

best suited to their specific needs. The second world war led to the further unfolding of State capitalism on a world-wide scale. The peculiarities of the various nations and their special situations within the world-power frame provided a great variety of developmental processes towards State capitalism.

The fact that State capitalism and fascism did not, and do not grow everywhere in a uniform manner provided Trotsky with the argument of the basic difference between bolshevism, fascism and capitalism plain and simple. This argument necessarily stresses superficialities of social development. In all essential aspects all three of these systems are identical, and represent only various stages of the same development—a development which aims at manipulating the mass of the population by dictatorial governments in a more or less authoritarian fashion, in order to secure the government and the privileged social layers which support it and to enable those governments to participate in the international economy of to-day by preparing for war, waging war, and profiting by war.

Trotsky could not permit himself to recognize in Bolshevism one aspect of the world-wide trend towards a fascist world economy. As late as 1940 he held the view that Bolshevism prevented the rise of Fascism in the Russia of 1917. It should have long since been clear, however, that, all that Lenin and Trotsky prevented in Russia was the use of a non-Marxian ideology for the fascist reconstruction of Russia. Because the Marxian ideology of Bolshevism merely served State capitalistic ends, it, too, has been discredited. From any view that goes beyond the capitalist system of exploitation Stalinism and Trotskyism are both relics of the past.

—Paul Mattick.

The above Review appeared in *Politics*.

Essay on Socialist Theory

[*Politics* is the name of a monthly magazine edited and published in New York by Dwight Macdonald.]

SCIENCE AND *Politics*

A Materialist Analysis

[The following Essay was started by a young nuclear physicist in Chicago, and others collaborated in presenting it in the form it now appears. It was submitted to Dwight Macdonald for publication in *Politics*, but, we understand, it was rather contemptuously rejected; maybe, the criticism was too good, as it did not come from professional writers. The publication of it has been delayed, as it was first intended to appear in a New York magazine; as the publication of that periodical is delayed I have been given the green light to go ahead and print. *Politics* is the name of monthly magazine edited and published in New York by Dwight Macdonald.—Editor S.S.R.]

It has been a particularly unhappy experience for me to witness the changes in subject matter and focal concern in *Politics* during the last year. There has been a marked departure from exposing the established order of society along the lines laid down in the first issue, which said of the new magazine: "Its predominant intellectual approach will be Marxist, in the sense of a method of analysis, not of a body of dogma." The apparent trend in *Politics* today is toward the non-operational (and therefore mystical) eternal verities, universal values and ultimate truths. There is apparently a "new failure of nerve" observable among many of the independent leftists who have in the past withstood the pressures of acquiescence to class society, whether capitalist or Bolshevik, who have seen through the fakery of manipulated culture and imperialist war.

Certainly, to explain the current flight of radicals to reform and to religion, one must look beyond the *status quo* pressures of cultural conformity and the reward-laden hands of the ruling class, which beckon no less now than always. The political situation in the world today forces the thinking radical to a reconsideration of his basic assumptions. It is enough to mention the failure of radical parties, the pointlessness of most types of radical action employed to date, the apparent entrenchment of capitalist-fascist ruling classes, and of the Soviet bureaucracy. World War II has functioned to strengthen the grip of the United States and Russia (with England already an American satellite) upon the rest of the world, and the fast growing competition between them is clear for all to see. Scientific advances pyramid at an ever increasing rate, and under the existing arrangement of society, science is a tool providing greater power than ever in the hands of the ruling class. (Nevertheless, the great strides in technology, making available tremendous sources of energy and, therefore, of potential material plenty for everyone, accentuate the contradictions of class society. To this point we return later.)

The current flight from a reasoned and radical approach to society, into the arms of the ruling class (via reform or via religion), derives in part at least from the feeling of impotence in the face of these historical developments, and from the evident inability of orthodox Marxism, as represented by the various parties, to provide the answers. We reject, however, for reasons to be discussed below, the idea that the failure of the parties means the failure of socialism. And we similarly reject the idea that socialist politics can be implemented by a "search for Absolute Truth." We suggest that accurate understandings of social processes are obtainable by empirical inquiry designed on the basis of class analysis. And we will demonstrate how these can serve as a guide to political action. It should be noted that the scientific radical behavior are separable matters; here our concern is solely with the former.

In this article the attempt is made to show in outline. (1) The limits within our social development can be predicted in relation to the possibilities for an egalitarian socialist society; (2) possibilities for influencing the course and rate of class political development; (3)

some important types of deliberate intervention in social processes which radicals can undertake; (4) some of the politically important areas where knowledge is lacking. The analysis is presented in three sections. I) First we deal with the relevancy of scientific method to political action; and some implications of the revolt among radicals against utilization of scientific method. II) In the second part we describe briefly some of the principal patterns of action among the major social classes which are relevant to socialist politics. III) And thirdly, we discuss specific areas for political action, based upon the preceding analysis, and contrast them with the obscurantist notions of the 'anti-Marxists' writing in the "New Roads" series.

