

## SHOP DELEGATES AND WORKERS' CONTROL

The article below, by Maurice Chambel-land, appeared some time ago in "Revolution Proletarienne" (Paris). It deals with the question of shop delegates from a trade-unionist point of view. Our opinions differ from those stated below, but we find the views of the author, as they are related to a concrete problem in France, interesting enough to give them some space in the C.C., if for no other reason than to show that even from a trade-union outlook the problem of shop councils becomes a very important one.

-----

At the unity congress at Toulouse, when we were faced with the choice between the electoral program of the Popular Front and the plan of the C.G.T. (french trade unions)--a choice that was finally not made because of the unanimous resolution--we declared that we could rally to the Plan (of the C.G.T.) as against the treacherous publicity stunt of the Popular Front, under the condition that the Plan would be made complete with the institution of shop delegates.

The self-styled "realistic" authors of the Plan had not thought of that. There was not a word in the Plan about shop delegates. I deposed before the Plan commission the following text: "There shall be instituted in each concern or shop of more than fifty workers a representation of the personnel under the following form:

1. Trade union shop delegates (the word "trade union" was added at Jouhaux's insistence) having as their function the watching over the application of the collective agreements and the social law, and particularly concerning the length of work. The power of the delegates shall apply to all questions interesting the personnel of the establishment, especially hiring and dismissal.
2. 'Safety' trade union delegates whose task shall be watching over the hygiene, and protection against accidents."

Less than three months later, in June, the shop delegates were officially instituted, first by the Matignon agreement, then by the law of the 24th of June, 1936.

In my study of the role and future of the shop delegates, today a living reality in all our shops, I shall not consider the historic and juridic aspect of the question.... We want to consider the question in its present aspect, from the practical angle and try to see clearly in the future. Here is something very important. It is a question of the organization and action of those who were the inspirers of the June days. In June, our labor movement was transformed. Even after unity (between the French Federation of Labor and the C.P. trade unions) it remained a movement where organizations of government employees, railway men, post office workers, teachers and workers in the public services had a marked preponderance. The industrial workers were small in number. In view of this, our trade union movement was not very representative. A true trade union movement ought to be based especially on the forces of production; it should unite, above all, the industrial proletariat.

But it was different after June. Industrial workers entered our unions by the millions. There is no factory today that has not its trade union organization and its shop delegates.

### Delegates Inside the Establishments

As you know, the notion of "trade union delegates", that is to say, delegates appointed by trade union organizations, was not kept. The Matignon agreement and the law on collective bargaining stipulated that the shop delegates should be elected by the entire personnel. This is better. The shop delegates are really the direct and genuine representatives of the workers.

The elections are held by means of the secret ballot. The secret ballot offers the worker the possibility to manifest freely his opinion. This must be conserved. The workers who do not belong to the trade union can vote and can be elected. There is nothing wrong about either. Imagine a reversal of the situation. Supposing that tomorrow we are given trade-unionism with the fascist sauce. We shall be happy to dispose of the possibility of expressing our opinion and acting in our place of work, outside of the fascist trade union organization.... That does not mean that in the present elections the trade union organization of the factory should not do its best to elect its candidate.

### House Committees

The law says that every establishment including more than ten workers ought to elect a delegate and a deputy delegate... This applies as well to establishments



composed of several shops or services...It would have been best to have advised immediately the delegates of the various categories to constitute among themselves a permanent organization that would bring them together periodically. In other words, we should have created, and we must create now, house committees. One day a month the delegates of the various categories will get together to examine grievances in each service, as well as general grievances...The house committee can be administered by an office. I think we must oppose the notion of a "general delegate" springing up in certain establishments. In the "Parisian Book", at the large Paul Dupont print shop, two general delegates were created for the entire establishment. They have not touched their tools since June. They are really "permanent"...but for the boss' benefit.

