

primarily a call for support and maintenance of bolshevik power. The proof that it was not much more than this is furnished by his inconsistency in this question: in addition to making his demands for world revolution, he at the same time came out for the "right of self-determination of all oppressed peoples", for their national liberation. Yet this double-entry bookkeeping sprang likewise from the jacobinical need of the Bolsheviks for holding on to power. With both slogans the forces of intervention of the capitalist countries in Russian affairs was weakened, since their attention was thus diverted to their own territories and colonies. That meant a respite for the Bolsheviks. In order to make it as long as possible, Lenin and the Bolsheviks used their International. It set for itself a double task: on the one hand, to subordinate the workers of Western Europe and America to the will of Moscow; on the other, to strengthen the influence of Moscow upon the peoples of Eastern Asia. Work on the international field was modeled after the course of the Russian Revolution. The goal was that of combining the interests of the workers and peasants on a world-wide scale and control of them through the Bolsheviks, by means of the Communist International. In this way at least the bolshevist state power in Russia received support; and in case the world revolution should really spread, the power over the world was to be won. Though the first design was attended with success, at the same time the second failed of accomplishment. The world revolution was unable to make headway as an enlarged imitation of the Russian, and the national limitations of the victory in Russia necessarily made of the Bolsheviks a counter-revolutionary force on the international plane. Hence also the demand for the "world revolution" was converted into the "theory of the building of socialism in one country". And this is not a perversion of the Leninist standpoint--as Trotsky, for example, asserts today--but the direct consequence of the pseudo world-revolutionary policy pursued by Lenin himself.

It was clear at that time, even to many Bolsheviks, that the restriction of the revolution to Russia would make of the Russian Revolution itself a factor by which the world revolution would be impeded. Thus, for example, Eugene Varga wrote in his book "Economic Problems of the Proletarian Dictatorship", published by the Communist International (1921): "The danger exists that Russia may be cut out as the motive power of the international revolution..... There are communists in Russia who have grown tired of waiting for the European revolution and wish to make the best of their national isolation..... With a Russia which would regard the social revolution of the other countries as a matter with which it had no concern, the capitalist countries would at any rate be able to live in peaceful neighborliness. I am far from believing that

such a bottling up of revolutionary Russia would be able to stop the progress of the world revolution. But that progress would be slowed down". And with the sharpening domestic crises in Russia around that time, it was not long before almost all communists, including Varga himself, had the feeling of which Varga here complains. In fact, still earlier, even in 1920, Lenin and Trotsky took pains to stem the revolutionary forces of Europe. Peace throughout the world was required in order to assure the building of state capitalism in Russia under the auspices of the Bolsheviks. It was inadvisable to have this peace disturbed either by way of war or new revolutions, for in either case a country like Russia was sure to be drawn in. Accordingly Lenin imposed, through splitting and intrigue, a neo-reformist course upon the labor movement of Western Europe, a course which led to its total dissolution. It was with sharp words indeed that Trotsky, with the approval of Lenin, turned on the uprising in Central Germany (1921): "We must flatly say to the German workers that we regard this philosophy of the offensive as the greatest danger and in its practical application as the greatest political crime". And in another revolutionary situation, in 1923, Trotsky declared to the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, again with the approval of Lenin: "We are of course interested in the victory of the working classes, but it is not at all to our interest to have the revolution break out in a Europe which is bled and exhausted, and to have the proletariat receive from the hands of the bourgeoisie nothing but ruins. We are interested in the maintenance of peace". And ten years later, when Hitler seized power, the Communist International did not move a finger to prevent. Trotsky is not only in error, but reveals a failure of memory resulting no doubt from the loss of his uniform, when today he characterizes Stalin's failure to help the German communists as a betrayal of the principles of Leninism. This betrayal was constantly practised by Lenin and Trotsky himself. But according to a dictum of Trotsky's, the important thing is, of course, not what is done, but who does it. Stalin is, as a matter of fact, the best disciple of Lenin, insofar as concerns his attitude to German fascism. The Bolsheviks have also, of course, not refrained from entering into alliances with Turkey and lending political and economic support to the government of that country even at a time when the sharpest measures were being taken there against the communists,--measures which frequently eclipsed even the actions of a Hitler.