I.—SCIENTIFIC METHOD: A TOOL FOR RADICALS

During the war years we heard a great deal about the invaluable services rendered by the natural scientists on behalf of the war effort. The atomic bomb was the super-duper culmination of a whole series of military tools devised in Allied laboratories. People who disliked war on various political grounds could not help but observe the service of the scientists, and some drew the inference that not only the scientists and their works were serving the ruling classes, but that even the scientific method, the procedures of inquiry used to develop the knowledge applied for ruling class purposes, is politically reactionary. If it is not explicitly reactionary, then so closely has it appeared to be intertwined with the activities of the ruling classes that it could hardly be relevant to a resistance and revolt against the *status quo*.

It is crucially important to draw a clear distinction between science and technology, method and its application. The same knowledge of natural phenomena can be used to make death-dealing explosives or to provide an unlimited source of energy for production. In a class society, the technological utilization of scientific understandings are, of course, exploited for the social purposes of the ruling class.

Scientific procedures are employed in investigations in the natural sciences. These pragmatic methods are essential for getting results in terms of knowledge of the underlying mechanisms and processes. And the search for knowledge is channeled in our society in those fields where it can aid profitability. Similarly, in the social sciences, in recent years, there have been certain serious, albeit limited, attempts to apply scientific methods for obtaining knowledge about society. What kind of knowledge? The attitudes of workers at their jobs have been investigated with a view to establishing the bases for management manipulation of worker attitudes. Extensive inquiries are being conducted under business and government auspices in public opinion measurement and control devices. And among the anthropologists the latest trend is toward "applied anthropology," which means simply appropriate arrangement of the cultural low-down on colonial peoples to facilitate the peaceful administration of their affairs by officials who, equipped with such information, are better able to manipulate their charges.

re indeed have been the attempts to apply scientific method for social inquiry into problems relevant to anti-*status-quo* politics. Virtually all of present-day standard sociology and economics consist of apologetics for class society, or various attempts to keep it going, e.g., social work, or the Keynesian State-capitalism proposals.

Based upon detailed empirical studies of mid-nineteenth century capitalism, Marx was able to predict the long-time development in capitalism, which slashed into the mythology of the classical apologists. However, as with most first attempts to generalize the data of a given field into an organized science, there were omissions and incomplete formulations. What makes his work of great significance to us to-day is his attempt to develop a scientific theory of social change: that the processes of social change occur in a patterned way, the pattern being determined loosely by interactions between the forces of production (including technology and natural resources) at any given time in the society in question, and the various social and business institutions present at that particular time; that in capitalist society the motor force is the drive to profit maximalization which produces international competition for markets, imperialism and war; that when this drive can no longer be satisfied within the existing order of society the existing order will break down, and the agent of this breakdown will be the vast bulk of the people who have everything to gain and "nothing to lose but their chains." This picture of society, even to-day, best accounts for the general, long-range developments of the last 80 years, since Marx. Marx's theories, however, did not predict history in the short-run. Whether or not Marx recognized this fact is beside the point. What is important is that his followers did not.

In the natural sciences, following announcement of a hypothesis, it is tested, developed, corrected, or thrown out altogether, on the basis of the empirical investigations of subsequent workers. However, because of the great political interests involved, and the development of manipulatory bolshevism, the fate of Marxist theory has been quite different. The Marxists who found validity in the picture of capitalist society which Marx drew, set up an intellectual barricade to defend the citadel of his writings down to the last misplaced comma. Anyone who deviated from the interpretations of the official disciples was denounced. One had only two alternatives—to accept the work as a dogma *in toto*, or to reject it. Only rarely has Marx's work been tested as scientific hypotheses rather than final statements.

The use of Marxism as party creed rather than as an analysis has retarded the development of the science, and has made the intellectual powerlessness of the parties increasingly evident. Those who, in this situation, rejected the *credo* as a whole came to support the *status-quo* via a number of channels: direct sell-out, elaborately nationalized reformism, insouciant American reaction to religious persecutions. Finally one has followed Marx's own footsteps in trying to make a more precise scientific evaluation of historical process.

Some Implications of the Search for Values:

The essayist's use of the word *values* here is not in its mathematic economic meaning, but in sense used in the discussion of "New Roads"—the precise usefulness of codes of behavior, which leading to *action* bring about a metamorphosis to newer or changed codes of behavior, i.e., engendering a revolutionary change in the basis of society.]

It is well substantiated that the values, or codes of behavior, of individuals vary with the social environment in which they live. Thus, codes of behavior may be shown to differ for different societies, for different groups (especially different occupational groups or classes) in our society at a given time. While there are always individual deviants, one may observe and measure the statistical correlations of values as represented by social attitudes, with occupational group. This is not to deny that people act in a manner consistent with their personal values—but these values are, in the first place, relative; and secondly, are determined statistically by the social situation and not appreciably subject to arbitrary control. Changes in codes of behavior which do occur are the result of altered conditions of living. Thus it is the institutional arrangements in the society which principally determine the ways of acting of the individual. (If one would like to see values of equality, freedom, opportunity for creativity and expression for everyone, etc., then one must ascertain: what sorts of socio-economic institutional arrangements would make such a way of living possible or natural for everyone.)