We must oppose the notion of "delegates general" because the trade union effort should be a "collective" effort and not an individual effort, no matter how much confidence is placed in a militant. On the other hand, forming the house committees, we should avoid rivalry with the trade union organism that might exist in the establishment. In the place where I work, we solved the problem by deciding that men of confidence or collectors for the trade union, or trade unions, who are not personally elected as delegates should nevertheless sit in the house committee, alongside of the delegates. Thus the house committee is at the same time the meeting of the delegates and the inter-union committee of the establishment.

#### The Work of the Delegates

The law says that the delegates "present to the management individual grievances that might not have satisfied immediately..." Now that there are shop delegates everywhere, we must make our comrades understand that, in their interest, they ought to abandon all direct individual grievances. We should not give the boss the opportunity to divide in order to rule. Individual grievances should be presented to the delegate of the category...who should present the disputed point to the house committee. Thus each worker and each category will profit by the total support given by the personnel to grievances individual and collective, recognized as justifiable by the house committee. It is understood that we must persuade rather than oblige; authoritarianism should be carefully avoided in the relation between the delegates and their electors.

It would be useful to specialize some members of the house committee in the periodic inspection of the establishment, and adjustment with the management of such matters as ventilation, heating, wardrobes, water closets

and showers, as well as safety devices. It would be useful to have a delegate specialize in the matter of work, --accidents and their adjustments.

The meeting of the house committee will occupy itself also with the following general grievances:

1. the enforcement of wage scales established by the collective agreement; the establishment and the respect for piece rates; the verification and the mitigation of production timing.
2. enforcement of the 40 hour week, and the policing of overtime work.
3. the organization of vacations.

All of this is accomplished normally in collaboration with the unions, since responsible union members sit in the house committee...Trade union recruiting is one of the principle tasks of the shop delegates. They need here the utmost of suppleness; they must avoid the creation of "cells" hostile to the trade union organization. This suppleness is just as important when dealing with members of the "Christian" or autonomous unions. Nothing must be done that would make a worker permeable to maneuvers by the boss.

#### The Shop Delegates and the Unions

What the delegates have to do in their shops is in fact no different from what the trade union organization has to do there. The tasks of the shop delegates and the trade union mix. Indeed, the delegate should inspire and organize the trade union in his shop...The institution of shop delegates is in a way the realization of the idea of "trade unionism in the place of work".. But how does our trade union machine work here? What are the relations between the shop delegates and the trade union organizations? If we look closely at what is happening in the Paris region, we shall notice misunderstandings that threaten to compromise this rebirth of trade unionism. (Chambelland gives a number of instances of the callous indifference and officiousness shown by the trade union offices to the shop delegates who came with grievances. He describes the several ways in which the delegates are responsible for their misunderstandings with the unions; impatience, striking with little provocation, dealing with the boss without trade union support.)



### What Remedies?

The simplest way of ameliorating these relations is to plainly apply in our unions the rules of worker democracy...The trade union membership in certain trades has become too large for general assemblies. The largest hall in Paris would not suffice for some Parisian unions; and if this were possible, we should not really have there a general assembly but a huge meeting where general discussion and the power of free choice are succumbed before disgusting demagoguery.

Our trade unions should try a formula which will permit them to assimilate without any trouble the movement of trade union delegates. It is the shop delegates who are now the base of the trade union. How can we apply here our old principle, according to which the trade union organization should be directed from below and not from above?

### What Can Replace the General Assembly?

An annual or semi-annual congress of shop delegates preceded by serious deliberations by each house committee. All enterprises will be able to exercise the strength of the trade unions completely. The shop congresses are the formula of the future so long as they can deliberate regularly and administer the organization directly and not be just simple consulting assemblies. Each industrial branch should be given an autonomy sufficiently large to be able to exist...A liaison between the house committees is indispensable in facing the concentration of the boss victoriously. The executive commission of a local committee is formed: from half a dozen militants elected by the general assembly of trade unionists living in the locality; by a representative of each trade union section of any enterprise of that locality.

Thus the local committee can call a meeting and organize the shop delegates...The tasks of the local committees among other things consist in giving out food supplies in the event of a strike.

With reference to this, what has happened? Local committees have generally fallen under the influence of parties whose militants seized most of the positions of local "permanents" to the detriment of trade unionism...Education in theoretical and practical trade unionism must be developed to the maximum.

