

be debated. The entry of his little crew into the slough of the Second International was the move of a frustrated man. But this frustration did not entirely fail to give rise to some wisdom, for with these uncertain moves came the realization of more possible forms than the Leninist whereby the workers may take over and "unleash" industry.

Now Trotzky may no longer be reckoned among the Marxists. He was a "great" man who cannot fit into the picture of a great multitude, which is the picture of this day.

The fiction of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia is, for Stalin, a means to kill class conscious workers and to set up a machine of world wide counter revolution; for Trotzky it is a self-defeating word-laden labyrinth. To Marxists, the present Russian regime is State Capitalist. It remains their duty to expose this prostitution to those workers who rightfully aspire to and struggle for a cleaner and healthier society.

- H. Smith -

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

This publication has justified its aim and continues to present the world's most significant thought and action. This journal dares to print what the uniformed mighty condemn.

Subscription-\$1.50 yearly, U.S.A.
(8 months - \$1.00)

Subscribe now.

P.O.Box 44, Station O,
New York City, N. Y.

IN GERMAN - RAETEKORRESPONDENZ

Herausgegeben monatlich von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommuniten, Holland; enthaelt aufschlussreiche Artikel ueber die Arbeiterbewegung und sollte fuer jeden unserer Freunde und Genossen von interesse sein. Einzelheft 1.00 durch uns zu beziehen.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

Anarchism and the Spanish Revolution

The Economic Organization of the Revolution

Nature and Significance of Overproduction

The Character of the Present Crisis

NEW BOOKS

The Revolution Betrayed . . . The End of Socialism in Russia

The Recovery Problem in the United States

Vol. III

Nos. 5&6

JUNE 1937

Also YEARLY

10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

Published at 1237 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!

ANARCHISM AND THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

The heroic struggles of the Spanish workers against the fascists is a milestone in the development of the international class movement of the proletariat. Simultaneously, this struggle put an end to the hitherto uninterrupted course of victorious fascism and initiated a new period of growing class struggles.

But this is not the only reason the Spanish Civil War is of great importance to the proletariat. Its significance lies also in the fact that it put to test the theories and tactics of anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism.

Spain has always been the classical land of anarchism. The enormous influence which anarchist doctrines gained in Spain can be understood only in relation to the peculiar class structure of the country. Proudhon's theory of individual and independent handicrafts, as well as Bakunin's application of the same theory to factories, found wholehearted support by small peasants, land and city workers. The anarchist doctrines were embraced by large sections of the Spanish proletariat and the acceptance of these doctrines was responsible for the spontaneous uprising of the workers against the fascist insurrection.

We do not mean to say, however, that the development of the struggle was also determined by anarchist ideology or that it reflects the aim of the anarchists. On the contrary, we shall presently point out that the anarchists were compelled to give up many of their old pet ideas and accept instead compromises of the worst kind. In analysing this development, we shall prove that an-

archism is incapable of solving the problems of the revolutionary class struggle. The anarchist tactics employed in Spain were unfit to cope with the situation, not because the movement was too small to allow for practical application but because the anarchist methods of organizing the various phases of the struggle were in contradiction to objective reality. This stage of development reveals striking similarities with the Russian bolsheviks of 1917. Just as the Russian bolsheviks were forced to abandon, step by step, their old theories until, finally, they were compelled to exploit the workers and peasants with bourgeois-capitalist methods, so the anarchists in Spain are now forced to accept measures which formerly had been denounced by them as being centralist and oppressive. The development of the Russian Revolution has shown the incorrectness of the bolshevist theories in solving the problems of the proletarian class struggle, and, similarly, the Spanish Civil War reveals the unfitness of the anarchist doctrines.

It seems to us of great enough importance to point out the mistakes made by the anarchists, largely because their valiant fight has induced many workers--who clearly see the treacherous role played by the representatives of the Second and Third Internationals--to believe that the anarchists are right after all. From our point of view, this is a great danger, as it tends to increase the confusion already rampant within the working class.

We consider it our duty to show, from the Spanish example, that the anarchist argumentation against Marxism is wrong; that, on the contrary, it is the anarchist doctrine which has failed. When it comes to understanding a certain situation, or to show ways and methods within a given revolutionary struggle, Marxism still takes the lead, and stands in sharp contrast to the pseudo-Marxism of the Second and Third International parties.

The weakness of the anarchist theories was shown first by the anarchist organizations on the question of organizing for political power. According to anarchist theory, the revolutionary victory would be assured and guaranteed by placing the management of the factories in the hands of the syndicates (unions). The anarchists never attempted to take away the power from the people's front government. Neither did they work toward the organization of a political soviet power. Instead of propagandizing the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, they preached class harmony to all groups belonging to the anti-fascist front. When the bourgeoisie began to curtail the power of the workers' organizations, the an-

archists joined the new government, which, according to anarchist theories, is a gross deviation from their basic principles. They tried to explain this move with the excuse that, on account of the collectivization, the new people's front government does not represent a political power, as it did before, but is merely an economic one, because its members are representatives of the syndicates to which, however, members of the petty bourgeois Esquerra also belonged. The anarchists argued: because the power lies in the factories, and the factories are controlled by the syndicates, therefore the power lies in the hands of the workers. How this actually works out we shall see below.