The insistence upon scientific handling of the problem in no way detracts from the possibility of action in regard to it; the science *directs* the action; it shows what action, how carried out, may be effective. The discovery of what socio-economic arrangements would make such values possible is essential, but it is the activity of people, the class activism, the party needling, the talking and writing, and the occurrence of personal experiences and public events, that actually bring about the new values. The usefulness of the scientific investigations, such as that conducted by Marx, is to tell what actions, among what parts of the population, will so fit in with the changing economic arrangements as to be effective.

The scope of politically-directed action is particularly great because in periods of changing economic conditions there are present both conservative and resistant-progressive values. Upholders of each of these values fight to spread their acceptance. Individuals and groups whose activities include the promotions of *status-quo* resistant values thus help the actual bringing about by the people of the social relations made possible by the changing economic arrangements. However, which values are resistant is determined not by absolutist theory, but by investigation of the particular socio-economic change in question.

This is very different from the conception that one can change people's "values"—their codes of behavior—by appealing to them to do so, or even by discussing what are the codes they

"should" have. Such a conception leads first of all to political impotence, because the pressure is put on an area where it can have no appreciable effect. Furthermore, thinking in terms of universal values implicitly carries with it the rejection of an analytic, scientific approach to the problem of implementing social change. It separates values from ways of living and makes them matters apart. If appealing to man's better nature will do the trick, then obviously there is no need for difficult and tedious analyses. It is no accident that in this society the upholders of "universal values" are institutions like the Catholic Church. The ex-Marxist trotting up in New Roads finds himself in strange company. The rejection of scientific method as a tool in the study of society leads to obscurantism, to metaphysics, and willy-nilly to religion.

Most significant of all, it must be noted that regardless of the intentions, rejections of an empirical, scientific procedure, in favor of absolutist and obscurantist conceptions, leads, in effect, because of its political impotence, to acquiescence to, and therefore support of, the existing organization of society. (Very much of the directly *status-quo* supporting elements of the culture of our society rests on such conceptions: America, for all its faults, is a Democracy; here people are Free and Equal; the Church belongs to all Men; Everyone has a Chance; the Best Man succeeds). The personal motivations of the searchers for absolute values may be anti-*status-quo*, but so long as in effect they obscure the actual (i.e., observable) ways of acting of the individual. If one political situation (by turning attention from class structure and its concomitants to abstract symbols which have no relevance to the material situation), then in function they serve but to bolster the *status-quo*.

For effective political work, the turn of events in the short run becomes of considerable importance. For a short-run analysis we need not a more intuitive commentary on Marx, and certainly not obscurantist non-science, but great refinement and elaboration of the mechanisms of historical process.

It is clear that scientific method has shown itself the tool for the elucidation of processes and mechanisms in the natural sciences. To the question, can it be applied in the social sciences, we reply, it is being applied in those areas where it is in the interests of the ruling class to get certain bits of understanding. It is systematically discouraged in areas where such understanding is not in the interests of the ruling class, or where the methods and categories of a scientific inquiry would undermine the function of a great part of social "theory" as apologetics for class society. (For example, pro-*status-quo* scientists are inhibited in utilization of class categories.) For persons concerned with effective radical action, however, there are very many unsolved problems. More detailed understandings of the historical process must be gained. What is the direction of development among the major class groups? How can the social attitude and actions of people be changed, if at all? How will the tremendous energy available from atomic

Assion affect the business-directed technology and subsequently the social institutions? What are the characteristics of the growing technician occupations? How can that influence the course of resistance and revolt against the *status-quo*? It is because the extent of understanding of various trends such as these is crucial in determining the most effective course of political action, that scientific method finds its empirical justification as a tool for radical action.

The general character of scientific method, as applied in the social sciences, has been elaborated by several writers⁽⁵⁾. In the brief discussion which follows it will, of course, be impossible to show the workings of scientific method in a social science based on Marx: There is no room here to collect the mountains of necessary data, check the correctness of observation in terms of our categories, and show their relevance to the theoretical argument we present. Such work will have to be pre-supposed here. That does not mean that we are free to say anything we wish. We can make only those statements that are derivable from the relevant data for which there is no space here.

Even though the relevant data for each descriptive generalization in the following sections cannot be shown here, the reader can test their validity in accordance with such major methodological criteria as the following: Are the data referred to, and the categories in which they are grouped, operational (observable)? Is there a correlation between the given behavior and the social category that is most utilized, namely, classes in relation to means of production? Is there a mechanism (indicated or referred to) relating the given class group (in its social situation) and the resulting behavior of the group? Both mechanism and correlation are necessary for establishing causal connection. Does the generalization enable prediction of people's behavior? This is a test of its validity as an explanation of cause and effect.

The Marxist classes are used here as the basic categories, because with these categories it has been possible to obtain a wide range of correlation and descriptions of mechanisms relating class with people's actions, that have shown high predictive value.