### The Future of the Shop Delegates?

To be sure the bosses did not accept shop delegates willingly. The bosses have felt that their authority in the matter of work would be limited and reduced. It is certain the bosses will multiply their efforts to render difficult the normal functioning of the law and the application of collective conventions. We must show the shop delegates the importance of their role and indicate to them the elasticity of their powers... A thousand circumstances in the life of the shops lend themselves marvelously to the realization of worker control. But they must use their greatest initiative. Thus they will acquire the capacity of administration. Thus they will be able tomorrow to have the enterprises "turn" in the trade union region.

---

### CHILD LABOR.-(continued from page 11)

overfed, trained at an early age to class distinction, with an aversion to work. For that future society, the demands, protests and legislation attempting to "prohibit" child labor, all the issues concomitant to the exploitation of the working class and its offspring, will form only a part of the historical epoch that was capitalism.

---

### WAGES AND PRICES.-(continued from page 15)

industrial cycle, in one word, as reaction of labor against the previous action of capital". (Value, Price and Profit).

The need of capitalism to increase continuously its profitability on the one hand, and the growing impossibility of granting the masses a fair existence on the other hand, will sharpen its contradictions and difficulties. The capitalist press might try to dope the workers with cleverly worded phrases, but the urge to live is greater and cannot be nourished permanently with phraseology.

- - - - -



## NOTES ON PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITS

Private property of the means of production was the greatest revolutionary power history has ever known. Since the beginning of industrial production (about 1800) the capitalists' desire and need for bigger profits turned out to be the great magician capable of changing the surface of entire continents in less than 100 years. Capitalism learned to master the forces of nature and to put them into its service. Its strivings for profits distributed huge amounts of commodities over almost all parts of the globe and, simultaneously, was instrumental in the tremendous increase of the population. The population of Europe, for instance, was estimated in 1800 at 187 millions; in 1910 there were 447 millions, and in 1915 already 462 millions.

Such a rapid growth was possible only on account of the fast development of the means of production which, in turn, changed also the human relationship. Industrial production specialized the labor process; workers no longer toiled for themselves but for society; they became tools in the hands of profit-hungry capitalists. Private property created vast armies of wage slaves against which chattel slavery is but child's play. "The bourgeoisie has created quite different wonders than Egyptian Pyramids, Roman waterworks and Gothic cathedrals". (Communist Manifesto). The desire for profits was the great motor in this development. But not the desire for profit alone. The capitalists, individually or united, constantly wage war against each other for the greatest possible part of the profits which the working class is able to create. The desire for profit is simultaneously a struggle about the profit. (To illustrate this point, let us assume the following: ten capitalists wish to share the total profit of 100. If they could reach some agreement, they would allot to each one ten units; but because they cannot agree--this is beyond their will power on account of some deeper rooted facts--they try to snatch as much as possible. Some might get 20, while the weaker might get only 5. That is why we said they fight also about the profit.)

The fight about the profit is, at the same time, a struggle for the preservation of capital. As a result of these struggles, we record the formation of trusts and monopolies which means that the struggles continue on an enlarged scale and disrupt from time to time the entire organism of capitalist economy.

In order to understand the rapid tempo of the social

development, it is necessary not to forget that profitability is the basis for capital production. Profitability demands alertness on the part of the individual capitalist to assure a certain profit level. How high must this level be? We may remark here that the level is determined by the social average rate of profit (of all capitalists). Some capitalists realize more than the average, some less--the total profit divided by the number of capitalists gives the average. Those capitals which remain below the average are not profitable and are bound to collapse first at the beginning of a crisis.

To assure the average profit, therefore, is the main object of any capitalist while those who realize more are interested to retain that position. We may refer to the not altogether insignificant fact that it is not greediness on the part of the capitalist to assure at least the average profit. There are other more far reaching motives. It is an empirical fact that an enterprise which realizes annually 3% profit, while the average profit demands 8%, becomes within a relatively short time unprofitable and goes bankrupt.