During the time the anarchists belonged to the government, the decree to dissolve the militia was issued. The incorporation of the militia, and the regular army, the suppression of the POUM in Madrid, were decreed with their approval. The anarchists helped to organize a bourgeois political power, but did nothing toward the formation of proletarian political power.

It is not our intention to make the anarchists responsible for development of the anti-fascist struggle and its diversion into a bourgeois blind alley. Other factors are to be blamed, particularly the passive attitude of the workers in other countries. What we most severely criticize is the fact that the anarchists have ceased to work toward a real proletarian revolution and that they identify themselves with the present development. They have thereby "smoke-screened" the position of the workers against the bourgeoisie, and gave rise to illusions for which, we are afraid, they themselves will have to pay very dearly in the future.

The tactics of the Spanish anarchists have found a number of critics in foreign liberal groups; some of these critics even accuse them of betraying anarchist ideals. But as these critics fail to see the actual situation their Spanish comrades are facing, they remain negative. It could not be otherwise. The anarchist doctrines simply cannot answer the questions that revolutionary practice raises. No participation in the government, no organization of political power, syndication of production, these are the basic anarchist slogans.

With such slogans it is utterly impossible to deal effectively with the interests of the proletarian revolution. The Spanish anarchists fell back into bourgeois practices because they were unable to replace their unrealizable slogans with revolutionary proletarian ones. Precisely for this reason, the

foreign liberal critics and advisers could not offer any solution, for these problems can be solved only on the basis of Marxian theory.

The most extreme position among the foreign anarchists is taken by the Dutch Anarchists (excepting the Dutch Anarcho-Syndicalists of the NSV, Netherlands Syndicalist Vuband). The dyed-in-the-wool anarchists of Holland refute every fight with employes' military weapons, because such struggle stands in contradiction to the anarchist ideal and goal. They deny the existence of classes. Although they cannot refuse to express their sympathy with the fighting anti-fascist masses. In reality, their position means a sabotage of the struggle. They denounce all action which purports to help the Spanish workers, such as sending weapons to them. The kernel of their propaganda is this: everything must be done to prevent spreading the conflict to other European countries. They propagate "passive resistance", a la Gandhi, whose philosophy, translated in the objective reality, means the surrender of defenseless workers to the fascist butchers.

The oppositional anarchists maintain that centralized power within the proletarian dictatorship or military staff will lead to another form of suppression of the masses. The Spanish anarchists retaliate by pointing out that they (in Spain) do not work for centralized political power; on the contrary, they favor syndication of production, which excludes exploitation of workers. They earnestly believe that the factories are in the hands of the workers and that it is unnecessary to organize all the factories on a centralistic and political basis. The actual development, however, has proven already that centralization of production is taking place and the anarchists are forced to adjust themselves to the new conditions even against their own will. Wherever the anarchist workers neglect to organize their power politically and centralistically in the factories and communes, the representatives of the bourgeois-capitalist parties, including the Socialist and Communist parties, will undertake it. This means that the syndicates, instead of being controlled directly by the workers in the factories, will be ruled according to laws and decrees issued by the bourgeois-capitalist government.

II

From this viewpoint, the question arises: is it true that the workers in Catalonia possessed the power in the factories after the anarchists had syndicated production? To answer this question, we need only to quote a few paragraphs from the pamphlet, "What is

the CNT and FAI?" (Official CNT and FAI publication.)

"The management of the collectivized factories lies in the hands of the factory councils who are elected at a general factory meeting. This council shall consist of from five to fifteen members. The term of official service on the councils is two years....

"The factory councils are responsible to the factory meeting and the industry council of the particular industry... Production is regulated by the factory council in conjunction with the industry council. They also regulate questions of compensation, sanitary conditions, etc.

"Each factory council appoints a director (manager). In factories employing more than 500 workers, the appointment must have the approval of the industry council. With the approval of the workers in the factory, each factory delegates one member of the factory council to the industry council of the 'Generalidad'. The factory councils report regularly to the factory meeting and to the IC about their activity and planning.

"In case of incompatibility or refusal to carry out instructions, members of the factory council can be dismissed either by the factory meeting or the industry council.

"Should a member of the factory council be dismissed by the IC against the wishes of the workers, then the latter have the right to appeal the dismissal before the IC. The IC of the Generalidad decides the case after having heard the report of the anti-fascist general economic council.

"The general economic councils of the various industry branches consists of four representatives of the factory councils, eight representatives of the various syndicates (comprising proportionally all political groups) and four technicians. The latter are appointed by the anti-fascist general economic council. This committee is headed by a member of the industry council of the Generalidad.

"The general economic council has the following task: organization of production, computation of costs, elimination of competition between the factories, investigation of the demands for industrial products, as well as home and foreign markets, rentability and consolidation of factories, reorganization of production methods, tariffs, establishment of central markets, acquisition of means of production and raw

material, credits, establishment, of technical laboratories, statistics for production and consumption, attempts to replace foreign raw material with home products, etc."