In view of the fact that the Communist International insofar as it continues to function is merely an agency for the Russian tourist trade, in view of the collapse in all countries of the communist movements controlled from Moscow, the legend of Lenin, the world-revolutionist, is no doubt sufficiently weakened that one may

count on its disappearance in the near future. And of course even today the hangers-on of the Communist International are no longer operating with the concept of the world revolution, but speak of the "Workers Fatherland", from which they draw their enthusiasm so long as they are not forced to live in it as workers. Those who continue to acclaim Lenin as the world revolutionary par excellence are as a matter of fact getting excited about nothing more than Lenin's political dreams of world-wide power, dreams which faded to nothingness in the light of day.

The contradiction existing between the real historical significance of Lenin and that which is generally ascribed to him is greater and, at the same time, more inscrutable than in the case of any other personage acting on modern history. We have shown that he cannot be made responsible for the success of the Russian Revolution, and also that his theory and practice cannot, as is so often done, be appraised as of world-revolutionary importance. Neither, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, can he be regarded as having extended or supplemented Marxism. In the work of Thomas B. Brameld, entitled "A Philosophical Approach to Communism", recently published by the University of Chicago, communism is still defined as "a synthesis of the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin". It is not only in this book, but also generally, and quite particularly in the party-communist press, that Lenin is placed in such a relation to Marx and Engels. Stalin has denoted "Leninism" as: "Marxism in the period of imperialism". Such a position, however, derives its only justification from an unfounded overestimation of Lenin. Lenin has not added to Marxism a single element which could be rated as new and independent. Lenin's philosophical outlook is dialectical materialism as developed by Marx, Engels and Plechanov. It is to it that he refers in connection with all important problems; it is his criterion in everything and the final court of appeal. In his main philosophical work, "Materialism and Empirio-criticism", he merely repeats Engels in tracing the oppositions of the different philosophical points of view back to the one great contradiction: Materialism vs. Idealism. While for the first position, Nature is primary and Mind secondary, exactly the opposite holds of the other. This previously known formulation is documented by Lenin with additional material from the various fields of knowledge. And so there can be no thought of any essential enrichment of the marxian dialectic on the part of Lenin. In the field of philosophy, to speak of a Leninist school is impossible

In the field of economic theory, also, no such independent significance can be ascribed to Lenin. Lenin's economic writings are more marxist than those of any of his contemporaries, but they are only brilliant applications

of the already existing economic doctrines associated with Marxism. Lenin had absolutely no thought of being an independent theoretician in matters of economics; to him, Marx had already said everything fundamental in this field. Since, to his mind, it was quite impossible to go beyond Marx, he concerned himself with nothing further than proving that the marxist postulates were in accord with the actual development. His principal work on economics, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", is eloquent testimony on this point. Lenin never wanted to be more than Marx's disciple, and so it is only in legend that one can speak of a theory of "leninism".

Lenin wanted above all else to be a practical politician. His theoretical works are almost exclusively of a polemic nature. They combat the theoretical and other enemies of Marxism, which Lenin identifies with his own political strivings and those of the Bolsheviks generally. To Marxism, practice decides regarding the truth of a theory. As a practitioner endeavoring to actualize the doctrines of Marx, Lenin may have actually rendered Marxism an enormous service. However, as regards Marxism again, every practice is a social one, which can be modified and influenced by individuals only in very limited measure, never decisively. There is no doubt that the union of theory and practice, of final goal and concrete questions of the moment, with which Lenin was constantly concerned, may be acclaimed as a great accomplishment. But the criterion for this accomplishment is again the success which attends it, and that success, as we have already said, was denied to Lenin. His work not only failed to advance the world revolutionary movement; it also failed to form the preconditions for a truly socialist society in Russia. The success (such as it was) did not bring him nearer to his goal, but pushed it farther into the distance.

The actual condition in Russia and the present situation of the workers throughout the world ought really to be sufficient proof to any communist observer that the present "leninist" policy is just the opposite of that expressed by its phraseology. And in the long run such a condition must without doubt destroy the artificially constructed Lenin Legend, so that history itself will finally set Lenin in his proper historical place.