The necessity to gain the average profit compels every enterprise to continuous improvements of the means of production as, otherwise, it might be left behind unfit to carry on the competitive struggle. It is like a race, but a race which knows no end and whose pace increases with each cycle.

Aside from these facts, the problem of the average rate of profit can also be approached from another angle, namely, from the viewpoint of the productivity within the factories. One can easily visualize that the factory with the lowest production cost (overhead) produces not only more cheaply than others but realizes also the greatest profits. The most productive enterprise realizes the highest profits. This does not mean that it also produces the greatest amount of commodities, but it merely indicates that the cost is lowest. If we would compile the production cost of all enterprises and would compare them, we would recognize many variations which radiate around a certain index. In other words, the productivity of all enterprises radiates around the social average productivity.

Seen in this light, struggle for average profit is nothing else but the struggle for the social average productivity; and because each enterprise must assure for itself that average profit in order to continue production profitably, it is simultaneously forced to keep in line with the attained social average of productivity.



The most important factor to raise the productivity of the labor process is the installment of newer and better labor saving machinery. With them, the workers can turn out more products--the productivity per worker increases. Although this results at first in a price increase for raw materials and other means of production, this increase is compensated by the greater mass of finished products which means that the price for the single product falls. The improved technical composition of capital, therefore, enlarges the mass of products, but at the same time decreases the cost per single product. This antagonistic development forces upon the capitalist the necessity of finding new markets.

We see that the struggle for the average profit and average productivity leads directly towards the struggle for markets. And just as little as the struggle for the average rate of profit could be traced back to the capitalists' greediness, just as little can the struggle for markets--whose climax is the imperialist war--find its origin therein. Not the greediness or wickedness of the capitalists is responsible for misery and war, but rather certain laws of motion imminent in the capitalist system of production. It is an actual life necessity for capitalists to fight other private property owners, within the factories and on the open market, for the required profit rate. As long as it is possible to wage these competitive struggles with peaceful means, so long will capitalism pursue a policy of peaceful expansion. However, should it become impossible to continue profitably such a policy, or should the contradictions become unsurmountable, then the differences lead to open warfare. And again, not because the capitalists are blood-thirsty, but because the "country"--that is, capitalism as a system--is actually endangered.

The struggle of the capitalists to lower the cost of production goes hand in hand with the expansion of production. Capitalists improve the means of production because they must seek to increase the output. But the starting point of this process, as we have seen, was the struggle for average productivity and for this reason improvements are life necessities for capitalism which it cannot escape. If a capitalist does not follow the trend of technical development, his business will soon operate below the average rate of productivity and is bound to go bankrupt. He must improve his machinery because this alone enables him to lower the cost price for each commodity produced and permits him to remain in the "contest". Hence, improvement and expansion of production is the method under which the various capitals fight for preservation. The faster the technical development proceeds, the more aggressive the capitalists are in their endeavor to exploit the new devices;

only to increase manifold the output, thereby cheapening the value of the product again. A vicious circle, but whose progressive development no capitalist can retard. Along with technical development goes a tremendous waste of labor power. If Ford, for instance, increases the productivity in his factories by the introduction of better machinery, he thereby raises, at the same time, the average productivity. This means that all other automobile factories not only lag behind Ford in productivity, but that also their rentability has decreased. In relation to Ford, their invested capital for means of production has been depreciated; and although they may work at top speed, their profits begin to shrink. This tendency in the fall of the rate of profit can be overcome only by introducing the same-(or better) new devices than the competitor has introduced. Naturally, this requires an immense outlay in new capital. We see that technical development under capitalism very often means destruction of machinery that could not be termed old or worn, yet it has become old and outclassed because it does not fulfill the requirements necessary to guarantee the average rate of profit. This "moral depreciation" of machinery is the greater the faster technical develops. The capitalists, of course, anticipate such "depreciation" and build up big reserve funds. But because these funds must exceed the actual technical depreciation caused by the production process, the social waste of labor power is enormous.