II.—THE COURSE OF CLASS DEVELOPMENT

Basic to the discussion is the fact that whenever development of social-economic arrangements comes in the wake of the production changes, it will be the result of the reaction of the people to the changing conditions. If a country develops power relations among people, which we call fascism, it is, in the last analysis, not because a Hitler or an upper class imposed them upon the people (by what power could they do so?), but because the great bulk of the people acted in such a way as to bring them about: not, of course, that they all had equal roles in this, but that the upper class moved toward greater bureaucratic control, and the mass of the people was sufficiently dependent on it (productionally or culturally) to accept these moves, and so on. The very power, privilege and wealth of a ruling class is describable as a system of accepted ways—ways which are accepted,

for the most part unrecognizably, by almost every person in the population. Were it not so, what makes the people submit to the prerogatives of the ruling class, except in the case of a class ruling by conquest? The power of police is only a token power, which can be used against individual deviants when the bulk of the population is not prepared to oppose the acts of the police or of the government.

It is therefore of interest to ask what, within the framework of our categories, are the facts about the actions of the people, keeping in mind the particular historical situation in which the actions occur. In general, we will see that people do not act at random, they are not free agents who follow indeterminate whims, but that they act in conformity with traditional ways, with patterns of action for particular common types of social situation. Gradually different ways of acting arise, neither at random, nor by intent, but out of the difficulty of carrying out the accepted patterns in the face of changing conditions: thus peasants were "content" to live on feudal manors until the development of commerce made possible greater freedom and conveniences in the growing cities (and created a class of people who were interested in getting them into the cities); people revolted *en masse* against the Catholic Church and its "*weltanschauung*,"* not at random times, but as capitalism began to develop; governments passed health laws, not in moments of deepened humanity, but at times when industrial development or the military powers needed strengthening by healthier bodies. Conversely, patterns of interpersonal relations contradictory to the technological and institutional possibilities of a given period do not have a chance. Nineteenth century Utopian so-called socialists were Utopian basically because the material and cultural conditions of their time precluded any action toward a socialist society.

An important immediate advantage accrues from the search for regularities in people's actions, and especially in the way that they react to changing social conditions. In terms of the ordinary political discussion we find ourselves in an era of major changes due to such discrete and hard-to-evaluate events as world-wide wars, State intervention in the economy, formation of fascist States, etc. It is impossible as yet to discuss these as independent unit subjects of investigation and to discover what their future history and long-range effect will be. However, what are total wars, State economics, and so on? They are all names for particular, if complex, forms of social human activity. They all represent acts initiated by some people, fostered by others, submitted to by yet others, and so on. If we investigate what each of the groups involved is doing, such that their actions lead to wars and so on, we find that their several actions are not major new departures, but continuations of their previous patterns of action changed only (as far as one can determine) by changed conditions and by changes in the pattern of action of the other social groups. When we talk in these terms

* German for "world outlook," "universal viewpoint."

we no longer find ourselves in a world of sharp breaks and unevaluated entities, but in one of relative regularity and continuity.

What follows is no foolhardy attempt to state explicitly the class relations of our society to-day, or to predict in particular the changes which are on the way. Rather, it is a tentative and approximate description of class relations, selecting those changes which seem to be of greatest interest to the problem of defining our road in politics. By pointing out the division between bureaucratic and productive co-operations in the middle class, and the lack of productive independence on the part of the pure working class, the survey that follows may roughly indicate the limits of political action open to us. In any case, it is only with the aid of surveys of this type that effective courses of political resistance can be set.

I.—The Clash in Power

The actions of the class in power are most fully recorded, and we can see how their actions gradually changed. The very change from competitive to monopoly pricing and concentration of economic control derives from the continued carrying out by business men of their pattern of acquisitive competitive profit-making. As business men followed this pattern it was unavoidable that that accumulation of capital should result. And as they continued in this pattern, under the changed "conditions of doing business" which accumulation yielded, it was unavoidable that ever greater accumulations should result and that institutional patterns should change as well (e.g., the separation of ownership and control in business corporations). Through it all, business people have acted in the way which their culture set for them as the only way to act, and that was taken as natural and right by almost everyone else; to get maximum profits from employing workers and selling articles and to maintain their position of social control in one way or another.

II.—The Bidders for Power

If we leave out the office and store clerks, and the other lower middle class occupations which do not differ from the broad working class in social power, income, and opportunity, we find the major remnants of the middle class in a group of occupations which form the last stronghold of fluid class lines and of the opportunity to rise. These include chiefly: the persons with technical or scientific training; the managers, who make major decisions on production (within the limits set by considerations of profitability), and maintain the present relations between the classes (by guarding the power and *status quo* income of the business man, by controlling the workers, etc.); and the intellectuals, the writers, artists, and the like, who express not only themselves, but also many others of their generation, and who are therefore able to represent an in a way influence large numbers of people.

The type of work these people do, and the opportunities for extension of their work or of its importance which are inherent in the increasing scale of capitalist production, has given rise to various dissatisfactions with capitalist social

ations. These are often aimed at the planlessness of capitalism, the inefficiency evidenced both in poverty amidst plenty and in the non-utilization of present scientific knowledge, the dog-eat-dog character of this society, the lack of personal freedom, the insufficient importance in society of their own occupation or type of training. Some of these dissatisfactions can be met within the social-economic relations of a profit-making ruling class; and those who are disturbed primarily by their own exclusion from the most privileged groups can do their best to rise into them. This group included many of the New Dealers who want planned economy at home with continuation of private property and profitability, and who support the inter-economy competition from profit-maximization leading to world wars.

