

increases and shorter hours are needed by Capital, so long as the thing is objectively possible, and are introduced for the most various reasons: for example, in order still further to break the competitive capacity of the small capitals in the interest of the large concerns, or in order to offset the increased intensity of the labor process and to enable the necessary reproduction of labor power, and likewise in the interest of social security, since an industrial proletariat can simply not, in the long run, be treated like slaves or serfs. This social policy is not out of harmony with the fact of the sharpened exploitation of the workers; it is rather a manifestation of this latter, revealing that Capital has been successful in raising the degree of exploitation. So that in spite of the fascist "social policy", the situation of the Italian workers has not been improved, but worsened, while Italian capital has increased its profits in accordance with this worsening. Any objective work on the Italian development since Mussolini's seizure of power will teach Nomad that he talks nonsense when he asserts that the fascists proceeded against Capital in order to further the interests of the workers and thereby to conform to their own bureaucratic necessities. In general, Nomad should be more careful about the choice of his "proofs". It is simply impossible--to take another instance--to maintain that "the Japanese officers' caste" (25) has independent disposal over Manchuria. A single glance at the capital investments in Manchuria would have taught him better. And even though half these capital investments are made by the Japanese government itself, still the Japanese government can hardly be claimed to be identical with Nomad's fascist officers' caste, but with Japanese capital and large landed property; a circumstance that finds expression, according to Nomad himself, in the fact that his officers "are in the habit of 'bumping off' from time to time the most prominent representatives" of the Japanese ruling class.

On page 26 Nomad attempts to identify our conception regarding fascism with that of the Stalinists. We had not, however, as Nomad will have it, asserted that fascism has been created by "the necessity of saving the capitalist system either from the proletarian menace or from the internal weakness." We said rather that "it was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal" (26). The direct control of monopoly capital over the other social strata precluded the continuance of democratic parliamentarism. Fascism directed itself not against a menacing revolution, but against the reformist activity of the labor movement within the frame-

work of bourgeois democracy. From the external point of view, fascism arose from the necessity of strengthening the imperialist potentialities. The economic concentration had to be followed by the political. The middle-class movement, for which the crisis had furnished the impetus, was put to use by Capital for the purpose of breaking the reformistically organized resistance of the proletariat to its further impoverishment. True, the middle class represented in the fascist movement its specific interests; but since these are directed against the workers as well as against monopoly capital, and since accordingly a choice has to be made, it could only proceed with monopoly capital, and not against it. This situation was put to use by monopoly capital and with the aid of fascism it succeeded in creating the preconditions for a further relatively frictionless impoverishment of the proletariat and at the same time in greatly furthering the imperialist potentialities without resistance on the part of the workers. A part of the middle class received the positions of the ousted labor bureaucracy, whereby also the solidarity of interests of the middle class was broken. With the aid of this new bureaucracy monopoly capital now controls all the other social groups. Just as previously the labor bureaucracy had to turn against the interests of its partisans, so also the fascist bureaucracy has to turn against its middle-class partisans; for the interests of monopoly capital cannot be impaired without bringing into question the whole of exploitation society. The role which is played in present-day capitalist society by the large capitals is too considerable for their existence to be brought into question. To speak of present-day fascism as an intellectualist rule is rank nonsense.

Fascism is the dictatorship of Capital in the industrial countries under the economic crisis. One cannot denominate as fascism any dictatorship without distinction. When Nomad says that fascist dictatorships rule even in "more or less undeveloped Balkan or Latin-American" countries, he fails to consider that the relatively recent concept of Fascism has a quite determinate meaning and cannot be used for dictatorship generally. The czarist dictatorship was Czarism, and it does not occur to anyone to speak of the "Czar's Fascism". Hence when we speak of Fascism, we mean not something general, but something definite; we mean the dictatorship of Capital in contrast to capitalist democracy. Confusion of concepts, of which Nomad makes use, can hardly take the place of proofs.

We are glad to take notice that Nomad finds his previous characterization of the intellectualist rule--"state capitalism", "state socialism" or "capitalism

without capitalists"--to be inadequate and now wants to replace these terms with that of "unequalitarian socialism". (28) It appears, that is, that he has meanwhile arrived with Henryk Grossmann (28) at the view that "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner, and the Russian State, that is, the bureaucracy, is only one sole firm, so to speak." Whatever Nomad or others may understand by Socialism or Communism, however much they may water and falsify concepts, so far as we ourselves are concerned, Communism still remains a state of affairs in which the workers themselves are the masters of the means of production, and State Capitalism the social condition in which the State stands over against the workers as the owner of the means of production just as the private capitalists did previously. That is simple and clear and needs no new formulations. -- But to come to Grossmann, whom Nomad likes to flaunt before our eyes.