A European paper said: "The enemy of fixed capital is the rising number of technical improvements and inventions which, although they help to raise the cultural level of humanity, are more destructive to economic life than is generally anticipated. How many goods are being produced never to be used! Of how much use value was a machine that had to be replaced by a more productive one, to the respective factory? We can see this process of depreciation in almost all enterprises, and we begin to recognize the enormous waste of labor and capital destruction the "machine age" has created. For some industries it has become increasingly difficult to build large enough reserve funds to replace depreciated models".

The tempo of industrial development is not only determined by technical improvements but also by the amount of profits which the workers create (by profits we understand here dividends, interest, etc.). The amount of profit, expressed in money, exceeds the amount of wages paid, probably by more than double. All profits are divided into at least two parts: one goes into the consumption fund for the capitalist, while the other is reinvested in order to realize during the following production cycle still greater profits. That part which



cannot be profitably reinvested in his own enterprise is loaned to banks or traded at the stock exchange from where it flows back into the production process of other capitalists, only to return again in the form of dividends or interest to the first capitalist.

Inasmuch as profits add new capital to the production process, they are a socially necessary function. Capital which fights for the average rate of productivity receives from the capital investing "public" the needed 'ammunition', and the fight for the preservation of the fixed capital simultaneously there becomes a struggle for investment capital.

So long as the banks have a superfluity of money, it is cheap; i.e., credits and loans have a low rate of interest. But with increasing production activity, the demand for capital grows and the rate of interest rises, or money becomes dearer. Climbing of the interest rate indicates not only a shortage of investment capital, but also that capitalists are competing among each other to get it at the most favorable rates.

It is of great importance not to lose sight of the social function of profits. It reveals that the tempo of development depends to a great degree upon the amount of capital that is seeking investment. The greater the disposable amount of profit, the more intense is the technical development. In other words: under capitalism the process of production is the more profitable the less the wage-earning class consumes. The less the wage earners consume, the more is left for the capitalist class. The more they have at their disposal, the better they can wage that necessary struggle for the preservation of capital.

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

#### NOTICE

In the production of the "OUTLINE STUDY COURSE IN MARXIAN ECONOMICS" technical difficulties have delayed us and we cannot ship copies until April 3rd.

Subscribe for your copy NOW. This is a limited edition. Price - 50 cents per copy.

~~~~~  
TROTSKY AND PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.  
~~~~~

Leon Trotsky fell into an error within an error. To him present "proletarian dictatorship" in Russia is more real and hence more characteristic than some vague dictatorship of the workers that shall arise in the future. Thus we have it that in Russia there is a workers' dictatorship and secondly, this supposed dictatorship is representative. That this "living example" should color his conceptions of the future forms of workers' rule is, to him, a matter of necessity. What indeed could be more indicative of things to come than the thing that has already come.

Mirroring the Russian set-up, for him, the struggle for power must proceed, in the order of their importance, with first the party; by a distant second, the unions; and last and least important, the councils. The "spontaneous factor" is properly accredited, but without the iron will, the tried and experienced, the semi-military-party, everything not only may, but must be, lost. From all of which must inevitably arise the intransigent "line", though he would insist it is only the principle that is adamant; there must also arise the bureaucratic organization; the indisposition to admit mistakes in order to avoid affecting the organization's prestige and finally, there must arise great, greater and yet greater leaders who must respectively commit great, greater and yet greater stupidities and blunders.

In his travels, Gulliver discovered the Empire of Blefuscu. Trotsky looks thru the spyglass of his theory and finds a proletarian form of rule in Russia. The story each tells is equally entertaining and valid. For first of all things it must be established that the proletarian dictatorship (and upon this point history itself has given the ruling) can mean only a power which is grounded upon a production level permitting the introduction of economic plenty, abundance and surplus. It is a power which can assume actuality in the world-wide and communistic sense only after capitalism has run its gamut of development.

If it is taken into account that proletarian power rests, not upon the human will but like capitalist dictatorship, upon a specific level of industrial development and the resultant market conditions, (which



have priority to "will" and which determine what the human relations to production should be) then one will seek the evidence of power in the level of development, in the concomitant mode of production, in the mode of exchange.

