

fight, from the boldest aims. The working class itself can be defeated, but it can never be crushed. Its forces are indomitable; its roots are in the firm earth; as growing green turf, the blooming tops which are mown always come up anew. The workers can temporarily desist from fighting when weakened, but their forces increase continually. A party that follows them in their retreat cannot recover, it must lose its character and repudiate its principles; it is lost forever. A party, a group, leaders, have limited force which is entirely spent, is sacrificed in honor, or in dishonor in the events of the class struggle; the class itself draws upon an unlimited store.

Prominent leaders can show the way, parties in their principles and platforms can express the ideas, the aims of the class only temporary. At first the class follows them, but then it has to pass them up, putting up bolder aims, higher ideas, conforming to the widening and deepening of the class struggle. The party tries to keep the class at its former lower level, at its more moderate aims, and has to be discarded. The doctrine that a party stands above the class, that it should remain the leader always, being theoretically false, in practice means strangling the class and leading it to its defeat.

We will show how in the communist party this doctrine after its first glorious ascendance led to rapid decay.

II.

These are the principles leading the communist party and determining its practice: the party has to win dictatorship, to conquer power, to make revolution, and by this to liberate the workers; the workers have to follow, to back the party and to bring it to power.

Hence its direct aim is: to win the masses of the workers as adherents, to bring them to its side; not to make them good independent fighters, able to find and to force their own way.

Parliamentary action is one of the means. Though the C.P. declared that parliamentarism was useless for the revolution, still it went into parliament; this was called 'revolutionary parliamentarism', to demonstrate in parliament the uselessness of parliamentarism. In reality it was a means to get votes and voters, followers of the party. It served to detract the worker's votes from the socialist party. Numerous workers who were disillusioned by the capitalist policy of social-democracy, who wished to stand for revolution, were won over by the big talk and the furious criticisms of the C.P. against

capitalism. Now this policy opened a new way for them, to stick to their old belief that by voting only and following leaders, this time better leaders, they would be liberated. These famous revolutionists, who in Russia had founded the State of the workers, told them this easy way was the right way.

Another means was trade unionism. Though the C.P. declared the unions useless for the revolution, yet the communists had to become members of them in order to win the unions for communism. This did not mean the making of the union members into clearly class conscious revolutionists; it meant the replacing of the "corrupt" old leaders by Communist Party men. It meant the Party controlling the ruling class machine of the unions, that it might command the big armies of union members. Of course the old leaders were not willing to give way; they simply excluded the red opposition groups. Then new "red" unions were formed.

Strikes are the schools for communism. When the workers are on strike, fighting the capitalist class face to face, then they learn the real power of capitalism; they see all its forces directed against them. But then they realize more fully the necessary force of solidarity, the necessity for unity. They are more keen to understand, and their spirit is eager to learn. What they learn is the most important lesson, and that is that communism is the only salvation.

The Communist Party varied this truth according to its principles in each strike that it was present to take part, or rightly to take the lead. The direction must be taken out of the hands of the trade union leaders, who do not have the right fighting spirit. The workers should lead themselves. The reason for this statement was because the working class, as you know, is represented by the C.P., therefore the Party should lead them. Each success was used to advertise the Party. Instead of the communist education, which is a natural outcome of each big fight in capitalism, came the artificial aim: to increase the influence of the party on the masses.

Instead of the natural lesson, that communism is the salvation, came the artificial lesson that the communist party is the saviour. By its revolutionary talk, they caught and absorbed all the eager fighting spirit of the strikers, but diverted it to its own aims. Quarrels which were injurious to the workers' cause were often the result.

A continual fight was made against the social democratic party to detract its followers from it by criticism of

its politics. Their leaders were denounced and were called by the most spicy names as accomplices of capital and traitors of the working class. Doubtlessly, a serious, critical exposition showing that social democracy had left the way of class struggle will open the eyes of many workers. But now, all at once, the scene changed and an alliance was offered to these 'traitors' for a common fight against capitalism. This was called solemnly "the unity of the working class restored". In reality it would have been nothing but the temporary collaboration of two competing groups of leaders, both trying to keep or win obedient followers.

To win followers and votes, it is not necessary to call upon the working class alone. All the poor classes living miserably under capitalism will hail the new and better masters who promise them freedom. So they did as the socialist party did; the communist party addressed its propaganda to all who suffer.