It does not require much thinking to realize that these proposals place all economic functions in the hands of the general economic council. As we have seen, the GEC consists of eight representatives of the syndicates: four from the anti-fascist general economic council appointed technicians, and four representatives of the factory councils. The anti-fascist general economic council was organized at the beginning of the revolution and consists of representatives from the syndicates and the petty bourgeoisie (Esquerola, etc.). As the direct representatives of the workers, only the four factory council delegates could be counted upon. We note furthermore that in case of dismissal of factory council representatives, the IC of the Generalidad and the anti-fascist general economic council have decisive influence. The GEC can dismiss oppositional council members against which the workers may appeal to the industry council, but the decision rests with the anti-fascist GEC. The factory councils organize the working conditions but they are responsible not only to the workers in the factory but to the industry council as well. The factory council may appoint a director, but for the larger enterprises the consent of the IC is also required.

In brief, it can be said that the workers have actually very little to say about organization and control of factories. In reality, the syndicates govern. What that means we will investigate below.

Considering the few facts mentioned, we are unable to share the enthusiasm of the CNT about the "social development". "In the public offices pulsates the life of a real constructive revolution," writes Rosselli, in 'What is the CNT and FAI', (pp 38 and 39, German edition). According to our viewpoint, the heartbeats of a real revolution do not pulsate in the public offices but in the factories. In the offices throbs the heart of a different life, that of bureaucracy.

We do not criticize facts. Facts, realities, are determined by circumstances and conditions beyond the control of single groups; that the workers of Catalonia have not erected the dictatorship of the proletariat is no fault of theirs. The main reason lies in the confused international situation which places the Spanish workers in opposition to the rest of the world. Under such conditions, it is impossible for the Spanish proletariat to liberate itself from its

petty bourgeois ally. The revolution was doomed before it really started!

No, we do not criticize the facts. We do, however, criticize the anarchists for considering the conditions in Catalonia as being socialistic. All those who tell the workers of socialism in Catalonia - partly because they actually believe it, partly because they do not wish to lose contact and influence upon the development - prevent the workers from seeing already what is actually happening in Spain. They do not understand revolutionary principles and therefore render more difficult the development of the revolutionary struggles.

The Spanish workers cannot afford to fight effectively against the rule of the syndicates as this would lead to a complete collapse of the military fronts. They have no other alternative. They must fight against the fascists to save their lives, must accept every assistance regardless of where it comes from. They do not ask whether the result will be socialism or capitalism; they only know that they have to fight until the bitter end. Only a small section of the proletariat is consciously revolutionary.

So long as the syndicates organize the military struggle, the workers will support them; that this leads to compromises with the bourgeoisie cannot be denied and is considered as a necessary evil. The slogan of the CNT, "First the Victory Over the Fascists, and Then the Social Revolution", expresses the sentiment still prevailing among the militant workers. But this sentiment can also be explained by the general backwardness of the country which not only makes possible but even forces the proletariat into compromises with the bourgeoisie. It follows, therefore, that the character of the revolutionary struggle undergoes tremendous changes and instead of pointing toward the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, it leads to the consolidation of a new capitalist order.

Foreign Help Strangulates the Revolution

The working class in Spain fights not only against the fascist bourgeoisie, but against the bourgeoisie of the entire world. The fascist countries, Italy, Germany, Portugal and the Argentine, support the Spanish fascists in this fight with all the means at their disposal. This fact suffices to make impossible the victory of the revolution in Spain. The enormous power of the enemy states is too potent for the Spanish proletariat. If the Spanish fascists, with their tremendous power, failed to win up to now, suffering military de-

feats on several fronts, that is the result of the delivery of modern weapons from abroad to the anti-fascist government. While Mexico, from the beginning, lent support with munitions and arms on a small scale, Russia began with its support only after five months of warfare. The help came after the fascist troops, equipped with modern Italian and German arms and further aided by the fascist countries in every way, forced back the anti-fascist militia. From this resulted the possibility for further fighting. Another consequence was that Germany and Italy were compelled to send still more arms and even troops. In this way, these countries became more and more influential in the political situation. With such development of events, France and England, anxious because of their relationship with their colonies, could not remain disinterested. In view of these developments, the fight in Spain assumes the character of an international conflict between the big imperialist powers who openly or clandestinely participate in the war in order to defend old or to obtain new positions of domination. On both sides the hostile fronts in Spain are now supported with arms and other material help. It cannot yet be discerned when and where this fight will end.

Meanwhile, the Spanish workers are being saved by this help from abroad. Simultaneously, the revolution is being given its final kick. Modern arms from abroad made possible the military battle, and consequently the Spanish proletariat became subjugated to imperialist interests and primarily to Russian interests. Russia does not help the Spanish government to further the revolution, but to hinder the growth of Italian and German influence in the mediterranean zone. The stopping of Russian ships and attachments of cargo clearly designates what Russia may expect when it permits Germany and Italy to achieve victory.

Russia tries to become entrenched in Spain. We will only indicate how, as the result of Russian pressure, the Spanish workers gradually are losing their influence on the development of events; how the militia committees are dissolved, the POUM excluded from the government and the hands of the CNT tied.

For months now arms and munitions have been denied to the POUM and CNT on the Aragon front. All this proves that the power on which the Spanish anti-fascists depend materially, also governs the fight of the Spanish workers. They can try to get rid of Russian influence but they cannot do without Russian help, and will, as a last resort, take over everything Russia demands. As long as workers outside of Spain do not revolt against their own bourgeoisie, and by these

actions give active help to the revolutionary struggle in Spain, the Spanish workers will have to sacrifice their socialist goal.