More important, however, for the present discussion, are the dissatisfactions that imply rejection of competitive profit-making. (E.g., the resentments against planlessness, production inefficiency, and even the lack of human fraternity in this society.) Two aspects of these attitudes are of interest to us here: First, they conform with the direction in which the patterns of action of the business class are being gradually changed, and would make possible a greater utilization of natural resources than the present capitalist patterns permit with the same technological knowledge. Second, these attitudes do not, for the most part, require an egalitarian social structure: they could be satisfied by an efficiently operated bureaucracy. It is quite important, though hardly surprising, that the class which can conduct a bureaucracy expresses ideals which could be satisfied by that very social structure.

Persons committed to these dissatisfactions may feel themselves sincerely anti-capitalist, but there are several lines of action opened to them. 1) They may compete for control of the government apparatus, with the aid of those sections of big business which are prepared to accept a more planned economy, with a more direct government-business interlock—a development which may well take place in some of the western capitalisms. (2) They may seek power with support from parts of the ruling class (those with most to gain from immediate State centralization) and parts of the working or lower middle class (those having certain occupational or personality features). Such are, for example, the left-wing fascist leaders. (3) These middle-class anti-capitalists may form a "popular-front" with working class people. The ideology of such class collaboration would express the common anti-capitalism of both groups, but would not contain a fundamental opposition to all class rule and to structural inequality. This type of middle class-working-class co-operation, leading essentially to the establishment of a new class rule, would make use of such capitalist-class techniques as appeals to authority and prestige, adventurism, and so on. (The leadership-ridden and more manipulatory leftist parties are examples of this development. Somewhat similar to this would be the Soviet bureaucracy, which rose to power by mediating between the peasants and the industrial workers.) These middle class groups may themselves split up on

occupational lines. The managerial elements will probably side with the more far-sighted sector of the ruling class. Many people from the more technological occupations, on the other hand, may find themselves occupationally moving closer to the working class. It is already clear that numbers of skilled technicians in industry will greatly increase in the coming period, with the growing intricacy of production techniques.

The development of a large technician group is only beginning. However, so important a role do they play in production that we present here a series of tentative hypotheses concerning the possible relation of parts of the technician group with the working class. Clearly, the whole field requires considerable investigation. By technicians we mean the whole range of occupations, other than simple machine-tending, which are necessary for modern production technology. It is assumed that in relation to degree of control over their work these occupations may range in status from one similar to that of skilled workers up to the top-managerial status of the Vice-President in charge of production. We further assume that a great many of the productionally necessary technicians will occupy the lower statuses. To distinguish the technicians from the managers (the latter including, for example, advertisers, social workers, sales and personnel managers), we may say that the managers are those who deal primarily with people, while the technicians' work is primarily with material and machines.

In the coming development of our society, the bulk of technical people may well find themselves political allies of the workers, unable to grow into a new ruling class by themselves, but able to make common cause with the working masses, with comparable objections to capitalist-managerial bureaucracy and with comparable ideology for a future society. But such collaboration cannot seriously develop on the basis of self-sacrificing idealism. It will not develop from the scientists whose hearts bleed for the poor worker, but from those whose defence of their occupational and individual interests makes allies of the workers. It is therefore pointless, for example, to blame scientists for working on the atomic bomb, since before the governmental restrictions appeared the physicists had no occupational reason for refusing to work on it. Occupational groups or economic classes are not known to have deviated from their accepted ways and work in society for the sake of some other group of humanity. The accepted ways may make them act for their own good, or in the interest of the ruling class (with whose interests the culture generally conforms); the deviations are primarily for their own economic advantage and security of life. These deviations occur when their security and well being come into conflict with business needs, as is now occurring in the case of the atomic scientists. The importance of the atom bomb in relation to the scientists' social situation is not that they heinously agreed to work on it, but that they have now been subjected to greater occupational control and deprivation by the ruling class.

The position of many people in the technical occupations is in certain re-

spects similar to that of the working class. Technicians are directly involved in the productive process; most of them have little administrative or coercive power over other workers (only a few participate in business management); their share in the goods of society, while more than that of the workers, is hardly enough to engender, in most of them, any great affection for the ruling classes.

If with the coming technological changes, the occupational status of many technicians becomes fairly similar to that of the workers, such a situation would probably be reflected in a growing coincidence of social attitudes in the two groups, and could be experimentally determined. If such a merging does occur, then a crucial requirement for the eventual classless organization of society will have been met. This is a technological requirement.

It means that there is a fundamental material agreement between the two groups necessary for the operation of the production technology. However, we have still to consider the social-relations requirements. How would a society dominated by these groups be administered?