We are not interested in Grossmann's sympathies for the U.S.S.R., since, with all respect for Grossmann's scientific achievement, we have still not ceased to think independently. As a matter of fact, however, what Nomad here presents as Grossmann's view, and which he then accepts as his own, proves either that Nomad can't read or that he is incapable of reproducing things as they are written down. Neither in the passage adduced by Nomad nor anywhere else does Grossmann say what Nomad here tries to impute to him. Grossmann does not concern himself in the least with the question of whether the hilferdingian "general cartel" is still capitalistic or already socialist as being "only one sole firm", since to Grossmann this "general cartel" is quite inconceivable except as "a series of cartels of separate branches of production which exchange their products among each other". (Grossmann, Das Akkumulations- und Zusammenbruchsgesetz des kapitalistischen Systems, page 606). He says instead, in the passage adduced by Nomad: "Only one or the other is possible: either we have in the general cartel a 'regulated' economy, which then ceases to be capitalistic; or if it is capitalistic, then it cannot possibly be 'regulated'. For Hilferding involves himself in an inescapable logical contradiction when he quite eliminates exchange and nevertheless still speak of a 'capitalist' mode of production." (Ib., page 610.) So that what Grossmann is here concerned with is not Nomad's question, whether "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner," but whether capitalism can exist without the exchange relation. And to Grossmann, as to us, the significance of the exchange relation is represented in the following passage: "The abolition of exchange means, at the same time, the abolition of wage labor. The capitalist mode of production resting on wage labor presupposes, surely, the existence of the

capital relation, that is, a relation in which labor power as a commodity is purchased on the market by the owners of the means of production. Where a commodity is exchanged on the market between the working class and the employing class, there must necessarily exist also exchange value. If Hilferding speaks of the disappearance of commodity exchange and of value--and he has to do so in order to arrive at his 'regulated' economy--then there is also no place for the exchange of the commodity 'labor power'; or in other words, this implies that the capital relation also, the capitalist mode of production, must necessarily disappear. What comes to take its place may be either an unveiled master-and-man relationship, as in the Middle Ages, or else a socialist communal economy." (Ib., page 611) Since wage labor prevails in Russia, there must also be its existence there, according to Grossmann, a capital relation. And, thus, with the existence of the wage and capital relation in Russia, a regulated economy there is out of the question. So that to us and to Marxism the russian "planned-economy" tendencies have nothing in common with a socialist planned economy, but are only the technico-organizational measures of monopoly capital carried to the extreme.

Nomad's false interpretation of Henryk Grossmann is matched by his exposition of marxist principles, in which connection he rejoices that others also (Stalin, Sorel, Hook) have found it necessary to stand Marx on his head. In the first place, we may say that socialism does not mean "primarily a change in the form of production, or in the ownership of the means of production" (29), as Nomad asserts, but signifies, according to Marx and also to us, the abolition of any and all property relation with respect to the means of production thru their socialization. The question of distribution is not for Marxism "a secondary matter", (29) as Nomad puts it, but is inseparably bound up with the form of production. With the change in the forms of production there change also the forms of distribution; nothing else in this respect is possible. Marx was not of the opinion, as Nomad writes, that "during the first phase of communism . . . there would be no equality of incomes", but Marx writes that by reason of the equal incomes the inequality will still continue to exist. Let us listen to Marx himself: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as if it had developed on a basis of its own, but on the contrary as it emerges from capitalist society... The individual producer received back from society, with deductions, exactly what he gives. What he has given to society is his individual amount of labor. For example, the social working day consists of the sum of the individual hours of work. He receives from society a voucher that he has

contributed such and such quantity of work (after deductions from his work for the common fund) and draws thru this voucher on the social storehouse as much of the means of consumption as the same quantity of work costs. The same amount of work which he has given to society in one form, he receives back in another. Here obviously the same principle prevails as that which regulates the exchange of commodities, so far as this exchange is of equal values, i.e. equal quantities of labor in one form are exchanged for equal quantities of labor in another form. The right of the producers is proportional to the amount of labor they contribute; the equality consists in the fact that everything is measured by an equal measure, labor, . . . and labor, to serve as a measure, must be defined by its duration or intensity; otherwise it ceases to be a standard measure. This equal right is an unequal right for unequal work; it tacitly recognizes unequal individual endowment, and thus capacities for production, as natural privileges. Right can by its very nature only consist in the application of an equal standard, but unequal individuals are only measurable by an equal standard insofar as they can be brought under an equal observation, be regarded from one definite aspect only, e.g. in the case under review, they must be considered only as workers and nothing more be seen in them, everything else being ignored. Further, one worker is married, another single, one has more children than another, and so on. Given an equal capacity for labor and thence an equal share in the funds for social consumption, the one will in practice receive more than the other, the one will be richer than the other, and so forth. To avoid all these inconveniences right must be unequal instead of being equal. But these deficiencies are unavoidable in the first phase of communist society." (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, pages 29-31).