\* \* \* \* \*

.....

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

On the resolution adopted by

## THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE

The Group of International Communists of Holland has taken a stand on the result of the Brussels conference (cf. Council Correspondence #11, Sept. 1935) and its views of the conceptions there formulated are set forth below. The editorial board of Council Correspondence has found it necessary to leave out portions of the dutch criticism, since they deal with matters which are foreign to our readers, as, for example, the discussion regarding the present tasks of the german council movement. The Council Communists of America will shortly publish their own views regarding the Brussels conference and the discussion to which it has given rise. It may be stated at once, however, that we agree neither with the conference resolution nor with the criticism here presented. We have to regard them both merely as contributions to a discussion which will have to be further extended before it can lead to a truly international program.

In the first part of the Brussels resolution it is stated that no fundamental differences of opinion exist regarding the international tendencies of capitalist development and the resulting tasks and tactical necessities. Such differences of opinion do, however, exist, and we wish to refer to them briefly here. It is not very difficult, for example, to see that the "actual conditions" in Germany are interpreted from two different points of view, and for this reason also the statement of these "actual conditions" must turn out different. Our "Basic Principles on Communist Production and Distribution", our conception regarding the capitalist laws of motion, as we have published them, form the criterion of our judgment of the german situation. The german delegates at the conference saw the situation in Germany from the viewpoint of the daily, practical struggle against the bourgeoisie under National Socialism. To them, accordingly, the question as to how the council communists must organize themselves (groups of three, five, etc.) is of more importance than the question as to how the working class itself is to appropriate the necessary knowledge of

the forces by which society is moved. Their conception of the tasks and tactic of the council communists of the new labor movement is directly influenced by the practical necessities of the daily struggle; theory occupies second place, and is regarded as resulting from experience of the practical class struggle. They go still a step farther, however; they want to take what is believed to have been found as the tasks and tactic of the council communists as a result of the practical struggle against National Socialism in Germany and give it validity as a directive for the council communists on an international scale. And this because in their view the development throughout the world is driving to conditions like those in Germany. . . .

The actively working groups in Germany have not yet completely broken with the conceptions of the old labor movement now in a state of collapse. Thus we see it is not true that theory is a secondary matter resulting from practice and experience. Without a certain insight into the course of the process of development of society, and without the conception deduced therefrom regarding the tasks to be mastered, not a single movement is possible. Inversely: theoretical insight is the presupposition of any movement which wants not merely to incite to insurrection and to rebel against suppression, but wants to work in a revolutionary sense, that is, in a manner calculated to transform society. . . . Thru the entire resolution there runs like a red line the endeavor to construct on an international scale: the shaping of an international program and of an international speaking-tube for propagating the same; forming of a committee for binding together more firmly the international work; organizational and financial measures; international support. In short, the new fifth or sixth International is here present in crudely revised edition; all that is still needed is to give it, after a few conferences, a more concrete form, and then the international party work on the basis of the adopted program can begin. It is beyond the scope of these remarks to furnish the proof that in this way we enter once more upon the path of the old labor movement. We confine ourselves here to stating that such a conception regarding the tasks of the new labor movement stands in contradiction to that of the dutch group. We are not of the opinion that an international council organization has to be formed, with a ready-made program, into which organization hereafter all those will enter which embrace its program. We are of the opinion that revolutionary workers throughout the world must form independent groups to the end of developing themselves, forming their own orientation and thus becoming independent. The embracing of a party, or council-program, acts as a hindrance to this process of independent development. We are further

of the opinion that under the very sort of conditions that exist in Germany it is only such independent groups that are possible. The building up of a straight-laced, international organization, held together by means of a program, will prove illusory.

The working class itself must be in a position to orient itself continually, ever anew; it must be able to analyze and see through the social relations. In a word: it must itself be able to do what parties and leaders think that they have to do for it. That can come about, however, only provided that in independent groups this "self-orientation" is constantly accomplished and becomes daily practice.