If the interpersonal relations of status, coercive authority, and so on are the necessary concomitants of modern technology, then the technology itself precludes an egalitarian society; and the various totalitarian State arrangements appear inseparable. Given such an assumption, the only way to avoid totalitarianism would be the liquidation of modern production technique. Back to handicraft, if not to roots-and-berries. Such an approach is found in much of the current popular and even scholarly treatment of the subject of bureaucracy. All such discussion is based upon a fundamental methodological error. Two elements of social organizations are confused: a technical aspect, making and implementing decisions; and a social-relational aspect, the kind of relations among the persons involved. The same production output may be achieved with various kinds of social relations among the persons involved.

III.—THE WORKING CLASS

We now consider some patterns of action of the bulk of the populace, the people who can have no thought of rising appreciably or of playing a leading part in present-day society. Despite differences between various occupational groups within the working class, the bulk of them have been similarly affected by many technological and social changes: the grouping into large production units; the struggle against powerful employers who control much of society, instead of against the individual small boss of early industrial capitalism; the emergence of the government as mass employer or agent of the giant employers. Under these changing conditions significant developments may be seen in working class action; the commonness of mass-strikes; techniques such as the sit-down; managerial types of demands such as the U.A.W.'s "look at the books;" and the New York Transport Union's objection to sale of the municipal power plants; the spread of labor and nominally socialist electoral victories in pre-war and post-war Europe.

All developments of this type are, of

course, "within capitalism." Reformists quite miss the point when they hope that such actions can add up to a change of social power. On the other hand, radicals cannot afford to disregard the changes in patterns which are evidenced here, and cannot assume that they reveal nothing about the future political action of the working class. The importance of these economic activities appears only if we analyse the component patterns of action. In these intra-capitalist developments workers are increasingly habituated to mass actions involving almost all the members of an occupation. Working class groups often co-operate with each other, as in sympathy strikes and refusals to cross picket lines. They have shown themselves able to hold out very long for their demands, and they have in many cases paid no heed to the blandishments of "national interest," of church and civic leaders, and of the government. They have shown a widespread resentment of the boss and his class, which is expressed, for example, in industrial sabotage. They reveal many departures from the attitudes which capitalist culture sought to inculcate, including embryonic attitudes against capitalist property relations and the significant lack of enthusiasm for World War II.

The existence of these attitudes and actions is undoubtedly compatible with present-day capitalism. But the elements of which they are made up include, together with their getting-along-in-capitalism techniques, also modes of resistance to the present relations of production. These modes change with the changing of technology and of business patterns, and one task of a radical is not to bewail their current insignificance but to note their presence and try to evaluate the degree and direction of their future growth.

In seeking to evaluate their future growth we must first ask why are these patterns of resistance so retarded at present. It is not that the people do not resist, or do not seek better conditions for themselves. The hard-fought strikes and the considerable differences in social attitudes between workers and bosses suffice to reveal the class struggle and incipient consciousness. It is certainly not that people do not overthrow their rulers as long as they have the minimum requisite for biological survival.

We have then a situation wherein the working class expresses considerable resistance to the present relations of production, but does not carry its resistance out to the point of abandoning these relations—relations which are maintained, in the last analysis, because and as long as the great bulk of the people accept them. What are the brakes that slow down resistant actions and keep them within capitalist bounds?

One obstacle is the fact that the working class is not to date in a position to carry out and improve upon modern production by itself. Contrary to the stock expression, objective expressions are not "ripe and rotten ripe" for a working class revolution. Industrial workers cannot produce technicians, so that the social and political relation of the various technical occupations to the working class becomes a question of prime importance.

Conditions which may move technic-

ians toward a working class status are only now developing. Furthermore, at present neither industrial workers nor technicians have the know-how and tentative blue-prints for deciding what to produce and when, under what circumstances to distribute production, and so on. These decisions are now made by business and managerial people, on the basis of a roundabout calculation in which the ultimate determinant is profitability. To make decisions about production without this accepted pattern requires considerable awareness—at least among workers and technicians—of the present patterns, and of the social and technologic considerations on which profitless production decisions could be made. Preliminary steps in this direction may be seen in union discussions with management on matters of production, and in the implications of the U.A.W.'s demand for "a look at the books." We, too, can make production decisions.

The other brake on working class resistance to capitalist conditions is their acceptance of many attitudes, beliefs, and patterns of action which developed out of the long years of business rule, and which the business class tries to foster in all ways. These are the pervasive cultural features of a class society—the absolutist beliefs like religion, the reliance upon leaders and the devaluation of one's own importance in society, the assumption of the naturalness of profit and private ownership of means of production, the open or sneaking admiration for the "captains of industry," and so on. Taking these for granted, or being unready to oppose them as undesirable and partially imposed patterns, deters people from acting consistently and effectively against those features of this society which they are even now ready to oppose. For the subtler and more ideological features of our culture are interrelated with the more obvious and economic features of productional relations. If a worker feels that it is sinful, or if it never occurs to him that he and his fellows could get along without the capitalist government and the whole boss class, his class actions will necessarily be limited: he may strike for better pay, but he will hardly carry out a revolution.