So that Marx says exactly the opposite of what Nomad, like others previously, would like to read from him. For the very reason that the incomes are the same, whereas the individual conditions of the different workers are dissimilar, it is nonsense to speak of the removal of all inequality. Any other equality than that of incomes cannot exist in this phase of communism, as otherwise the "application of an equal standard" would be precluded, which in this first phase of communism is still necessary. Nor do the disquisitions in the Critique of the Gotha Program stand alone in this respect, but in the closest relation with the general standpoint of Marxism. Our interpretation, not that of Nomad, is confirmed by a great number of passages of "Capital", of Engels' "Anti-Duehring", etc. No other than our interpretation can be brought into harmony with the marxian doctrine of value. In Marx's writings, the higher is distinguished

from the lower phase of communism precisely in virtue of the fact that in this higher phase the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" can be actualized, whereby it becomes possible to dispense with the narrow legal standpoint of equal incomes in spite of the unequal conditions of the individuals. While in the first phase of communism each worker receives for the same labor time, assuming equal intensity of labor (in case of relatively harder labor, shorter hours), the same income, since he is regarded only as a worker and nothing else, later on any standard of this sort is dispensed with, since society is able to leave this narrow legal foundation. If Nomad had made himself a bit more familiar with the communist laws of production, he would have been in a position to arrive at a better understanding of Marx's disquisitions and he might also have spared himself the silly question "who is to determine a man's needs?" Nomad is incapable of conceiving an independent human being. It might be stated, however, that even if people lack the capacity for anything further, there can after all hardly be any doubt that they are in a position to "determine their needs"; at any rate, we have never yet met anyone who did not know what he wanted.

Nomad does not limit himself, however, to turning the views of other people upside down; he is also not averse to distorting reality itself in conformity with his own ideas. In order to controvert our view that even in the alleged "planned economy" of state capitalism no improvement of the situation of the working class is possible, - that here also the capitalist tendency to crisis, even though modified, continues to exist--he asserts: "Even that one per cent of planned economy which was instituted by the New Dealers has undoubtedly improved the situation of large sections of the working class and won the sympathies of the masses for President Roosevelt". (30) In the first place, it is not permissible here to speak vaguely of "large sections" and perhaps attempt to maintain one's thesis with a reference to the shabby "public works" of the Roosevelt Administration, since of course we constantly speak of the working class as a whole; and secondly, what is Nomad's proof for his bold assertion? A single glance at the statistics would have shown him how badly he is mistaken. He would see that since the installation of the Roosevelt regime, the share of the workers in the social product has become not larger, but smaller; that the situation of the workers has been worsened, notwithstanding the slight upturn of quite recent date, which is not even attributable to Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy", but to the inflation and the further rationalization, insofar as it is not bound up with the temporary spurt in production as a natural result of many years of depression.

The April 1936 official figures of the general business indexes published by the Federal Reserve authorities show that the volume of industrial production was 12 percent below the normal level (#). The value of all construction contracts was 58 percent below normal, while that of residential contracts was 74 percent below normal. Factory employment in April 1936 was on this same basis 25 percent below normal, while factory payrolls were 31 percent under normal, and department store sales 28 percent below. Ponder this: The volume of industrial production is 12 percent, factory employment 25 percent, and factory payrolls 31 percent below normal. In view of the differences between these three figures, Nomad's talk of the improvement of conditions as a result of Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy" is revealed as nonsense. The circumstance that the masses nevertheless stand enthusiastically behind Roosevelt is not to be wondered at, for the government and the bourgeois propaganda machine are, of course, on hand for the purpose of making those masses tipsy. The mass is enthusiastic not because it has obtained something, but because it is expecting something. In consideration of its own weakness, it sets its hopes upon a messiah. The mass enthusiasm for Roosevelt or Hitler springs, like its need of religion, not from its well-being, but from its misery.

Perhaps in order to show that the "intellectualist economy" is capable of improving the situation of the workers and hence also capable of assuring its rule for an unlimited time, Nomad will also present us with the rising wage figures of Russia. In case he does, we should like to ask him not to content himself, like the Russian intellectuals, with the wage figures alone, but also to let us have at the same time the price changes. Further still, the figures regarding the development of the productivity of labor...With all these figures in mind, he himself cannot help noting that in spite of the rising Russian wages, the situation of the workers has worsened with increasing accumulation. For the past year it has already become necessary in Russia to impoverish the working population not only relatively to the mounting production, but also absolutely; the disproportion between prices and wages has already led to an actual wage cut, a matter which Nomad probably knows as well as we.