What can we do in the matter? We can propagate this recognition; namely, that the new labor movement must necessarily take this course if the working class is to attain victory. What today takes place sporadically or, if on a larger scale, still only spontaneously, must take place consciously and be recognized as a necessity. Just as in revolutionary time (19 19-20) we recognized the independent shop organizations as the instrument for the mastering of production, so we now recognize in the independent discussion and propaganda groups the instrument for intelligently mastering the social forces. It is a matter of propagating and spreading this recognition: that is the one side of our activity. The other is this: that we show how such groups have to work, in what the essential part of their activity consists, and what methods they have to employ in order to master their tasks. We ourselves must be such a group.

The second part of the resolution surely shows that the analysis of the social relations differs even in the small circle of the groups represented at the conference. The resolution here posits the development of bourgeois society to state capitalism, and draws the conclusion that the mammoth economy on a continental scale is putting itself across as planned economy. And the opinion is expressed that capitalism will overcome in this space the competitive struggle by which it is disrupted. We should like to go on and ask: What stands in the way of carrying this thought construction through to its end and asserting that finally, when the continental oppositions are fought out (the resolution assumes that in order to conduct this struggle the oppositions within the continents will be overcome through state capitalism), the capitalism by means of planned economy will eliminate the competitive struggle on a world-wide scale and overcome its crises?

Hitherto we have met with such a characterization of the capitalist development only among the social democrats,

tho with the difference that the social democrats ~~welcome~~ this alleged development because it "smoothes the way" for socialism, while the resolution wants to overcome it through the communist revolution. The group in Holland rejects this analysis as false and unmarxist. We have been demonstrating for years, in our writings, the exact opposite; namely, that capitalism reels from one crisis into another--and furthermore, we have published and are still publishing arguments of our american comrades who have coined the concept of the "permanent crisis" and who say that capitalism and planned economy are contradictions which mutually exclude each other.

The analysis of capitalist development as given in the resolution is not an analysis in the marxist sense, because it sets out from the assumption that through organizational and political measures on the part of the state power the inner contradictions of capitalism can be overcome and systematically ordered. The marxist analysis, on the other hand, has as its starting point that the inner contradictions of capitalism (inc. competitive struggle) are at the same time its vital element. Now if one assumes that these contradictions are overcome through planned and mammoth economy under state capitalism, then under such an economy one can also no longer speak of capitalism. One is then at home in the fascist fancy of overcoming capital rule through the omnipotence of the fascist or national-socialist party State. Here the owners and masters of the means of production--private entrepreneurs, trust- and monopoly magnates, etc.--are given the new designation of "leaders", while the wage-workers employed by them are made over into their "following". The idea is borrowed from feudal conditions and is hence utopian; it is incapable of affecting capitalist reality with all its contradictions and the resulting crises.

The social-democratic idea of the overcoming of the capitalist crises through international trustification of capital ("general cartel" of Hilferding) is also of utopian character. Here also the development of capitalist society appears as a process of concentration carried out by persons, the owners of capital. These owners of capital are at the same time, by reason of such ownership, commanders of productive processes. If, now, this command over capitalist production is combined through capital concentration, in "one hand", then in this general command, according to Hilferding, the goal of the capitalist development is attained. The capitalist general command can then no longer pursue any capitalist ends, it is itself the end-result of the capitalist development. Therefore it must now direct the economy according to plan,--no longer capitalistically, chaotically, in the mutual competitive struggle by which the inner

contradictions are reproduced on an ever higher level,-- but in accordance with new, socialist ends. Naturally, the social democrats are of the opinion that they know the socialist ends better than the capital owners; their endeavor is to take over the general command themselves. It is scarcely necessary to say in this connection that this social-democratic conception is fully shared by the Bolsheviks (Lenin). The thing that distinguishes these latter from the official social democrats is merely the manner in which they have brought about the change of command: the Bolsheviks by way of revolution and the Social Democrats by way of bourgeois democracy.

The historical progression appears here, just as in the fascist fancy, as the action of persons. Today it is capital owners, acting according to capitalist motives, which finally find their goal in the completed concentration of capital; tomorrow it is party leaders, revolutionary dictator, centrally directed economic organization, acting according to social-democratic, communist, national-socialist party programs.