Russia gave the example, The Bolshevik Party, though a worker's party, had won power only by their alliance with the peasants. When, once in power, they were threatened by the capitalist tendencies in the wealthy peasants, they called upon the poor peasants as the allies of the workers. Then the C.P. in America and Europe always imitating Russian slogans directed their appeals to the workers and the poor peasants also. It forgot that in highly developed countries of capitalism there lives in the poor peasants the strong spirit of private ownership the same as in the big farmers, if they could be won over by promises they would be but unreliable allies ready to desert at the first contrariety.

The working class in its revolution can only rely upon its own force. Other poor classes of society will often join them, but they cannot give additional weight of importance because the strong innate force which proletarian solidarity and master ship over production gives to the working class is lacking in them. Therefore, even in rebellion, they are uncertain and fickle. What can be aimed at is that they will not be tools in the capitalists' hands. This cannot be obtained by promises. Promises and platforms count with parties, but classes are directed by deeper feelings and passions founded on interests. They can be reached only when their respect and their confidence is aroused because they see that the workers bravely and energetically attack the capitalist class.

The matter is different for a communist party wishing to win power for itself. All the poor who suffer under capitalism are equally as good as followers of the party. Their despair, seeing no sure way out by their

own force, makes them the right adherents to a party that says it liberates them. They are apt to break out in explosions but not to climb in continuous fight. In the heavy world crisis of these last few years the increasing masses of the regularly unemployed, in which the need and the idea of a rapid immediate world revolution became dominant, also turned to the communist party. Especially by means of this army, the C.P. hoped to conquer political supremacy for itself.

The communist party did not try to increase the power of the working class. It did not educate its adherents to clearness, to wisdom, to unity of all workers. It educated them into enthusiastic but blind, hence fanatical, believers and followers; into obedient subjects of the party in power. Its aim was not to make the working class strong, but to make the party powerful. Because its fundamental ideas originated from primitive Russian, not from highly developed capitalistic European and American conditions.

When a party wishes to win followers with all means and cannot attract them by arousing their interest in revolution, then it will try to win them by appealing to their reactionary prejudices. The strongest feeling which capitalism awakes and raises with all its might against revolution is nationalism. When in 1923 French troops occupied the Rhineland and everywhere in Germany the waves of nationalism went high, the C.P. also played the nationalistic game trying to compete with the capitalistic parties. In the Reichstag it proposed a companionship of the communist armed forces, the "red guards", with the German capitalist army (Reichwehr). Here international politics played a part. Russia, at that time hostile to the western victorious governments, tried to make an alliance with Germany, hence the German communist party had to make friends with its own capitalist government.

This was the chief character of all the communist parties affiliated to the Third International; they were directed by Moscow by the Russian communist leaders, so they were the tools of Russian foreign policies. Russia was 'all the workers fatherland', the center of communist world revolution. The interest of Russia should be the prominent interest of the communist workers all over the world. It was clearly stated by the Russian leaders that when a capitalist government should be the ally of Russia against other powers, the workers in that country had to stand by their government. They had to fight their government, in other countries. The class struggle between the capitalist and the workers class had to be made subordinate to the temporary needs and fortunes of Russian foreign politics.

Its dependence on Russia, materially and spiritually, is at the root of all the weakness of the communist party. All the ambiguities in the Russian development are reflected in the position of the C.P. The Russian leaders have to tell their subjects that their state-capitalistic building-up of industrialism is the building-up of communism. Hence each new factory or electric power plant is hailed in the communist papers as a triumph of communism. In order to encourage the minds of the Russians in perseverance, they were told by their papers that capitalist was nearly succumbing to a world revolution and envious of Russia, meditated to make war with Russia. This was repeated in the communist papers all over the world, while at the same time Russia was concluding commercial treaties with these capitalist governments. When Russia made alliances with some capitalist states and took part in their diplomatic quarrels, the communist papers glorified this as a capitulation of the capitalist world before communism. The papers continually advertised Russian 'communism' before the workers of the world.

Russia is the great example; hence the Russian example has to be imitated in the communist party. Just as in Russia, the party has to dominate the class. In the Russian party the leaders dominate because they have all the power factors in their hands. In the same way the C.P. leaders dominate. The members have to show 'discipline'. Moscow, the "comintern" (Central Committee of the Third International) are the highest leaders; at their command the leaders in every country are dismissed and replaced by others.

It is natural that in the other countries there are doubts that arise among the workers and members as to the rightness of these Russian methods. But such opposition was always beaten down and excluded from the party. No independent judgment was allowed; obedience was demanded.