Now that we have seen how Nomad can expound texts in his own interest and represent reality as he would like to have it in order not to upset his theory, it will not

(#) The general business indexes are stated in terms which take their averages for the years 1923-25 as being equal to 100,

be surprising to hear that he can also predict in accordance with these theories our own future. Our position on the question of the intellectuals, he writes, is determined by the fact that "criticism of the intelligentsia as the ruling class of the coming period of a socialized form of economy" is directed also against our own "ambitions for power". (31) And then he compares us with all the other groups which at one time or another have promised to serve the masses and nevertheless were only aiming at power for themselves. When we speak of Workers' Councils, Nomad sees nothing more than the propagandists of the council idea, not the councils themselves, of which he can form no other idea than the one which he has of the bourgeois leadership organizations. He knows nothing at all of the economic functions of the councils, but sees in them only another party. For this reason he fails to realize how ridiculous he makes himself in referring to the Russian Soviets as an indication of our own future. The Russian Soviets were not "holding out the promise of 'withering away' of the State", as Nomad imagines (32). The Soviets and the bolshevist state apparatus stood over against each other as separate organizations from the very beginning of the Russian revolution, the state apparatus seeing in the Soviets only an instrument for the carrying out of its resolutions. With the extension of the state apparatus and the concentration of all power in the hands of the bureaucracy, the Soviets were dismantled, until today they have declined to nothing more than an empty decoration of no more significance than Hitler's "Labor Front". It was the State, i.e. the Party, that promised to "wither away"; the Soviets could promise nothing of the sort. Even though the State was able to come into existence only by means of the Soviets, i.e. of the Russian revolution, still under the Russian conditions the bureaucracy was soon in a position to deprive the Soviets of all power. To us the councils or Soviets are not instruments of the revolution with which the party works, but they are the basis of the dictatorship as well as of communist production. They cannot "wither away", nor have they any state beside themselves which could do likewise. They cannot promise that their "State" will vanish, for there is here no longer a State in the sense of the bourgeoisie or of the Bolsheviks. Their own state functions, i.e. the suppression of all capitalist forces, become superfluous with the success of that endeavor and thereby vanish. But the councils as the organization of the communist economy remain in existence. There is no special State by the side of them.

Taking as his text the brief presentation of our conception of communist society contained in one number of the Council Correspondence, Nomad tries to demonstrate

that we merely use other names in promising and aiming at the same thing as all previous labor organizations. The fact simply is that as a special group we promise nothing at all: to us the revolution and what comes after it is an affair of the class, which can promise nothing to itself. It can at most do something, or omit doing something. As a part of the working class, we are pleased to cooperate in the class tasks, and it goes without saying that in this connection we will try to put across the conception for which we stand. However, our attitude is such as to preclude the possibility that we ourselves, as a special group, should occupy or strive for positions by the side of the class organizations. To that end we would first have to change our attitude and become a party. It would be only by way of the backward development to a party that we could be placed in a position to add another to the already existing labor bureaucracies. We hold it to be impossible henceforth, under the present conditions in the industrial countries, to develop a labor bureaucracy which would be able to operate against the class interests of the proletariat. The period of capitalist dictatorship preceding the revolutionary uprising precludes the forming of organizations which would be capable of holding the revolution to certain paths in conformity with their desires. Whether in the process of the revolution itself, organizations will be formed by which the previously forming councils will again be destroyed is very questionable, even if not precluded. Still, just because this possibility exists, it is all the more necessary to insist on the exclusive rule of the councils. If reactionary forces should succeed in emasculating the councils, it is thereby also precluded that the workers' situation would be improved. The revolution is in that case only temporarily brought to a standstill; it will have to arise anew. In the last instance, the councils must after all assert themselves, for they alone are capable of actualizing communism, and only this latter is capable of doing justice to the needs of the masses.

According to Nomad, however, even then nothing is yet attained; for as he sees it, the councils will then do the same thing as the state capitalist parties attempted previously. And he tries to prove it to us with our own words. Since we speak of the necessity of centralism he writes that this "necessary centralism actually does away with the means of production in the hands of the producers,.... is nothing but our good old Bolshevik state bureaucracy". (33) It would lead too far to explain to Nomad at this place the process of communist economy. It might be stated here, however, that there are all sorts of centralism, and not centralism without qualification. The technico-centralistic management of