Indeed, scientifically, there is no other way to explain an economic and political system except by an investigation of how things are made (how great, if at all, is the social division of labor) and how, if at all, these things are exchanged. Only from such an investigation evolves the information of whether exchange values are being produced, whether labor-power is exchanged for wages, whether capital is accumulating, and whether surplus-value is being appropriated. One cannot guess at a social system and insist upon having caught a right (as if by divination) against another's wrong. A system is explained by its economic mechanics and dynamics, or it is not explained nor understood.

#### The Simple is Too Profound

Incapable of grasping these simplicities, Trotsky snubs them out of existence by ignoring them. The truly great can only be concerned with the profundities.

This is the stage of imperialism, and countries have developed unevenly. A backward country may capture power and this may facilitate the capture of power in a more advanced country. Capitalism is an international system. Now, when workers have captured power in a backward country, while waiting for others to come to their aid, is not that a proletarian dictatorship?

When workers have captured power on the Fiji Islands, what is the world significance of such a power? It is that workers have captured power on the Fiji Islands. No more and no less.

Trotsky's is the dramatized way of looking at revolution and social processes. A general strike in a highly industrialized country has more significance from the point of view of world revolution than the capture of power upon a Fiji Island as large as one-sixth of the earth. The capturing of "power" when there is no power (industries) in a country that is ripening for capitalism (as in Russia) is the taking out of insurance that the workers are undertaking the governmental tasks of the bourgeoisie, under and not above a bourgeois system of production. It is precisely the uneven development of countries that makes for these undesired but inescapable anomalies.

It is not precluded that in the event of another such

backward October, the workers of the "West" will come to the aid in time. That is not the question here, (which, by the way, is not one that will ever be determined theoretically). The point here considered is that since the West did not come to the aid of the Russian workers, what does that make of the present Russian regime, and how does Trotsky contemplate this regime.

Trotsky makes a logical equation: the workers in Russia have captured power, hence there is a proletarian dictatorship in Russia. Even the premise for such an equation is false without introducing the peasants and their aims and the petty urban bourgeoisie with their aspirations. Nor is it correct to say that the workers without these classes or against them have conquered in October. But Trotsky sees the question of workers' power not, first, in its economic mollifications but in its phenomenal outlines. "A thing is because it seems".

But did not the workers under the Bolsheviks take power? Surely a hard and fast question calculated to dissipate any false ideas. But asking this question is but another way of saying: did not the workers enforce, by armed might, the new relations to production? To pose the question is to receive the answer: They did not. For new socialistic relations to production were not established even if the former aristocracy and few but concentrated capitalists were expropriated. To insist that nationalization of industry and state control of banking is in, and by, itself a socialist measure, is to approve of what Mussolini and, to an ever increasing extent, Hitler claims for themselves. What is pertinent is whether there is abundant industry that comes into possession of the armed workers.

The Russian Revolution, in the historical sense, was the capture of the factory-yard of the world without managing to capture the factory. Yet there remains another point to consider. On Nov. 7, 1917, the Russian proletariat defeated its enemies and retained its guns. Subsequently the "International" and "Budenny's Cavalry" were heard far and wide. Speeches concerning Socialism were promulgated from all platforms. What was the meaning of all that?

The meaning is that the proletariat, because of its propertylessness, does not, like the young bourgeoisie, establish its economic power first and then proceed to capture state power, but must act conversely. And it is this necessity that stands behind the "weak link" that has determined immature, though necessarily



justifiable, efforts at the capture of power.

Correctly construed, when the Russian workers acted, it was the world's workers acting where they could, (in Russia) because they could not yet act where they would (in industrial countries). When this backward effort succeeds, the power is both real and enigmatic. It is hinged so completely upon the mood of workers in other lands that with them it is positive, without them - negative.

The proletarian dictatorship is no mere matter of avenging oneself upon ones enemies. What is involved in the essence of such a dictatorship is the destruction of the former system of production (not as Lenin insisted: the destruction first of the state and that act is all-sufficing. Russia has illustrated that the old state can be destroyed but the old system remains), and the "freeing" of the productive capacities.