The real cause of the internal breakdown of the Spanish revolution is to be found in the fact that Spanish workers have been dependent on the material help of capitalist countries (in this case on Russian state capitalism). If the revolution should extend over a sufficiently large area, if it, for example, could be effected in England, France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, then things would have another aspect. Only if the counter-revolution in the most important industrial areas of Europe were crushed, as it now is crushed in Madrid, Catalonia, Asturias, the power of the fascist bourgeoisie would be broken. White guard troops in reactionary zones could then certainly endanger the revolution; but they could no longer defeat it. Troops which do not have their base in an industry of sufficient importance very soon reach the end of their power. The workers will no longer be dependent on foreign capitalist powers if the proletarian revolution in the more important industrial areas of Europe is effected. It can then seize all power. So, once more, we state that the proletarian revolution can only be victorious if it is international. If it is confined to a small region, it will be either crushed with armed power or degenerate by being used for imperialist interests. If the proletarian revolution is strong enough on an international scale, then it need have no fear of degenerating in the direction of state or private capitalism. In the following section, we will deal with the questions which would arise under those circumstances.

The Class Struggle in "Red" Spain

Although we pointed out in the preceding section how the international situation forced the Spanish workers to compromise with the bourgeoisie, we did not imply that the class struggle in "Red" Spain was ended. On the contrary, it continues under cover of the anti-fascist people's front, and is proved by the assaults the bourgeoisie make on every stronghold of the workers' committees, by the continuous reinforcement of the position of the government. The workers in "Red" Spain cannot be indifferent to this development; on their part, they must attempt to maintain the positions they won, to prevent the further encroachments of the bourgeoisie and to give new revolutionary direction to the events.

If the workers in Catalonia do not fight against the new advances of the bourgeoisie, their complete de-

feat is certain. If the people's front government would eventually defeat the fascists, it will use all its power to push back the proletariat into its former position. The fight between the working class and the bourgeoisie will continue but under much worse conditions for the proletariat; because the "democratic" bourgeoisie, after the victory over the fascists, won by the workers, will then use all their forces in the anti-proletarian fight. The systematic disintegration of the workers' powers has been going on for months; and in the speeches of Caballero, one can already recognize what the workers may expect of the present government after they achieve victory for it.

We stated that the Spanish revolution can only be victorious if it becomes international. But the Spanish workers cannot wait for the revolution to begin in other parts of Europe; they cannot wait for the help which, until now, has been only a pious wish. They must now, at once, defend their cause not only against the fascists but against their own bourgeois allies. The organization of their power is also, in the present situation, an urgent necessity.

How does the Spanish workers' movement answer this question? The only organization that gives a concrete answer to this question is the POUM. It propagandizes for the election of a general congress of councils, out of which shall emerge a real proletarian government.

To this we reply that the foundation for such a proposal does not yet exist. The so-called "worker councils" insofar as they are not yet liquidated are to the greatest extent under the influence of the Generalidad which has stringent control over their composition. Incidentally, the election of the congress would not guarantee the power of the workers over production. Social power means more than merely the control of the government. Only if proletarian power penetrates the entire social life can it maintain itself. The central political power, however great its importance may be, is merely a link to the position of power which has its roots in every part of social life.

If the workers are to organize their power against the bourgeoisie, they must begin their task from the bottom. They must, first, free their shop organizations from the influence of official parties and unions because the latter bind the workers to the present government and thereby to capitalist society. They must try to influence, thru their shop organizations, every part of social life. Only from this basis

is it possible to build up proletarian power; only from this basis can the forces of the working class work in harmony.

The Economic Organization of the Revolution

The question of the political and economic organization of the revolution cannot be separated. The anarchists who denied the necessity of a political organization, could not therefore give an adequate solution to the problem of economic organization. Such questions as the connection of labor in the different workshops with that of the circulation of goods, are interrelated problems insofar as the formation of workers' political power is concerned. The power of the workers in the factories cannot be maintained without the building of political labor power, and the latter cannot be maintained as labor power unless it has its roots in the organization of shop councils. So after demonstrating the necessity for the building of political power, the question arises as to the form of proletarian power, how it integrates society, and how it is rooted in the shops.

Let us assume that the workers in the principal industrial areas, for example in those of Europe, had achieved power and thus crushed the military power of the bourgeoisie to a great extent. Then the greatest menace to the revolution from the outside is obviated. But how are the workers, as common owners of the shops, to face the problem of setting the wheels rolling so that society's needs are met? For that purpose, raw materials are necessary. But where do they come from? Or, after the product is made, where should it be sent? Who needs it?

None of these problems can be solved if each factory were to work in its own way. Raw materials for the factories come from all parts of the world and the products resulting from these raw materials are consumed in all parts of the world. How are the workers to know from whom they must obtain their raw materials? How are they to find the consumers for their products? Products cannot be produced at random. The workers cannot deliver products and raw materials without knowing that both are to be appropriately used. If economic life is not to break down immediately, then methods must be found to make possible the organization of the movement of goods.

Here lies the difficulty. In capitalism, this task is accomplished by the free market and thru money. On the market the capitalists, as owners of products, face each other; here the needs of society are ascertained.

Money is the measurement for these needs. The prices express the approximate value of the products. In communism, these economic forms which spring from and are bound to private property will disappear. So the question arises: how are the needs of society to be ascertained, determined, under communism?