large industrial concerns is something different from the capitalistic centralization of power in the hands of a few capitalists. The authority of the technico-organizational central apparatus extends only to the technico-organizational matters of the concern; it is subject to the control of the actual owners of these concerns. The technico-organizational and the economic-political centralization may, as in Russia, be largely combined; here the planning commission operates in harmony with the government, or carries out its desires. Not every centralism, however, signifies actual power over society. Whether the central control of production and distribution is at the same time centralization of power, or only a technical function and nothing more, depends on the whole complex of social conditions. A central planning commission alone has no power over the producers; in order to have that, it has to have also at its disposal material means for putting thru its plans even against the producers' will. That is to say that in order to impose its own will, it must have by the side of itself a state apparatus. It is not the central planning commission in Russia which can exercise dictatorship, but only the State with its police, soldiery, etc. Without this special state apparatus, not subject to the control of the producers, the centralization of economic activity is void of all authority; it can fulfill only technical functions, no economic-political ones. When there is no special State beside the councils, when the armed enterprises represent the one and only actual social power, then the central organization itself is reduced to a mere enterprise, to a clearing house, of no greater importance than any other enterprise. Nomad's incapacity to distinguish between technical and economic matters trips him up in his consideration of communism quite as fatally as before in his consideration of the functions of the intellectuals under capitalism. Incidentally, it might be stated that Nomad need not lose any sleep over the fate of the unemployed. It is not at all the bureaucracy that "will have to tackle the problem of reorganizing the industries". (33) As previously, so also under communism, industry can be reorganized only by industry itself. The enterprises are quite capable of taking on workers; they are in no need, to that end, of the orders of Nomad's intellectuals, who ordinarily know as much about the enterprises as a tapeworm does about sunlight.

And now a word regarding that "very suspicious passage"; namely, our statement that "equality must not only be actually possible; it must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society". That was by no means intended "artfully" with a view to later justification of inequality on the ground of the un-

ripeness of the situation. Of course, we too are aware that between theory and practice a complete agreement is not always immediately possible and that the organization of the communist society also will be faced with great difficulties; yet for that very reason, the theory must be represented all the more consistently. Whether communism, as we see it, will be actually capable of complete realization "on the morrow after the revolution" is a question which we pass over as idle speculation. We know that any reorganization of society is a long and painful process; but we know also that this process can only be shortened when one takes part in it as if the "morrow after the revolution" were going to find the complete communism in operation. The more consistently the revolutionists proceed, the greater the success. Just as today we adjust our policy to the overthrow of Capital, altho Capital is still sitting tight in the saddle, so also we have adjusted our policy to the immediate complete realization of communism, without regard for the fact that the process will probably be a tedious struggle. However, when we said that "equality must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society", what we had in mind was nothing of the sort that Nomad terms "suspicious". On the contrary: since we are convinced that even today in the industrially developed countries only equality, communism, is capable of driving forward the productive forces, we wished here to give expression to the idea that in such countries only communist revolutions are possible. Marx welcomed the development of capitalism as a development of the social forces of production and this development was bound up with the existence of classes, was the horribly bloody process of the creation of the proletariat and of industry. No equality was here possible; equality would not have been able to develop the productive forces in the measure in which capitalism was able to do so. The development of the productive forces at a certain stage of the development of human society is bound up with inequality. Inequality is here progressive. Equality in backward Russia, for example, with but little industry and an infinitesimal minority of proletarians, would never have been able to develop the productive forces in such measure as has been possible under the inequality of the bolshevist-capitalist dictatorship. The Bolsheviks, like Capital in other countries, were progressive because they promoted not equality but inequality, even though by reason of this they became a reactionary force with respect to the international revolution. An exploiting society is objectively revolutionary when this exploitation is identical with the development of the productive forces. It is not until it stands in the way of the development of those productive forces that it becomes objectively reactionary. To renounce the ex-

ploitation of the Russian workers would be for Russia objectively reactionary; the inequality and exploitation has called forth industry and produced the proletariat, forces which today announce the coming in Russia of the communist revolution. Our point of departure is constantly the industrial proletariat in countries where the bourgeoisie is compelled to restrict the productive forces. Only such a proletariat, in such countries, is in a position, by means of communist equality, to drive forward the productive forces.

When we further said that with the setting aside of the class relations "there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions", we meant exactly what we said; not what Nomad tries hard to understand by it, "that there will be different income levels, but that these differences will not be very sharp" (34). The sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions vanish precisely because of the equal incomes. An engineer will not feel so far removed from a manual worker when both have the same incomes; for it is not so much the occupation by which people are separated, but the various incomes to which those occupations give rise.