Since proletarian dictatorship is the same as an unimpeded path to plenty and material equality, the former rich having been expropriated, there may logically be different forms of that dictatorship; but for it to be a workers' dictatorship in the first place, the requisite remains that this path continues, in the main, unobstructed. When a proletarian dictatorship rests upon a capitalist economy (surplus value and its appropriation, capital accumulation) and finds it necessary in the interests of its economy to enforce and produce not plenty for the workers but poverty (relative pauperization), not material equality but ever expanding inequality, one may ask, how can such a dictatorship be proletarian?

It is actually maintaining that a particular capitalism is socialism because its founders endeavored to be followers of Marx. The proof presented cannot therefore be the system but the integrity of the leaders.

Trotsky does not see capitalism in Russia, for to admit that would be admitting that other Russian workers, now either dead or dying in Verkhny, Uralsk, were right and that he was wrong. It would be both personally and politically embarrassing to the "Old Man" and then it may well be that his ignorance of Marxian economics prevents him from calling things by their name.

Trotsky looks not upon the new capitalists in Russia but upon the memory of his conquests for Socialism. It is therefore small wonder why the assassin face of Stalin is more vivid to him than the exploitation of the Russian masses. And where are these new capitalists in Russia, pray?

What is a capitalist? It is as childish to say that a capitalist is a man with a lot of money as that he is a fellow with a big waistline. A capitalist is an agency by route of which capital accumulates. He is of the class, secondly, that receives greater material means from production. In other words, in a system where the accumulation of capital goes on and where there are people who gain more than most other people, such a system bespeaks the presence of capitalists. To the system itself it is not pertinent whether the capitalist is the sole and titular owner of an industry or whether he shares it equally with a hundred others; whether he owns privately a billion dollars or a measly two hundred thousand rubles, and only a couple of servants.

#### What is the Proletarian Dictatorship?

The proletarian dictatorship is not a substantial and finished product like a workers' club or the Palace of Soviets; it is a process which, like all social processes, assumes definite forms only to the immediate and momentary onlooker. The Marxist must seek in this process the complete unfulfillment of the entire social highway over to the point of Communism. The proletarian dictatorship does not end until what is now the most backward colonial country turns socialist. Such a gamut provides for many variations in power-form, for set-backs and for temporary defeats. For the very first effort at Proletarian dictatorship to provide a guidebook to power is surely a bit of laughter fit to peel thru the ages. But such are the conceits of the "great" of whom with the passing of Lenin and Trotsky and with the real advent of workers' power there shall be none left.

That the very term "proletarian dictatorship" has by now become objectionable to the masses is hardly to be questioned. Thanks for this is naturally due the Comintern for what it has done with this power while it existed in hot-house form, and what it has done since the defeat of the Russian proletariat. Indubitably, a new term will evolve to replace this odious one.

How a false theoretical estimate must lead to bad tactical and organizational conclusions is classically demonstrated by Trotsky's pathetic efforts to defeat Stalin by organizing the world revolution.

From "corrupt workers bureaucracy" and Bonapartism, there poured the resultant "lines" respectively of reforming the Comintern and of building a new Comintern. The failure of both efforts is too glaring to



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

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

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

- H. Smith -

---

#### INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

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

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

Subscribe now.

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

---

#### IN GERMAN - RAETEKORRESPONDENZ

Herausgegeben monatlich von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommuniten, Holland; enthaelt aufschlussreiche Artikel ueber die Arbeiterbewegung und sollte fuer jeden unserer Freunde und Genossen von interesse sein. Einzelheft 10c durch uns zu beziehen.

---

# INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

---

*For Theory and Discussion*

---

## CONTENTS:

### **Anarchism and the Spanish Revolution**

The Economic Organization of the Revolution

---

### *Nature and Significance of Overproduction*

The Character of the Present Crisis

---

## NEW BOOKS

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

---

### *The Recovery Problem in the United States*

---

Vol. III

Nos. 5 & 6

JUNE 1937

Also YEARLY

10c A COPY