As we have seen, the development of working class action is not only a matter of its relations to production and to the other classes, but also of its rejection of the culture of class rule. It may be expected that working-class dissatisfactions bring about awareness of the contradictions between their practical desires and their accepted beliefs and attitudes, leading to a recognition of the undesirability to them, or the fraudulent character, of these beliefs and attitudes. As such recognition grows, and as the workers (and technicians) rationalize to themselves their broadening opposition to capitalist and bureaucratic relations, it is to be expected that a general breakdown of mutual understanding and sympathy, or an inability to deal with each other as fellow humans, will develop between the anti-*status quo* people and those who support class rule. This situation, such as was developing in pre-War Europe, is the precursor (not necessarily immediate) of a major change in the patterns of social action.

Various acts of the ruling class may affect the growing rejection of class-rule culture and the actions to which such rejection could lead. The effect of wars, State intervention, and revision of early capitalist economic institutions in the direction of State capitalism, cannot be evaluated as yet. They may slow down popular dissatisfactions and the awareness of contradictions; but there is nothing in them that can halt or reverse the process which leads to these dissatisfactions. "The State vs. the Individual" may be a new departure in economic forms—but not fundamentally in patterns of social action. For the State is not an impersonal force operating against people, but rather a special case of interpersonal relations among the people—rulers, workers, etc.—of the country. A government is no more than what the people let it be, or can be forced to accept.

The development of more or less planned ruling class manipulation of culture and personalities may also have some effect. There is no reason, however, to think that such techniques of the Brave New World can actually make people into unreasoning conditioned animals who will never calculate their own material interests. It is not the conditioning that seems improbable, but the effective exclusions of hedonistic reasoning.

Before leaving the subject of the course of class action, notice ought to be taken of a number of possible queries.

The question "why have masses not become socialist?" is answerable in terms of the preceding discussion. The working people are not yet in position to carry out the whole of social production (13); the technicians have not (as yet) been sufficiently separated off from the business managers to become part of a growing resistance, among producers, to the relations of class rule; and the culture of the *status quo* deters incipient resisters from becoming aware of the system of relations and from acting adequately against it. However, the fact that the "masses have not become socialist" is seen to be no proof that they may not; the direction of development gives no cause for black despair.

The failure of the various political parties, too, can not be used as an argument against the development pictured here. True, the parties express opposition to various features of capitalism. But they are not the sole measure of that opposition, for by their very structure and methods they are also part of the present social structure and express its influence: they are built on lines of leadership and authority, contain machines or insider-groups, call on the masses to follow them, and so on. At times when their own development and the conjunction of outside circumstances lead workers to mass action, the workers may act through leftist parties (as they did in Germany in 1919). But when such periods pass many workers pass from the party: quite pragmatically, they may have used the party when they needed an organized vehicle, but they came primarily for the action, not for the resistant expression afforded by the party. During such lulls between periods of activism, the tendency to stay with the party is relatively greater among the theorists, the petit bourgeois,

Various personality groups such as the bureaucratic, and those who get some satisfaction from dividing their life between capitalist occupations and party activities. All this is not to say that the parties are not, in particular historical situations, valuable tools in the class struggle. Parties and political campaigns are a major part of the process which yields political action out of economic conditions. Their work can include such important functions as the winning over of technicians and scientists to working class politics, in periods of depression or of partial proletarianization of technical occupations.

The crushing of the various labor and socialist parties, and their trade unions, in Germany and other fascist countries is also not a contradiction of the development of class struggle. Except in a special case, Nazism was no "victory of the middle class over the working class." If proof were needed, it would almost suffice to point out that the German working class did not fight seriously against it. Part of the German and international ruling class and of the German middle class utilized working class opposition to many capitalist conditions as a basis for gaining considerable mass acceptance (if not support) for changes toward more bureaucratic patterns. There is no denying that the result was a considerable set-back to the masses of the people. There is also no denying that comparable developments, based on corresponding situations, may establish terrible capitalist-managerial bureaucracies elsewhere. But the "fault" is the working class' own unreadiness, and the unreadiness is one that can be, and perhaps is being, decreased along the lines indicated above.

Lastly, even the history of Soviet Russia does not prove the impossibility of calculating the course of the class struggle. It neither makes sense, nor is it necessary, to picture the U.S.S.R. as a glorious workers' State gone sour because of the perfidy of one man or of a clique. The Russian revolution occurred in a country in which peasants were the main producers in an economy of general scarcity, with industrial workers a small, though important second.

Although the particular historical situation made the workers the leaders of the revolution, it was inescapable that the basic economic relations should be determined by the development of the patterns of action of the peasant class as well as by those of the workers. The Russian workers were not tricked by unforeseeable personal or other factors. The development was in fact foreseen, and foreseen on the basis of an analysis of class action essentially similar to the one presented here.

We had previously asked what could make the mass of people want to live in an egalitarian socialist manner. The development of the technology is such as to make possible a sufficiency of material goods. Workers and technical people appear to be developing towards being able to administer and operate such a technology. These, however, are necessary, but hardly sufficient conditions for an egalitarian, socialist society. What about the direction of institutionally patterned behavior?