We do not regard it as possible to convince Nomad of what any other serious work on the subject would tell him, namely, that there has unmistakably been bound up with the development of the productive forces a leveling up of the intelligence of the various social strata, and that with the further development of the productive forces this process is bound to go on, the one being inseparable from the other. The intelligence of the workers is not dissociated from society even when their activity is restricted to the performance of a manipulation, since the decisive thing here is not the manipulation but the state of society as a whole. Such things, which are understandable forthwith to any reflecting human being, we do not consider it possible to make clear to Nomad because his conviction of proletarian helotism is too hidebound to be shaken. "Ninety-nine out of a hundred (workers)," he writes (36), "understand absolutely nothing of the complicated business of running a highly involved social system of the machine age,"; without the faintest suspicion that he is here merely giving expression to his own incapacity. When we assert that the working class is in a position, without and if necessary against the intellectuals, to conduct their society, Nomad sees nothing more than shabby demagoguery which flatters the workers in order to win them.

The workers, according to Nomad, are incapable of anything, but he finds that society can be conducted very

well by Heinz Neumann's "Lumpenproletarians" and the "similar group of declassé intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who seized all the power in Russia" (27). What the workers can not do, altho they are practically the masters of all production, that can be done quite well, according to Nomad, by the "outs", "the unemployed or underpaid journalists, lecturers, college graduates and under-graduates, lawyers without clients and doctors without patients, educated ex-workers in search of a white collar position," etc., etc. (18). And accordingly Nomad's struggle against this intellectual rabble cannot be taken seriously. For if the workers themselves are not in a position to take over production today, they will not be capable of doing so tomorrow either; if the intellectuals have or obtain a monopoly on the control and direction of production, they will also know how to make this monopoly permanent. That, however, could only be welcomed, according to Nomad's theory, since the intellectuals have become a blessing to the workers: without them the workers would have to go hungry, since they themselves are, of course, incapable of directing production. And so the workers would be obliged, in their own interest, to further the ambitions of the intellectuals, instead of turning against them, for the existence and the success of the intellectuals is the condition precedent to their own existence and their own success. What Heinz Neumann still spoke of as the "Lumpenproletariat" has meanwhile become for Nomad the light of humanity. True it is only in their own interest that the intellectuals are the workers' benefactors, since they make use of the workers in the struggle against the old capitalists; but still their success is in line with the workers' most immediate interests, since they must offer the workers more than these latter receive from the private capitalists. So that Nomad is then quite consistent in saying that it is very much a matter of indifference which of the existing labor organizations the workers join, since "each of these organizations, in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours, etc." (41). And since, according to Nomad, this is and must be done also by the Fascists, we really fail to see why they too should not be favored with working-class support.

In all this, Nomad never once stops to ask himself whether what he asserts is in harmony with the facts or, if so, is permanently possible. As a matter of fact, political parties and trade unions have long assured their existence by helping to make possible any improvement in the workers' situation. It is solely for this reason, of course, that the history of the old labor movement has become a history of labor

fakery. The fact that these organizations, just like the whole of bourgeois society, of which they are a part, have had to be both revolutionary and reactionary, helpful to the workers at one time and injurious at another--this temporal factor Nomad has quite overlooked. It reality, it is only in quite determinate historical conditions that these organizations are able to "do something for the workers", while under other historical conditions they are obliged to operate against the workers' interests, whether they want to or not. What Nomad has to demonstrate is that these organizations are today in a position to become the workers' "benefactors"; but that is simply not demonstrable.

But to come back to the assertion that the intellectuals are capable while the workers are not, of directing production. In the first place, here again we meet with the confusion of technical with economic matters. For as yet the intellectuals have performed no social-economic functions; they still leave these to the market, not only in private-capitalist countries but also, in a somewhat more organized form, in Russia. And as concerns their technical functions, Nomad attaches to them excessive importance. If he had but a faint idea of modern enterprises, or if he could see the modern industrial proletariat as it actually is, it would become clear to him that this proletariat is quite in a position to manage production. This management is also a function to which may be applied the statement which Nomad relates exclusively to ordinary manual tasks; it "can be learned in a few days or weeks" (35). Incidentally, the greater part of the present-day intellectual functions is not devoted to production, but to activities which are necessary only in a profit economy, while in a communist society they drop out.

Furthermore, of course, it is not at all necessary that the workers themselves perform all indispensable intellectual functions forthwith. All that is necessary is that they have charge of the enterprises, for thereby they have control also over the intellectuals. Enterprises are not mastered with intellectuals, but with arms. They are mastered thru economic measures which preclude the arising of special organs of power by the side of the workers' councils. They are mastered also by reason of the fact of our constituting the majority, which counts when it is not opposed by any special political apparatus of power. With the mastery of the workers over the enterprises and thereby over production and distribution, nothing remains to the intellectuals but to place themselves at the disposition of the working population. They are obliged to take their places in the economic system determined by the workers, or they have to go hungry. Who, then, would

continue to doubt that a part of the intellectuals necessary for production, in early recognition of the consequences of the altered situation, will take their places willingly in the new order, and thereby isolate and render still more powerless the part whose attitude toward this order is still unsympathetic. Under communist conditions, the intellectuals will no more be in a position to exist outside society than they are today. If they want to live, they have no choice but to work together with the workers in the enterprises.