After the revolution the Russians had built up a "red army" to defend their freedom against the attacks of the "white armies". In the same way the German C. P. formed a "red guard", bodies of armed young communists, to fight against the armed nationalists.

It was not simply a workers army against capitalism, but also a weapon against all the adversaries of the C.P. Wherever oppositions arose at meetings and other workers criticised the party politics, the red guards at the command of their leaders were to deal with them, with maltreatment. Not opening their brains, but breaking their skulls was the method employed against criticising fellow-workers. Thus young and eager

fighters were educated into rowdies instead of educating them to become real communists. When the national revolution came, when national violence proved too far stronger and more irresistible than communist violence, numerous young workers who had learned nothing but to beat their leaders' adversaries, at once changed their colors and became just as zealous nationalists as they were before zealous communists.

Thru the glory that radiated from the Russian revolution, thru its own gallant talk, the C.P. assembled year by year all the ardent enthusiastic young workers under its colors. These young workers were used either in idle sham fights or spilt into useless party politics; all these valuable qualities were lost to the revolution. The best of them, disillusioned, turned their back on the party and tried to find new ground in founding separate groups.

Looking backward, we see the world war, as a culmination of capitalist oppression, arouse the revolutionary spirit of the workers everywhere. Barbarous Russia, as the weakest of the governments, fell at the first stroke, and as a bright meteor the Russian revolution rose and shone over the earth. It was another revolution, than the workers needed. Its dazzling light, first filling them with hope and force, blinded them, so that they did not see their own way. Now they have to recover and to turn their eyes towards the dawn of their own revolution.

The communist party cannot recover. Russia is making its peace with the capitalist nations and taking its place among them with its own economic system. The communist party inseparably linked to Russia is doomed to live on sham fighting. Opposition groups split off ascribing the decay to false tactics of some particular leaders, to diversify from the right principles. In vain; the basis of the downfall lies in the principles themselves.

- J. H. -

.....

Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?

(Critical Remarks on the Reflections of Max Nomad)

I.

The historical development being extremely complicated, the historians are free to select the most various starting-points. The marxist interpretation is based on the growth of the social forces of production; history is here a history of class struggles. The fact that the Marxists have devoted more attention to the essential factors of history and gladly left to the novelists and biographers the task of drawing in the "human-all-too-human" factors which it likewise indubitably contains--a defect which is at the same time a virtue, as being a manifestation of methodical and rational thinking--is over and over again seized upon by critics and employed as an argument against Marxism. Of course, the refutation of such criticism presents no difficulties; it merely becomes necessary to consider afterwards the unessential accompanying manifestations which had been neglected, a matter which is the easier the better one knows the truly decisive factors here at work.

One can write a history of class struggles in which the internal and personal strivings and group struggles within the real class contests are left out of account. In this case, one has not said everything, to be sure, but he has said the most important. One can, conversely, because he has a more romantic idea of matters and also because he may want a larger circle of readers, write an extremely colorful history which does not pass beyond the reflections of the phenomena in the brains of the acting personages, a history which in its concern with the narrower personal strivings forgets the broader social factors. This latter procedure is not only a concession to the prevailing ideology, but also facilitates the task of the writer himself; in this way he is in a position to present the course of history in a manner which has the appearance of being logical, while he himself is not required to possess any thoro knowledge of economics and sociology, but may rely exclusively upon his "knowledge of human nature", which in turn rests largely upon knowledge of one self.

It is no doubt possible to note throughout the course of history that the shrewd have continually outwitted the stupid, that deceivers were deceived, that in all previous class societies individuals and groups have

struggled for political power to the end of securing material advantages and that the broad masses thereby involved merely constituted the springboard of the successful; that hitherto, insofar as the poor themselves were concerned, the change of times merely brought them repeatedly a change of exploiters. It is true that in this way history is regarded superficially; that is, the external phenomena are confused with the essence of things. Still, it is possible to pass off such an historical glossary as factual material which is incontestible and thereby pay compliments to "good common sense".

There are half-truths which are really such, and other half-truths which if not further developed become nonsense. If one sees in the history of the past and present nothing more than struggles for privileges--struggles limited for the most part still to the political instruments of power and generally not coinciding with the positions of economic power but dependent on and controlled by the latter--if one isolates these struggles from the real class-struggles whose basis is necessarily economic-sociological and not individual-egoistic,--in such a case one cannot fail to see in the coming development nothing more than the repetition of past history, and "good common sense" is served once more with the popular ejaculation: "Thus it has been, thus it is and thus it will remain". And in this way one finds himself in the comfortable position of the sceptic, who--granted, of course, that this philosophy does not stand in the way of his continued existence--finds the world all the more agreeable the lousier it is, and for whom the whole of history has no other *raison d'être* than to confirm the correctness of his position.