The marxist analysis turns this fancy around and stands it on its feet. It shows that the capitalist mode of production consists essentially in the separation of the direct producers from their conditions of labor, while at the same time production is carried on socially. The means of production belong to non-workers; the workers themselves can produce with them only in case they sell their labor power, and hence themselves as workers, to the owners of the means of production. The workers are thus themselves turned into a means for the purpose of producing, into a flesh-and-blood productive instrument in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalist mode of production is accordingly a certain relation of human beings among each other, namely, the relation in which they stand to the reproduction of their vital conditions. From this relation, which is historically given, arises the concentration of capital as a natural necessity, for this concentration is essentially nothing other than the separation of the producers from their means of labor and carried to the extreme. One can also say just as well that the capitalistic productive relation of human beings among each other -- which consists essentially in the expropriation of the producers -- is accomplished on an ever higher level.

In this analysis, the capital owners by whom the concentration of capital is brought about appear as acting persons in an inevitable process of development, in the development of the capitalistic relation of human beings to each other. And this process, from which all the inner contradictions of capitalist economy arise, cannot

be held up through planning at any desired stage of development, or altered in its result, any more than one can alter the fact that fire develops heat and consumes fuel. So long as social production is carried on in the forms of expropriation of the producers and of appropriation of the product by non-workers, so long also does this appropriation reproduce itself on an ever higher level and so long also will the capital owners fight among each other for the booty. This holds for state planned-economy on the national, continental or world-wide scale (whether under national-socialist, social-democratic or bolshevist leadership is a matter of indifference) as well as for the mammoth capital organization sketched by the social democrat Hilferding in his general cartel.

The development to planned and mammoth economy as set forth in the resolution obviously sets out from the supposition that the planning can be brought about by way of the state power. This statement of the capitalist development is insofar essentially the same as that of the exponents of planned economy. It is distinguished from this latter only in the fact that it predicts as a consequence of this would-be planned economy an ever sharper opposition between capital owners and wage working class. This prediction comes somewhat as a surprise: for if one holds planning under capitalism to be possible, then surely the situation of the working class is also embraced in the general scheme. A planned economy which fails to take account of that is unthinkable, even tho one holds state planned economy to be possible. We must accordingly assume that the planned economy is thought of as a forced welding together of the ~~owning~~ class through the omnipotence of the State, which suppresses the competitive struggle among the class and prescribes its share of the earnings. On the other side, again through the omnipotence of the State, the wage workers are assigned their share of the product--and, to be sure, as the resolution assumes, a share which becomes smaller and smaller.

But why, then, must the share of the workers become smaller? The Bolsheviks, and also the National Socialists, promise the workers that their situation in life is to become better just as soon as the socialist construction within the framework of the planned economy is once sufficiently advanced. What is the source of the resolution's assertion that this state planned economy can bring only sharpened exploitation, if after all it regards this planned economy as possible? Is the increased exploitation of the workers owing to the bad leaders of the National Socialists or Bolsheviks, or to the distorted program, or to the circumstance that the plan is directed to the workers' impoverishment? No, it

will be answered, the best leadership and planned economy cannot affect the fact that the exploitation and the opposition between owning and wage-working class grows sharper, for capital requires its profit. That, however, is the same thing as saying that the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production assert themselves in opposition to all planned economy. With the expression of this latter view, the first, which holds planned economy under capitalism to be possible, is again overthrown; the one conception excludes the other.

We are unable to conceive that such a self-contradictory characterization of capitalist development can become the common conception and also starting-point of the international council movement. We are of the opinion that the german comrades have been dazzled by the theatrical magniloquence of the national-socialist State and have taken appearance for reality. That in itself would not matter so much if this appearance had not led to a theory which, even though set forth with windings and turnings, breaks with the marxist mode of thought. That, however, is what has happened in the resolution, so that finally the door is opened for all possible personal views and opinions which may be anything whatever except "general basic conceptions" for the new labor movement now arising.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*

#### Please Notice

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

R E A D :

Raetekorrespondenz, (theoretisches- und Diskussionsorgan fuer die Raetebewegung),

herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland). Einzelnummer 10¢. Order from :  
Council Correspondence-1604 N. California Ave.-Chicago, Ill.