We have here been obliged to speak from the standpoint of Nomad's argumentation, altho it would have been much simpler and more enlightening to deal with this problem without regard to Nomad, from the standpoint of Marxism. Only a further word in conclusion: Just as there is no theory, however false, which does not contain also a grain of truth, so also Nomad's theory is based upon a partial truth. Since class oppositions exist under capitalism and state capitalism, and since the intellectual professions are for the most part exercised by elements of the middle class, the opposition between middle class and proletariat, between middle class and capital is manifested also as an opposition between intellectuals and workers, or intellectuals and capitalists. From one of a number of phases of these class oppositions, Nomad constructs the eternal opposition between intellectual and manual activity. History ceases to be a history of class struggles; it becomes a struggle between the educated and those on the way to becoming so for the mastery over the ignorant; a state of affairs to which Nomad applies the name of permanent revolution. Yet, in this competitive struggle between the educated or relatively educated, the ignorant also are continually gaining, since in order to get the support of these latter the competing group is obliged to have more to offer them than has the intellectual element in power at the time. Thus the salvation of humanity lies in this competitive struggle of the intellectuals, and thus things will slowly become better also for the less educated, so that they themselves will naturally become more and more enlightened. And all that in complete independence of the economic problems of society and its transformations. If, however, we think Nomad's theory of the "permanent revolution" consistently to its end, we can come to no other conclusion than that here also, where the situation of the workers keeps on improving, a point must of necessity be reached at which equality is established and the opposition between intellectuals and workers has wholly disappeared; and hence there disappears also Nomad's permanent revolution, which now, after all, like all other socialist theories, has its "final". But even

tho Nomad himself may like to split his head over the question of how he arrived at a permanent revolution without permanency, our attention continues to be directed to the more important problems of the class struggle between Capital and Labor. -P.M.-

#####

To ALL THE WORKERS IN THE WORLD

Fellow workers,proletarians, workers of the world at large: Where are you? Where is your social and class consciousness when you permit the governments directing the destinies of your countries to support, by their non-intervention in the Spanish civil war, the military fascists that rose in arms in defense of privilege and capital.

Fellow anarchists and communists, syndicalists, socialists and trade-unionists: The hour of liberation for Spain has struck.The working class of the Iberian peninsula turns to you for help.In the defense of an ideal which is also your ideal,they are shedding their blood on the battlefields,convinced that you,fellow workers of the world, will respond adequately to their heroic sacrifice. Your governments have refused aid to the Spanish government that was elected by the people, but you are not the official STATE,you are not a bourgeois power, you are WORKERS, you are our BROTHERS and you cannot permit that such refusal be carried out while other nations give their open support to the enemies of the Spanish working class.

Arise,proletarians! Fight the evil designs of your governments!Send us arms and munitions to enable us to fight and crush the hangmen of the Spanish people;for they are your enemies just as much as they are ours.

If it is true that you are intimately interested in the bloody struggle that we are carrying on against the military-fascist uprising,if you feel an ardent desire for the freedom of the working class,do not hesitate and come to our help immediately. Your fellow workers in Spain require from you that support which your governments have denied Spain.There is not and there should be no other diplomacy among workers than that of doing their duty. Your duty, comrades and fellow workers throughout the world, is not to permit the fascists and their allies to crush us.

THE NATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF LABOR
THE IBERIAN ANARCHIST FEDERATION

The "Popular Front" and Fascism

A manifesto issued by the Communist Party of Italy and published in the "Impreco" (#38), the official Press Correspondence of the Communist International, states:

" Only the brotherly union of the people of Italy brought about by the reconciliation of Fascists and non-Fascists will be in a position to break down the power of the bloodsuckers in our country."

"Let us reach out our hands to each other, children of the Italian nation, Fascists and Communists, Catholics and Socialists, people of all opinions, and let us march side by side to enforce the right of existence of a civilised country, as ours is. We have the same ambition - to make Italy strong, free and happy."

"Workers and intellectuals, Socialists, Democrats, Liberals, Catholics! Use all your endeavours for the reconciliation and unity of the Italian people, for the creation of a People's Front in Italy. The present rulers of Italy wish to keep the Italian people split into Fascists and non-Fascists. Let us raise high the banner of unity of the people for bread, work, liberty and peace!"

" We proclaim that we are prepared to fight, together with you and the whole Italian people, for the carrying out of the Fascist programme of 1919 and for every demand which represents a particular or general and immediate interest of the workers and the people of Italy." The C.P. --- Mussolini's most loyal Opposition.