The ideological, generalizing interpretation of history which is characterized by lack of recognition of the decisive factors here at work, that is, the development of the productive forces, and which is compelled to have recourse to such things as the "nature" of human beings, things which are no less changeable than the social orders themselves, offers the working class practically and theoretically nothing with which their vital problems could be solved. Since there will still for a very long while be "stupid" and "clever" persons, and since even after economic equality has been attained some time will still be required before there is any likelihood of intellectual equality, there is no foreseeing on this basis when the struggle against exploitation will lead to more than a change of exploiters. The question of who exploits the workers, however, is something which they can afford to disregard; their goal and need is the abolition of any and all exploitation. The consolation which seeks to base itself on the possibility

of a permanent economic opposition on the part of the oppressed is only a half-consolation, since this continued class-struggle, even if not forever, still for fairly long stretches of time can be prevented precisely thru the employment of the instruments of power in the hands of the rulers; a state of affairs which makes it permissible to envisage the prospect that, under certain circumstances, long generations may be deprived of any possibility of modification of their wretched condition. Thus while the purely ideological interpretation of history offers no explanation of the past, and is incapable of seeing beyond the present, since all its presuppositions are bound to remain speculative, so likewise on the basis of that conception the present-day class struggle can be neither theoretically or practically furthered.

II.

Marxism sees in the opposition between Capital and Labor the great contradiction of present-day society, a contradiction thru which it is finally doomed to go under. Within this great, comprehensive contradiction, which can be abolished only thru the setting aside of capitalism, narrower contradictions arise, exist and pass away, all of which must be considered in the framework of the former. One of these many contradictions is that between intellectual and manual labor, a contradiction which is at the same time an expression of two different modes of life and hence of differences of interests. As to how far this narrower contradiction is capable of modifying, in the course of time, theories which relate to the greater contradiction between Capital and Labor, and the extent to which this narrower contradiction itself undergoes transformations, can be determined only thru ever renewed investigations of the concrete situations. The relation between manual and intellectual labor shifts in the same way as the relation between Capital and Labor proceeds toward its abolition.

The problem of the intellectuals is very closely bound up with that of the middle class, by which the greater part of the intellectuals is furnished. It has affected the labor movement from the beginning, and in the course of time it has called forth the most varying appraisals. And yet there was never a time when the uproar about this question was so great as at present, and this clamor is made by none other than the intellectuals themselves. The seeming importance of this social group is in reality, however, merely a matter of excessive self-esteem which must become the greater and more necessary in the proportion to which this stratum loses in importance. We have to do here, as a matter of fact, merely with the reaction of the intellectuals to their social depreciation.

We have no intention, within the limits of these notes, of taking up the problem of the intellectuals in its whole extent, but wish to concern ourselves only with a certain position on the subject, namely, with the view which today finds expression in the writings of Max Nomad. Being an intellectual himself, Nomad shares with his group colleagues the present-day tendency to overrate the importance of the intellectuals, and which at the same time is an overrating of the importance of the middle class. The marxianly oriented labor movement is to Nomad essentially a movement of declassed middle elements and upstart self-educated workers who are striving for privileged social positions, and see in their intellectual capacities their "capital" which is to help them to that end. The broad working masses, on the other hand, serve these elements, in their selfish ambitions, merely as a means.

The fact that the first industrial and social reforms were demanded and in part put thru by far-sighted bourgeois, not in opposition to but in the interest of a profitable and rational economy, gave rise to the idea that the middle class was presented with the task and the possibility of becoming an attorney in matters of social justice. Intellectuals stemming from the middle class have also over and over again sought to accommodate themselves to this idea. The slow but sure process of elimination of the early-capitalist middle class, thru the capitalist development, aroused the social sense of its intelligent elements, and the new intellectual and administrative functions arising thru the same process brought parts of the middle class into positions which provided them with a larger social perspective. Their better schooling with respect to the workers enabled them to usurp the more agreeable phases of the social division of labor; and the colossal "intellectual superstructure" which the expanding capitalist world had had to shape for itself, the enormous number of parasitical but capitalistically necessary social institutions which increased in proportion as capital accumulated, created a broad stratum of intellectual workers who, tho stemming from the middle class, yet soon became differentiated from it. The "liberal" professions, which could still afford the luxury of liberality, and the more complicated industrial professions whose importance was increasing with the progress of technics, --engineers, chemists, managers, etc.-- soon came to form a socially important stratum whose significance was recognized in the labor movement as well. Even the legal reform movement of the workers assured a part of the intelligenzia new possibilities of existence, socialist ideas acquired a market value, and many persons succeeded in making of socialism a career without the necessity of being paid by organizations.