#### PORTRAIT OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Capitalism is now, as we have all heard, in its stage of decline. That means--to anyone who has no illusions about the conduct of a ruling class--that revolution is on the order of the day. All humanity becomes divided more and more clearly into two great groups: on the one side, those who recognize the nature of the impending change and have the courage to help in promoting it--the revolutionists; on the other, those who want to evade or soften it, who want to reform and compromise and modernize--the ruling class and its various grades and categories of lackeys and flunkys. The out-and-out revolutionists--those who are heartily sick of capitalism in all its distinctive manifestations, whether in peace or war, and whose main preoccupation is that of doing away with it in the shortest possible order--are as yet a comparatively very small group with well defined characteristics. We leave their portrait to be drawn by others. The portrait of the counter-revolution, on the other hand, is highly complex, reflecting the various shades of opposition or perfect conformability to the established order, but in which the twilight tints distinctly predominate. We have here established the four great categories: fascists, half-fascists, socialists and sheep. But even these terms are far from being mutually exclusive; the "sheep" particularly may easily be conceived as embracing them all.

We take up these categories in the order named, hoping that our remarks will serve to clarify them in a way to make them readily distinguishable, though at the same time realizing that there is considerable transfusion of one into the other, and that the fascist, say, of today may be the socialist of tomorrow, but more often the other way 'round.

The chief difficulty involved in getting a clear picture of the fascists is the hierarchization within their ranks. This is owing to the fact that fascism, in the final analysis, really emanates from above--from the ruling class--and seeps down, or rather is poured down, into the masses, who lap it up in their daily newspaper as well as in their daily bread. It is probably true, as old Lloyd George has said, that "Scratch a conservative, and you will find a fascist". But some people are conservative out of interest, and others out of mere instinct or inertia. Thus, in the United States, the prime, if still only incipient, fascists are men like W.F. Heart and Henry Ford: the one furnishing, for the present, mainly the ideology and the other mainly the more material forms of seduction (wages, profit sharing, subsistence gardens, etc.). These are comparatively intelligent fascists; at least they know what they want

and are more or less successful in having it got for them. Insofar as they are still opposed to fascism--as, for example, to the fascist tendencies inherent in the Roosevelt administration (N. R. A.)--it is merely to the regimentation necessarily involved for the capitalists, to some extent, as well as for the workers. But the fascists with whom we are here concerned are of the much more numerous and humble variety: those who, even if they may know what they want, are not in a position to get it under the present system--except possibly at the cost of prostituting themselves completely--but who still find capitalism to their taste and believe in its possibilities, and who are determined to defend the system. This sort of fascist, who may be regarded as typical, can with perfect right take as his motto: "Duty toward others" The "others", however, whether he knows it or not, are the bourgeois-capitalist class of his own country.

Patriotism is the most distinctive characteristic of the true fascist. He not only believes in the innate superiority of his own country (or "race") over all others, but in the superiority of his own state, county, village.... He has all the savage's distrust of anything strange or foreign. Of course, on carrying this ideology to its logical conclusion, the fascist would also have to believe in his own superiority over all other human beings. But he seems to have a presentiment of the fact that this would be a *reductio ad absurdum*: the true fascist--of the humbler category--is neither a megalomaniac nor a solipsist; when in his patriotic fervor he gets down to himself, he quickly recoils and shifts his ego off onto the "leader", without whom there is nothing to be done. The leader on earth, and God in heaven are equally indispensable to the fascist: the one is simply the representative of the other. For this reason--the realization of his own insignificance--the true fascist can never be really irreligious; he can only be opposed to certain forms of religion or to certain sects, particularly to the Jews and Catholics as being tinged with internationalism and hence evoking his horror of what is foreign. He needs particularly the belief in the soul and a future life, because this helps to assure him of his own superiority to the dogs, swine and other such animals who have never been able, so far as known, to set up any pretensions to immortality. In fact, the fascist is very likely to be afflicted with an inferiority complex, and his zeal in serving the ruling class is a natural outgrowth of that condition. He actually imagines that by putting himself on the side of the ruling class, he therefore belongs to it. The hundred-percent fascist is a very distinctive type of homo insipiens; just as he claims to be able always to smell a Jew, so it is very easy, if not to smell, at least to spot a fascist.