;;:~::~~::~~::

Democracy in Russia

"The 16 prisoners, accused of conspiracy to murder Stalin, were sentenced to death at 2.30 a.m., August 24. They were convicted on the evidence of their own confessions, obtained from them by the OGPU before the trial; and the OGPU knows all the tricks of the third degree. Why did they not retract their confessions when in court? Broken fragments of manhood; hemmed in, as they were, by bayonets; torn between the fear of further torture and the last glimmer of hope of release - each individual had a promise that his life would be spared, on condition that he adhered to his confession. After the sentence, the 16 were not given much opportunity to withdraw their confessions; at dawn, August 25, it is officially reported, they were all shot, including the inevitable stool-pigeons. Why shoot the stool-pigeons? Dead men tell no tales. And why did Tomsy shoot himself? Not because he had plotted to kill Stalin, but because Stalin was plotting to kill Tomsy, after screwing out of him a false confession."
(F.W. Chandler in "Controversy" #1.)

Roosevelts Prosperity

The current monthly survey of business made public by the American Federation of Labor states that :

Profits of the larger corporations are approaching pre-depression levels, with profits for 330 large industrial corporations for nine months of 1936 55.5 per cent above the corresponding period in 1935.

Dividend payments to stockholders of 493 companies increased 33 per cent in 1936 over 1935.

Productivity in many industries has been enormously increased due to speed-up methods and technological improvements.

In the automobile industry in 1936 gains in production per worker were double the wage gains. In the boot and shoe industry production per worker per hour has increased 10.5 per cent in 1936 as compared with 1935 while the worker's earnings per hour have actually decreased 2.5 per cent.

The rise in hourly earnings of wage earners has been $\frac{1}{2}$ cent an hour in 1936 above the 1935 figure while the cost of living has gone up 2.3 per cent. So that the worker has actually received less for his hour's work in 1936 than he did in 1935.

The worker's weakly income, however, has increased more than hourly earnings because hours have been lengthened. The average work week in industry has been lengthened two hours in 1936, increasing from 38 to 40 hours and by thus adding to the work time of those already employed instead of taking on new workers, industry has denied jobs to several thousand unemployed.

By working two hours longer and by receiving half a cent more per hour, workers have added \$ 1.11 to their weekly pay, raising the average wage level from \$21.35 to \$ 22.53. This is a 5.5 per cent increase, somewhat more than the increase in cost of living so that the average weekly wage of 1936 will buy 3.1 per cent more than last year.

.....

READ:

Rätekorrespondenz, (theoretisches und Discussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung. Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland) 106
Order from : Council Correspondence, Chicago, Ill.
1237 N. California Ave.

The following is a list of the names of the persons who were present at the meeting held on the 12th day of October, 1912, at the residence of Mr. J. H. [Name] in the town of [Name], State of [Name].

The names of the persons present are as follows:

1. [Name]
2. [Name]
3. [Name]
4. [Name]
5. [Name]
6. [Name]
7. [Name]
8. [Name]
9. [Name]
10. [Name]
11. [Name]
12. [Name]
13. [Name]
14. [Name]
15. [Name]
16. [Name]
17. [Name]
18. [Name]
19. [Name]
20. [Name]
21. [Name]
22. [Name]
23. [Name]
24. [Name]
25. [Name]
26. [Name]
27. [Name]
28. [Name]
29. [Name]
30. [Name]
31. [Name]
32. [Name]
33. [Name]
34. [Name]
35. [Name]
36. [Name]
37. [Name]
38. [Name]
39. [Name]
40. [Name]
41. [Name]
42. [Name]
43. [Name]
44. [Name]
45. [Name]
46. [Name]
47. [Name]
48. [Name]
49. [Name]
50. [Name]
51. [Name]
52. [Name]
53. [Name]
54. [Name]
55. [Name]
56. [Name]
57. [Name]
58. [Name]
59. [Name]
60. [Name]
61. [Name]
62. [Name]
63. [Name]
64. [Name]
65. [Name]
66. [Name]
67. [Name]
68. [Name]
69. [Name]
70. [Name]
71. [Name]
72. [Name]
73. [Name]
74. [Name]
75. [Name]
76. [Name]
77. [Name]
78. [Name]
79. [Name]
80. [Name]
81. [Name]
82. [Name]
83. [Name]
84. [Name]
85. [Name]
86. [Name]
87. [Name]
88. [Name]
89. [Name]
90. [Name]
91. [Name]
92. [Name]
93. [Name]
94. [Name]
95. [Name]
96. [Name]
97. [Name]
98. [Name]
99. [Name]
100. [Name]

[This page is extremely faint and contains illegible text.]