While there were individual instances of impoverishment among these elements, and other instances in which intellectuals succeeded in making the leap into the ranks of the bourgeoisie, still the group itself is neither identical with the genuine proletariat nor can it fully identify its interests with those of the bourgeoisie. While to most of them reliance upon the bourgeoisie is a vital necessity, a smaller part is permitted the luxury of having a "conviction", that is, of coming out for socialism which is designed to do away with the intellectuals as a special social stratum. The ascendancy of the class struggle between Capital and Labor in the present-day economic system compels the middle class to decide for one or the other; in either case it has to fall in with strivings which are foreign to itself; a matter in which it can never be wholly successful. Even tho certain of them actually succeed in overcoming the inner and outer petty-bourgeois restrictions still clinging to them and in playing a truly valuable part in the class struggle, still the influence of the group as a whole upon the labor movement is an unwholesome one. Its world is not the world of the proletariat; it can no more disregard its own necessities than the proletariat is capable of renouncing its with immunity.

There is no doubt that the intrusion of petty-bourgeois elements, the intellectuals, was one of the causes of the degeneration of the labor movement. This degeneration had first become possible, however, only as a result of the capitalist-imperialistic upswing which rendered reformism not only possible but also necessary. In this period, only a labor movement constantly growing more "corrupt" was capable of existing and it was only for this reason that the intellectuals were ready and in a position to take over its ideological leadership.

Mass organizations in non-revolutionary times are of necessity reformistic, and any reformist organization is possible only thru the existence of an intellectual and organizational bureaucracy. Laws are not made in factories, wage contracts are discussed over the green table. The negotiators have to be schooled; the average worker is no match in this field for the contracting party on the capitalist side. He needs representatives, needs intellectuals, needs the bureaucracy; and the greater the scope of the reformist activity, the greater must become also the bureaucratic apparatus of the labor movement, and the more importance attaches to the intellectuals. Parliamentarism needs clever speakers, the trade-union horse-trading needs persons versed in the law, the legalism of democracy needs representatives schooled in the national economy. In brief, if one engages in politics within the framework of capitalism, he needs capitalist politicians.

Anyone who did not wish the degeneration of the old labor movement was obliged to speak out against reformism. Anyone wanting to do away with the bureaucracy was obliged to quit asking for practical results, and remain a sectarian, an example of consistent though untimely thinking. Reformism was the labor policy within the framework of capitalism on the upgrade. Revolutionary ideas could not seize the masses; the historical "short-sightedness" of the workers corresponded best to their immediate interests. Anyone who desired to play a part during this period was obliged to be a rebel and renegade at the same time. The breaking away from the traditional ideology and the acceptance of new ideas receiving lip service in the labor movement was permissible only to the rebellious natures among the middle class; if they wanted to play a role, however, they had to become renegades. To the self-educated workers striving for positions within the labor movement, only the same possibilities stood open. Even though they did not solve the "social question", still at least they solved their own problem. It was not so much the "nature" of these people,--this nature is the nature of all human beings,--but rather the possibility of employing this nature gainfully and corrupting it safely, which enabled renegadism to become the fashion. This corruption was in strict conformity with the temporary interests of the masses represented by these leaders.

Capitalism in the various stages of its development has continually produced rebels, and just as necessarily converted them, with few exceptions, into renegades. This was only the reflection, within the labor movement, of the movement of the middle class itself, which was destroyed and at the same time formed anew. The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy or, as today in Russia, a struggle against state bureaucracy. The struggle against the intellectuals in private-capitalist countries has meaning only so long as there is reformist activity and reformist organizations, that is, only so long as it is ineffective; for, as already stated, reformism is the realistic labor policy under capitalism on the upgrade. At a certain level of the decline period of capitalism, a level at which there can no longer be any reformist activity or any independent labor organizations, the struggle against the intellectuals becomes temporarily superfluous. It is not until and unless a state-capitalist revolution has been successful, it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals is taken up again and with redoubled fierceness. Any state bureaucracy whose existence is based on the mastery over the means of production, and which assures this mastery by means of a governmental