These fascists, however, are not particularly to be blamed. Their educational opportunities have usually been very limited--or neglected--and as a result of their more or less exclusive literary preoccupation with the newspapers, they have been thoroughly infected with the capitalist ideology. There is no possibility of "converting" them, except possibly by way of letting them see that being a revolutionist is a sign of superiority which it is within their power to attain. Otherwise, they are quite immune to communist propaganda, and retain their extreme susceptibility to the capitalist variety. This is on the assumption, however, that they still find it possible to live somehow under capitalism. If that becomes quite impossible, even by criminal means, then these fascists may furnish some of the best recruits to the revolutionary cause.

The half-fascist is chiefly distinguished from his "pure" brother by being a more intellectual, hence more sophisticated, specimen of the same type. He has read more or less and makes some pretensions to culture. He has accordingly shuffled off most of the prejudices of the fascist proper, and is more open to reason. His reading, however, has usually not been of a sort by which he could become really enlightened, but is chiefly of the conventional or academic variety. His education in economics has been particularly neglected, and his notions on the subject are of the most naive capitalist character. His favorite "economist" is very likely to be Stuart Chase (Mrs. Blue Bonnet) and he usually displays a weakness for "technocracy" and other such innocent pastimes. Marxism has remained quite beyond his ken, nor has he any inclinations in that direction. The most that he has a mind for is "literature" and other such more or less esthetic manifestations of the human ego. Theory and the theoreticians he finds dull and painful.

He is not, however, violently opposed to radicalism or anything else in particular. He prides himself on being broad-minded and tolerant--a tolerance which extends also to the more "idealistic" phases of fascism. His fascist tendency comes out chiefly in his reverence for the "strong man"--the unscrupulous wielder of power--and in his contempt for the masses. And yet the half-fascist would be mortally offended at the very suggestion that he might harbor a fascist streak. He looks upon himself as a liberal pure and simple. And "pure and simple" at least is correct; the half-fascist is pure and simple enough to read the ravings of a Spengler and to think that this is the last word in philosophy (and not merely that of the bourgeoisie), without suspecting that Spengler is only furnishing the ideology for fascism. Thus the half-fascist is a very half-and-half sort of person indeed, and whether when the time comes he jumps one way or the other will probably depend entirely on circumstances of the

moment or, as we say, on the constellation of forces.

Of all the counter-revolutionists, actual or potential, the most contemptible are, without doubt, the socialists. These, in the main, lack the excuse of ignorance which we readily grant to the fascists and half-fascists. They have mostly had at least some smattering of Marxism, as well as some political experience in the "labor movement", and have accordingly had an opportunity to know what capitalism is--its merits and its defects, its course and present stage of development--and to arrive at certain conclusions regarding the manner in which it is to be set aside. The circumstance that they still cling, in the main, to their dogma of non-violence--except in the interests of capitalism and against the workers themselves--can be explained only in terms of the most abject cowardice and the most brazen prostitution on the part of the leading spirits of the Second International. Deep down in their hearts, these old "labor leaders" know better, but they haven't the guts to admit it, even to themselves, much less to act in accordance with that recognition. Nor, as a matter of fact, is there any ground for expecting that they ever will. Fundamentally, the leaders of the old labor movement, not excluding the Bolsheviks (Stalinists, Leninists, Trotskyists and others still bound up with the traditions of the Russian revolution), are nearly or quite as petty-bourgeois in their outlook as are the fascists and half-fascists. Even though they may shout for the proletarian dictatorship, they really have a horror of the thing itself. This is because they think, more or less unconsciously, in terms of bourgeois society, which they would like to see preserved as nearly as possible, and because of their social status and superior educational advantages (as compared with the workers) which they feel entitle them to special consideration in any form of society. So that even when a proletarian dictatorship is once established--as seemed likely to happen in Russia--these old labor politicians can be counted upon to put an end to it as quickly as possible, if they have the power. Not, however, in order to do away with dictatorship itself and to inaugurate the classless society, but in order to replace the proletarian dictatorship by a bourgeois dictatorship, at least in form (with themselves as the dictators) if not in actual substance (by turning the power back to the old ruling class, as in Germany after the war). They are all more or less like the late secretary of the British Labor Party, who frankly confessed to regarding the collapse of the present social and political order as a "terrible prospect".