We know that the free market can accomplish its task only in a very limited manner. The needs which it measures are not determined by the real needs of the people, but by the purchasing power of the owners and by the amount of wages the worker receives. In communism, the real needs of the masses will be met and not those which depend solely on the contents of the pocket.

Now it is clear that the real needs of the masses cannot be ascertained by any sort of bureaucratic apparatus, but by the workers themselves. The first question here is, not whether the workers are capable of this act, but who has the disposal of the products of society? If a bureaucratic apparatus is permitted to determine the needs of the masses, then a new instrument of power over the working class is created. Therefore, it is essential that workers unite in consumers' cooperatives and thereby create the organism that expresses their needs. The same is true of the shops. Workers who are united in shop organizations ascertain the amount of raw materials they need for the products they must produce. There is, therefore, only one means under communism to ascertain the real needs of the masses; that is, the organization of producers and consumers; the organization of workers into shop organizations and consumers' cooperatives.

Now it is not sufficient for the workers to know what they need for their livelihood, and for the shops to know the necessary quantity of raw materials. The shops exchange their goods; there is a change of matter, the products go thru different phases, thru many factories until their entry into the sphere of consumption. To make this process possible, it is not only necessary to ascertain the quotas but also to administer them. So we come to the second part of the mechanism which must supersede the free market; that is, the general social accounting. This accounting must comprise the working over of statements obtained from the various shops and consumers' cooperatives to a lucid presentation which will give an accurate knowledge of the needs and possibilities of society.

If the building up of such a central accounting does not take place, then the total production will be submerged in chaos when private ownership of the

means of production is abolished and with it the free market. The free market cannot be abolished before organization of production and distribution of goods by the cooperatives of producers and consumers and the central accounting is created.

Russia showed how the "free market" against all the suppressive measures of the bolsheviki maintained itself, because the organs which were supposed to supersede it did not function. In Spain the powerlessness of the organizations to build up a communist production is clearly demonstrated by the existence of the free market. The old form of property has now another face. Instead of personal property in the means of production, the unions take on in part the role played by the former owners in a slightly modified form. The form is changed, the system remains. Property, as such, is not abolished. Barter of goods does not disappear. That is the great danger which faces the Spanish revolution from within.

The workers' task is to find a principal new form of distribution of goods. If they maintain the current forms, they would thus open all the doors to the full restoration of capitalism. In case the workers achieve a central distribution of goods, they certainly have the task of holding this central apparatus under their control. This apparatus, which is created for only registration and statistical purposes, contains the possibilities for appropriating the functions of power and create for itself an instrument of power which can be used against the workers. This development would be the first step in the direction of state capitalism.

Taking Over of Production by the Unions

This tendency is clearly discerned in Spain. Union officials are able to dispose of the apparatus of production. They have also a decisive influence over military formations. The influence of the workers on economic life extends no further than the influence of their unions. How very limited this influence is, can be proved by the measures of the unions which failed to lead to an earnest aggression against private property.

If the workers take over the regulation of economic life, one of their first acts will be leveled against the parasites. The fact that everything is purchasable with money, that money is the magic power which opens all doors, will disappear. One of the first acts of the workers will be, without doubt, the creation of a sort of labor check. These checks will be obtainable only by those who do useful work. (Special measures

regarding the aged, the ill, children, etc., will certainly be necessary).

In Catalonia this did not happen. Money remains the medium for exchange of goods. Also, there has been introduced certain control over the movement of goods which did not interfere with the workers having to bring their small possessions to pawn shops, while the house owners, for example, received guaranteed and unearned income, as much as four per cent of their capital. ("L'Espagne Antifasciste", Oct. 10).

One cannot deny the fact that the unions were unable to take other measures, otherwise they would have endangered the anti-fascist united front; and that they would surely recover what they had lost once they had vanquished the anti-fascists and accomplished all necessary reforms. The liberal character of the CNT would guarantee this.

Who argues in this manner makes the same errors as the different sorts of bolsheviks, from both the left and right. The measures accomplished up to now clearly prove that the workers still lack power. With which arguments will one defend the stand-point that the same union apparatus, which today dominates the workers, will, after the defeat of the fascists, place their power voluntarily in the hands of the workers?

Certainly the CNT is liberal. Even if we suppose that the officials of this organization would be ready to relinquish their power when the military situation permits, what would really be altered by this? Because not one or the other leader has the power. But the power is in the hands of the big apparatus which is composed of innumerable large and small "big shots" who dominate key positions as well as minor ones. They are able at the moment when driven from their privileged jobs, to turn the entire production upside down. Here arises the same problem which played such a significant role in the Russian revolution. The bureaucratic apparatus sabotaged the whole economic life as long as the workers controlled the factories. The same applies to Spain.