One of the large gaps in available information on social change is the understanding of how (by what interrela-

tions), and in what precise direction, the institutionally patterned behavior and attitudes of occupational groups are tending. Here is an area where relatively little has been scientifically established. It is known that social attitudes of people vary with their occupational (class) group. And this establishes a relationship between social attitudes and material-technical factors. This entire area of inquiry, requiring the utilization of social-psychological hypotheses and techniques, needs development.

It will now be clear that the whole argument presented here does not claim to answer out of hand all the problems of New Roads in politics. The importance of the science-based formulation is not that it takes a "position" on everything, but that it poses each problem in a way which is manageable, which permits the application of scientific inquiry to discover the relevant regularities. For this purpose we use the available evidence and validated theories, including the basic construction of Marx. We may say that the very conduct of such an inquiry is a necessary political act, for it makes possible intelligent deliberate interventions in the various social processes.

In this brief sketch of recent and possible future developments it was impossible to stop at every sentence and show scientific validation. However, the use of scientific procedure was involved in the very fact that such a survey of class relations is gone through before we proceed to ask what political action is available to us to-day. The survey which has just been completed here began with statements about an explicitly selected set of categories: the classes in relation to the means of production. These statements were presented as summaries of evidence, although the date could not be shown here, and could hardly be referred to. Regularities appearing from these statements were then sought. And the conclusions about political action which will now be offered will derive from a consideration of these regularities of class action.

In what follows we discuss the criteria for individual action. We do not ask here what organizational structures would be effective for what realm of this action. Such further questions, e.g., what kind of parties and groups are effective in what situations, would have to be derived from a refinement of our knowledge about class action.

(To be concluded in next issue)

YOU CANNOT FIND THESE REPORTS ANYWHERE ELSE.

Four eye-witness, on-the-spot statements on Soviet Russia by non-professional observers (workers, camp inmates, etc.):

1. *How the Soviet Lower Class Worked, Lived, and What the Russian Laborer Thought in 1945-1946.*
2. *Talks With Russian Prisoners in France.*
3. *Labor and Concentration Camps in U.S.S.R.*
4. *I Was Liberated by the Russian Troops.*

A blunt, objective analysis of world political situation: SOVIET ENIGMA. Five Statements for \$1. Write to NEW VIEWS, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York, 17, N.Y., U.S.A.

WILL IT BE AU-REVOIR?

With this issue the *Southern Socialist International Digest* faces a financial crisis. Funds are no longer available to meet current expenses. The deficit on each issue being over £20, which, together with the failure to contact a young, vigorous Socialist to accept the position of manager, and so relieve J. A. Dawson, whose health is breaking down through overwork, makes the position serious.

Unless we can increase our paid subscriptions to a number that will bear some fair portion of the cost of publication (at present paid subscriptions only total one-tenth of the number of copies mailed) we will not be able to surmount our difficulties.

Please, readers, send us a paid subscription and get subs. from your friends and fellow-workers.

In the meantime we will gladly receive Donations towards Cost of Printing.

NECESSARY READING

The Russian State Party Newsletter on Contemporary Communism.

Published by Ruth Fischer, 319 West 80 Street, New York, 24, N.Y., U.S.A.

Readers in Britain can now subscribe to *The Russian State Party* by notifying the above and sending remittance of 15/- for one year to—

Mr. Heinrich Jakubowicz,
3-6 Northwood Hall,

London, N.6, England.

Freedom, fortnightly, 6/- per year, posted, from the Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1, England.

Direct Action, monthly, 2d., 2/6 for one year, posted, from Ken. Hawkes, 15 Parliament Hill, London, N.W.3.

Socialist Standard, monthly, organ of S.P.G.B., 4/- for one year, posted, from Rugby Chambers, Rugby Street, London, W.C.1, England.

Western Socialist, monthly, 5 cents, organ of Workers' Socialist Party of U.S., fifteen issues for \$1, posted, from 27 Dock Square, Boston 8, Mass., U.S.A.

Socialist Comment, monthly, organ of S.P. of Australia, posted, 2/6 per year, from P.O. Box 1440M., Melbourne, Australia.

Weekly People, organ of Socialist Labor Party of U.S., \$2 per year, posted. Published by Labor News Co., 61 Cliff Street, New York 8, N.Y., U.S.A.

Socialist Press, monthly, organ of S.L.P. of Canada, 50 cents for one year. 2 College Street, Toronto 2, Ont., Canada.

Socialist Leader, weekly, organ of I.L.P., 10/6 for one year, from 318 Regent's Road, Finchley, London, N.3, England.

The Industrial Worker, official organ of I.W.W., U.S.A., 5 cents a copy, \$2.50 a year, posted.

2422 N. Halstead St., Chicago, 14, U.S.A. Broken Hill agent, handles also *Southern Socialist International Digest*: S. Brooks, 210 Cornish Street, Railway Town, Broken Hill

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRINTING COSTS

All contributions received up to going to press this issue were acknowledged in No. 28, dated February 1, 1947.

PRINTED IN AUSTRALIA

by Excelsior Printing Works, 634 Burwood Road, Hawthorn East.