We now come to the most curious of the counter-revolutionary forces, though these can hardly be rated as a "force" at all: the pure "sheep". These also are socialists of a sort--many of them actually profess to be such--but still more cowardly, more supine, more muddleheaded and more bourgeois. They may be said to constitute the lunatic fringe

of the socialist movement: the free-traders, the pacifists, the currency cranks, the reformers pure and simple--in a word, the church-going socialists. They are the people who can never accept or reject a thing outright, but--if they find it uncomfortable or otherwise obnoxious--can only suggest amending it gradually or modernizing it. This applies to Capitalism no less than to Christianity. They can point to all sorts of evils and "injustices" under capitalism, but insist that they can all be remedied within the system itself; not only can, but naturally will be, provided only that everybody becomes as nice and sheep-like as themselves, which they hold to be quite possible as well as desirable. Likewise as regards religion: the Catholic Church is rotten, naturally, but Protestantism--or at any rate the sect to which they themselves belong (usually one of the "modernist" persuasion)--is just what the country and the world needs to set it right. They have never bothered with such subjects as economics; they prefer to read things of a morally edifying nature. And, in fact, they see all problems in terms of morality and the human will. Instead of economic laws and forces, to them there are only individuals or, at most, political parties. Socialism to them--in case they profess to be socialists--is merely a matter of putting the socialists (headed by another good churchman, such as Norman Thomas) in charge of the capitalist state apparatus. Thus an old socialist on examining a chart depicting the economic organization of Mussolini's kingdom, remarked: "It looks like a very good thing to be taken over when they put the right men in office".

Their economic and political innocence is such that socialism is practically nothing but fascism under a different name; that is, state capitalism. If the fascists call themselves socialists (or national-socialists, or anything else but fascists), and refrain from too much violence, they are assured in advance of the support of all these people. And after fascism is once established or gets into power, it may do as it likes and still retain their support or at least their passive acquiescence; for that is the nature of sheep, to be on the side of a ruling class and never aspire to be the masters of their own destinies.

These compromisers and modernizers and shilly-shallyers are, in a sense, the strongest bulwark of capitalism and the worst enemies in the way of the revolutionary movement and the reconstruction of society. Not because of their numbers (which are considerable enough) nor because of any power of attack or defense (which is practically nil), but rather because of their demoralizing influence, their fertility in conjuring up new hopes and illusions as an excuse for delay and inaction. Far better, from the revolutionary point of view, are the forthright reactionaries in politics or the absolute fundamentalists in religion than these pious sheep with their liberal tub-thumping.

\*\*\*\*\*

And in the final result, it is only the workers who really count; not the timid, respectable philistines who try to excuse their own cowardice on the ground of the workers' alleged backwardness, for which the philistines and their idolized leaders are largely responsible. These petty-bourgeois poltroons who never advance beyond the stage of voting, and many of whom regard even that as an act of rare courage, are best characterized by Engels in "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", where, speaking of the small trading class, he says that it "never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything being lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter was settled".

- G -

\*\*\*\*\*

⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮   ⋮

\*\*\*\*\*

P A M P H L E T S :

"World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution"	10¢
"Bolshevism or Communism"	5¢
"What Next for the American Worker?"	10¢
"The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism"	10¢
"Marxism or Leninism".By Rosa Luxemburg	10¢
"The Inevitability of Communism"	25¢

Order from:  
Council Correspondence -1604 N.California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁  
❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁  
❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁❁

## For Theory and Discussion

## Contents:

### On The War Question

# Trade Unionism

# Problems of the New Labor Movement

Vol. II

No. 2

**JANUARY 1936**

**\$1.00 YEARLY**

10C A COPY