All the enthusiasm which the CNT has for the idea of the right of self-determination of the workshops does not alter the fact that the union committees did, in fact, take over the function of the employer and consequently forced to play the role of the exploiter of labor. The system of wage-labor is upheld in Spain. Only one aspect is changed: as wage-labor was formerly in the service of the capitalist, so it is now in the service of the unions. To prove this, we quote from "L'Espagne Antifasciste", No. 24, Nov. 28, 1936, under the

heading of an article entitled, "The Revolution Organizes Itself":

"The provincial plenum of Granada convened at Guadix from October 2 to October 4, 1936, and adopted the following resolutions:

- '5. The Committee of Union-Unity shall control the entire production (agriculture is referred to). For that purpose all material necessary for sowing and harvesting of crops shall be at their disposal.
- '6. As the basis for working with other regions, each committee must make possible the exchange of goods by comparing the values of products with each other according to current prices.
- '7. To expedite labor, the committee must list statistically those able to work and those unable, for it must know how much working power it can count on and how the food, according to the size of the family, is to be rationed.
- '8. The confiscated land is declared to be common property. Also the land of those who have sufficient physical and professional capacity, cannot be seized. This in order to obtain a maximum of rentability."

(Moreover, the land of the small owners cannot be confiscated. The seizure is to be accompanied by organs of the CNT and UGT).

These resolutions are to be understood as a kind of plan according to which the Union-Unity Committee will organize agrarian production. But at the same time we must clearly note that the leadership of small enterprises, as well as the leadership of large enterprises in which the maximum rentability must be guaranteed, shall remain in the hands of the former owners. The remainder of the land must be turned over for communal purposes. That means it must be put under the control of the Union committees. Furthermore, the Union-Unity Committee (UUC) obtains control over the entire production. But not a single word indicates what part the producers themselves must play in this new order of production. This problem does not seem to exist for the UGT. They only see their task in the establishment of another leadership, namely the leadership of the UUC which still remains the base for wage-labor. Also, the question of maintenance of the wage system determines the development of the proletarian revolution. If the workers remain wage workers, as they were be-

fore, even in the service of a committee set up by their own union, their position in the system of production remains unchanged. The social revolution will be pushed away from their main direction thru the fight for economic influence for the unions or the parties which will inevitably begin. Then the question arises: how far is the union to be regarded as the real representative of the workers? In other words; how much influence will the workers have over the central union committees which dominate the entire economic life?

Reality teaches us that the workers lose all their influence or power over these organizations; even in the best case, if all workers are organized in the CNT and UGT and if they chose the committees themselves. These gradually change if they are functioning in autonomous organs of power. The committees formulate all norms for production and distribution without being responsible to the workers who raised them to their functions, and they cannot at any moment be replaced at the will of the workers. They obtain the right to dispose of all means of production which are necessary for labor as well as the products while the worker receives only a definite amount of wages in proportion to the labor expended. The problem for the Spanish workers consists, therefore, up to the present, of preserving the power over the Union committees which rule production and distribution. Here it is clearly seen that the anarcho-syndicalist propaganda produces the opposite effect: the anarcho-syndicalists maintain that all obstacles are overcome when the unions achieve the direction of production. They see the danger of the formation of bureaucracy only in the organs of the state but not in the unions. They believe that liberal convictions will make such a development impossible.

But on the contrary, it has been proved and not only in Spain, that liberal convictions will be cast aside as soon as material necessities present themselves. Even the anarchists confirm the development of a bureaucracy, "L'Espagne Antifasciste", in the January 1st number, contains an article taken from the "Tierra Y Libertad", ("Land and Freedom" organ of the FAI) from which we quote the following:

"The last plenum of the "Regional Federation" of the anarchist groups in Catalonia has...made clear the standpoint of anarchism according to present-day demands. We will publicize all these conclusions with short comments."

The following extract is taken from these commented resolutions:

"4. It is necessary to abolish the parasitic bureaucracy which has developed to a high degree in the low and higher organs of the state."

The state is the eternal breeding place for a certain class - the bureaucracy. Today this situation becomes serious. It draws us toward a stream which endangers the revolution. Collectivization of enterprises, establishment of councils and committees became the fertile soil for a new bureaucracy which developed from the womb of the workers themselves. Disregarding the tasks of socialism and divorced from the spirit of the revolution, these elements which lead the places of production or the industries outside the control of the unions, frequently act as bureaucrats with absolute authority and behave as new masters. In the state offices and local bureaus, one can observe the growth of these "swivel-chair artists". This state of things must be ended. It is the task of the unions and the workers to erect a dam against this stream of bureaucratism. It is the union organization which must solve this problem. "The parasites must disappear from the new society. It is our urgent duty to begin the fight with our sharpest weapons and without delay."

But to drive out bureaucracy thru the unions would mean to drive the devil out with Beelzebub; because the conditions of power and not idealistic dogmas determine the development of events. Spanish anarcho-syndicalism, nourished by anarchist doctrines, declares itself for free communism and against all sorts of central power; yet its own power is concentrated in the unions and therefore these organizations are the means by which the anarcho-syndicalists will realize "free" communism.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM

Thus we have seen that practice and theory of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalists are entirely different. This was already evident when the CNT and the FAI could assure their position only by renouncing, step by step, their previous anti-political attitude, and the same is now reflected in the "economic structure" of the revolution.

Theoretically, they are the vanguard of a "free" communism. However, in order to move the "free" enterprises in the interest of the revolution, they are forced to rob these enterprises of their freedom and subordinate production to a central management. Practice compels abandonment of theory, which means that the theory did not fit the practice.

We will find an explanation for this discrepancy if we thoroly analyze these theories of "free communism" which are, in the last instance, the conceptions of Proudhon, adapted by Bakunin to modern methods of production.

Proudhon's socialistic conceptions, advanced a hundred years ago, are nothing more than the idealistic conceptions of petty bourgeois who looked upon the free competition of small enterprises as the ideal goal of economic development. Free competition was automatically to do away with all privileges arising thru the money-monopolies of banks and the real estate monopolies of large landed property owners. In this way, control from above was to be made superfluous; profits should disappear and each one should receive the "full fruit of his work", because, according to Proudhon, profits were made only thru big business (trade) monopoly. "I do not intend to do away with private property, but to socialize it; that is, to reduce it to small enterprises and deprive it of its power." Proudhon does not condemn property rights as such; he sees "real freedom" in free disposal of the fruits of labor and condemns private property only as privilege and power, the master's right to private property. ("Proudhon and Socialism" by Gottfried Salomon, p.31). For instance, in order to do away with money-monopoly, Proudhon had in mind the establishment of a central credit bank for the mutual credit of the producers, thus eliminating the cost of credit-money. This reminds us of the statement in "L'Espagne Antifasciste" on October 10, as follows:

"The syndicate CNT of the officials of the credit-bank in Madrid proposes the immediate transformation of all credit-banks into institutions for gratis-credits for the working class; that is to say, against an annual compensation of 2%..."

However, Proudhon's influence on the anarcho-syndicalists' conception is not limited to these relatively unimportant questions. His socialism fundamentally constitutes the basis of the whole anarcho-syndicalist doctrine with slight changes in regard to modern and highly industrialized conditions.

The conception of the CNT simply classifies enterprises as independent units in their "free competitive socialism". It is true that the anarcho-syndicalists do not want to return to the scale of small enterprise. They propose liquidating the small enterprises, or to let them die a natural death when they do not function rationally enough. However,

substituting Proudhon's "small enterprises" with "large enterprises", and "hand laborers" with "workers' syndicates" gives a picture of the socialism of the CNT.

The Necessity of Planned Production

In reality these theories are utopian. They are particularly unapplicable to the conditions in Spain. Free competition at this stage of development is no longer possible and even less so in a state of war and chaos, as in Catalonia. Where a number of enterprises or whole communities liberated and made themselves independent of the rest of the productive system - only in reality to exploit the consumers of their products, - now the CNT and the FAI have to suffer the consequences of their economic theories. They were forced to this step because a fight of all against all appeared inevitable otherwise, which might be of great danger in a moment when the civil war demanded the unification of all forces. They knew of no other way out but that already applied by the bolsheviks and social democrats, namely: abolition of the independence of enterprises and their subordination to a central economic management. The importance of this act is not diminished by the fact that this management is established thru their own trade unions. If the workers are nothing but wage workers in the centralistic system of production, this is, in spite of the CNT, nothing but a system functioning on capitalist principles.

This contradiction of the anarcho-syndicalists' theory and practice is partly due to their inability to find a solution to the most important problem of a proletarian revolution, with regard to economic organization, namely: how and in what way will be determined the share of the total output for each member and participant in the productive system? According to the anarcho-syndicalists' theory, this share should be determined by the independent enterprises or free individuals by the use of "free capital", thru production for the market and return of the full value thru exchange. This principle was maintained even when, years ago, the necessity of a planned production and consequently central bookkeeping was obvious. The anarcho-syndicalists see the necessity of planning the economic life and are of the opinion that this would not be feasible without central registration, meaning statistical organization of the productive factors and the social needs. However, they overlook giving a basis for these statistical requirements. It is an established fact that production cannot be investigated statistically and organized on a planned basis if

there is no measurement to be applied to the products.

Bolshevist vs. The Communist Mode of Production

Communism means production of the necessities of the broad masses. The question: how much can be consumed by individuals and how raw materials and half-finished products are to be distributed over various factories, cannot be solved in the capitalist money way. Money is an expression of certain private property relations. Money assures a certain share of the social product to its possessor. This holds good for individuals as well as enterprises. However, there is no private property of means of production under communism, nevertheless, each individual shall be entitled to a certain part for consumption from the social wealth, and each factory must have access to the necessary raw materials and means of production. How this is to be accomplished, the syndicalists answer only vaguely by pointing to statistical methods. This touches upon a very difficult problem of the proletarian revolution. If the workers would simply entrust the determination of their share to a "statistical bureau", they would in this way create a power of which they will lose control. On the other hand, regulated production is an impossibility if workers in the factories are entitled to any amount of goods.

We have, therefore, to deal with the following problem: how is it possible to unite, bring into accord, both principles which seem to be contradictory at first sight, namely, all power to the workers, meaning concentrated federalism, and planned regulation of production, which is identical with utmost centralism? We can answer this twofold question only by considering the very foundations of the total social production. Workers supply society with one and the same thing, their labor-power. In a society without exploitation, as communist society, no other measurement than the individual labor-power given to society can be valid for receiving from society the means of existence.

During the productive process, raw materials are converted into commodities by the addition of laborpower. A statistical bureau would nowadays be quite incapable of ascertaining the amount of labor incorporated in a certain product. The product has gone thru many hands, in addition an immense number of machines, tools, raw materials and half-finished products have been employed in its fabrication. While it is possible for a central statistical bureau to compile the figures necessary for a clear picture, comprising all branches in the whole reproduction process, individual factories or enter-

prises are in a much better position to determine the amount of labor crystallized in the finished products by computing the labor-time incorporated in raw materials and that necessary for the production of new goods. Since all enterprises are interconnected in the productive process, it is easy for individual enterprises to determine the total amount of labor-time required for a finished product on the basis of the figures disposable. Furthermore, it is quite easy to find out the social average labor-time by dividing the amount of employed labor-time into the amount of products. This is the final determining factor for the consumer. In order to obtain a product, he will only have to prove that he has given to society in a different form the amount of labor-time crystallized in the product that he wants for consumption. This excludes exploitation. Each one receives what he has given, each one gives what he receives; that is, the same amount of social average labor-time. There is no room under communism for a central statistical bureau at liberty to determine "their share" for different workers' categories.

The quantity for consumption of each worker is not to be determined from "above", each worker himself determines by his work how much he can demand from society. There is no other choice under communism; at least not during the first phase. Statistical bureaus can only serve administrative purposes. These bureaus can, for instance, compute social average values on hand with the use of data obtained from single factories, but these bureaus are to be rated as enterprises, the same as others. They possess no privileges. Communism could not exist where a central office exercises executive functions; under such circumstances there could exist only exploitation, suppression, capitalism.

We want, here, to stress two points: 1.-that should another dictatorship arise, this dictatorship cannot be separated from the underlying principles of production and distribution prevalent in society; 2.-if labor-time is not the direct measurement of production and distribution, but economic activity is solely regulated by a "statistical bureau" to determine the "ration" of the workers, then this situation would call for a combination system of exploitation.

The syndicalists are incapable of answering adequately the question of distribution. Only in one place, in the discussion of economic reconstruction in "L'Espagne Antifasciste", dated Dec.11,1936, this point is touched upon, as follows:

"In the case of introducing a means of exchange which

might bear no resemblance to present-day money and which will function only for the purpose of simplifying the exchange, this means of exchange will be administered thru a 'council for credit.'

The necessity for a unit of computation for allowing an estimate of the social needs and likewise serve as a measurement for consumption and production is completely ignored. The means of exchange have, in this case, only the function of simplifying the exchange. In what way this is to be accomplished, remains a mystery. And no mention is made about the measurement for expressing the value of products in these means of exchange; no way pointed out to ascertain the needs of the masses, whether thru shop councils or consumers' organizations, or thru technicians of the administrative offices. On the other hand, the technical equipment of the productive apparatus has been dealt with in detail. Thus economic problems are converted into technical problems by the syndicalists.

There is a close relationship between the syndicalists and the bolsheviks in this respect: their main interest centers around the technical organization of production. The only difference between the two conceptions is the greater naivete of the syndicalists. Both try to evade the question of the formation of new economic laws of motion. The bolsheviks are only capable of answering concretely the question of technical organization, which means absolute centralization under the management of a dictatorial apparatus. The syndicalists, on the other hand, in their desire for "independence of single enterprises" cannot solve even this problem. In reality, when encountering this problem, they sacrifice the right of self-determination of the workers in trying to solve it.

The right of self-determination of the workers over the factories and enterprises on the one hand and centralization of management of production on the other, are incompatible so long as the foundations of capitalism, money and commodity production, are not abolished and a new mode of production, based on the social average labor-time substituted instead. This accomplishment the workers cannot expect with the aid of parties, but only by their own action.

(From "Rätekorrespondenz" No. 21. April 1937)

#

PLEASE NOTICE NEW ADDRESS : Council Correspondence
P.O.Box 5343
Chicago, Ill.

NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF "OVERPRODUCTION"

a) Production As Reflection of Capital Accumulation.

Accumulation of unsold commodities is generally looked upon as the cause of unemployment and crisis. People who have little or no understanding of the economic forces within society, merely see the ever growing output and believe that by raising the purchasing power of the masses, the existing disparity between production and consumption could be overcome. They believe higher wages and shorter working hours would bring the desired result; overproduction would disappear and supply and demand balance once more.

By putting the word 'overproduction' in quotation marks, we indicated already our opposition to this 'common sense' theory. We hold the opinion that the cause for every crisis is to be found in the relationship between capital and labor. We know already that capitalism derives its profits from the unpaid labor of the working class. A crisis sets in when profits become insufficient to satisfy the needs of the capitalist class and its tools (the state, army and navy, judiciary system, church, etc.) and to finance the costly competitive struggle among the capitalist groups themselves. Comparing both theories, we agree that the first one sounds logical to anyone, while our conception might require a deeper knowledge of the economic structure. Without unduly complicating things, we must deal with the economic forces that lead to overproduction and crisis in order to show the fallacy of the 'common sense' theory.

During periods of normal development, production and consumption are more or less in equilibrium. Production does not grow faster than consumption; everything the factories produce is being consumed by society. (This is true notwithstanding the fact that, especially during the years after 1921, the production of coffee, rubber, sugar, wheat, due to natural influences, greatly exceeded the demand, but in relation to the total commodity output these exceptional cases had no influence upon the general development.) Aside from these exceptions, it is also a fact that more and more commodities are produced from year to year, and every year this "more" finds consumers. Who buys these commodities? Answer: The capitalists themselves!

As we have seen before, each year more money is thrown onto the market for profitable investment. The new capital acts as buyer of means of production, raw