

Living Marxism

AGAINST THE STREAM

Future of Unemployment

**PLANNING NEW
DEPRESSIONS**

The "Right To Work"

Marxism and Psychology

REVIEWS

1

Fifteen Cents

International Council Correspondence

LIVING MARXISM

Vol. IV.

FEBRUARY 1938

No. 1

Annual Subscription \$1.50 Address:

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE,

P. O. Box 5343,

Chicago, Illinois.

This magazine consciously opposes all forms of sectarianism. The sectarian confuses the interest of his group, whether it is a party or a union, with the interest of the class. It is our purpose to discover the actual proletarian tendencies in their backward organizational and theoretical forms; to effect a discussion of them beyond the boundaries of their organizations and the current dogmatics; to facilitate their fusion into unified action; and thus to help them achieve real significance.

The unsigned articles express the views of the publishers.

Against the Stream

THIS magazine shall express the critical thoughts and the radical actions the workers of America will be compelled to engage in. We know the arguments against such an intention. We know that today there seems to be a strong objection if not a positive animosity against thinking and theory as such. This objection is not limited to the rulers of our society who are afraid of the revolutionary activity connected with critical thinking. On the part of the ruled we find the unconscious fear that theoretical thought would reveal as erroneous and superfluous their painfully acquired adaptation to reality.

This trend toward irrationalism—which is only the other side of a blind admiration for meaningless facts—is the expression of our present conditions of production. The economic development of our time emerges from a society of independent proprietors of the means of production who were in immediate competition with each other, to an organization of industrial and political cliques of leaders more and more excluding all “peaceful” forms of competition economically and politically, internationally and nationally. Instead of an authority masked by the fetishes of law and agreement, open force imposing willing obedience increasingly characterize the social and economic relations. Typical of this stage of society is the man who acknowledges everything that serves the established power. At the top is the one who is ready to strike and the one at the bottom will be kicked when he falls.

With the constriction of the circle of the real rulers, the possibility of the conscious production of ideologies sets in and the establishing of a double truth by which the **knowledge** is reserved for the insiders and the **version** is made up for the

people. Cynicism towards truth and thinking spreads. The individual, once over-rated and upholstered by bourgeois philosophy, becomes suspect. His "freedom of thought" independence is ended. He is no longer supposed to think and is replaced by the illusions of the various "organic" collectivism. The rhetoric "we" echoes only creeds fabricated by the bureaucracies dominating economy and state. Bourgeois equality becomes a negative equality before the power which does not recognize any differentiations. The emphasized equal opportunity to develop according to one's abilities degenerates into an equal submission in which the abilities of all are sacrificed. The more the spotlight of propaganda lights up the leaders above, the less can we pierce through the uniform and ever-growing darkness engulfing those who are "led".

In this darkness the preservation and reproduction of society are realized. Here, in the process of production, the workers experience the discrepancy between a labor which supplies them with the mightiest means of controlling nature and the renewal of an outworn social organization under new labels which makes them more miserable and helpless than before. The workers experience that unemployment, economic crises, preparation for war, terroristic governments—all the present conditions which harass the mass of producers—are due not to a lack of technical possibilities, but to the social organization under which production functions. The workers therefore perceive daily the need for a rational solution of these contradictions. Because of their situation in production, they feel and recognize more than any other social group, the senselessness and emptiness of the official beliefs delivered to them. The conditions under which they are compelled to work imply that a meaningful human existence cannot be built on collectivistic phrases and empty creeds but only on an adequate and transparent relationship between the producers and society. The rationality of this relationship which is the task of a new social order, can alone give meaning to their work.

But the situation of the workers in this society by no means guarantees their conscious grasping of these implications. On the surface the world also appears to the proletarians just as the propaganda apparatus paints it. Those workers who have reached a conscious understanding of the needs of their situation must thus be able to pose their real interests against society as a whole, and even against the apparent ideologies of their own fellow workers. If they permitted these ideologies of the masses to determine their thoughts they would themselves become slavishly dependent on the existing set-up. Their criticism must be aggressive not only against the conscious apologists of the monopolistic disorder but also against the diverting conformistic or utopian tendencies of the rank and file.

Our next purpose will therefore be to gain the attention of those workers who are resolved to swim against the stream. We know the stream still flows with the Lewises, Greens and the leaders of a so-called People's Front and will merge in the grand parade of the next war for the defence of the business interests of our own and other exploiters, for the defence of all possible interests but the interest of the working class. All over this country are thousands of workers, toiling on products for a war they despise, acting in organizations in which they really don't believe or as functionaries of unions they hate. They all see the coming of a second edition of American "war-socialism". These workers feel the need for a critical orientation about the conditions of their class. We want to meet their needs and in this sense conceive the function of the magazine.

Out of the interrelationships between the readers and writers of this magazine — and as many readers as possible should also write for it—there should develop an organization of workers who act consciously in accordance with their class interests. We do not presuppose any traditional form for this organization. It should develop its structure solely according to the needs of the fight under the totally changing conditions. Neither do we presuppose a ready-made program. The unity of the organization growing around the magazine will not consist in an agreement on some programmatic sentences—which under present transitional conditions, would mean only that the doors would be closed, or in other words, that another sect would be created—but in the attainment of a common critical level related to certain common forms of action.

Only a prime willingness to face reality, the readiness to see and to learn, can secure success for our purpose. This does not imply that the essential experiences of the past movements have lost their value. They contain elements whose significance surpasses their hitherto achieved results. But they must be applied under new conditions. They must be developed further, practically and theoretically, under these changed conditions or as Lenin remarks somewhere: "The true kernel, the living soul of Marxism is the inquiry into the real situation."

However, this concrete inquiry on which the emphasis of the magazine will be placed is possible only on the basis of certain fundamental considerations which must direct our work. The first issues will therefore present some of these critical principles. They will be developed in connection with such urgent questions as the role of politics in class war, modern attempts toward a reorientation of the class struggle theory, the significance of unemployment and the possibilities of economic planning. We think these articles will show how we conceive the task of the critical theory and thus the function of "Living Marxism".

The Future of Unemployment

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE LABOR MARKET

☉ O the present economic system, unemployment is a necessity. It is capital's answer to the 'automatic' law of supply and demand in regard to labor power, providing an ever ready industrial reserve army needed for the sudden leaps of the capitalist expansion process. As far as unemployment serves these purposes it is welcome to capital. For the workers, however, the 'problem' simply means misery.

Should there be at any time in a particular country a shortage of 'hands', capital will see to it that this situation is relieved by all possible means of attracting workers and increasing the population. However, in times of depression the desire for abundant labor does not exclude the wish to reduce the unemployed army in order to ease the relief burden. To deport 'foreign' workers, or to drive former peasants back to the farms, is not inconsistent with the desire to see many begging for one job; it is simply an attempted 'saving', the greatest virtue in present-day society. The existing mobility of labor, rising from the fact that workers are free of all property, and from the simplification of many labor processes and the development of transportation, allows such double-faced policies, which in this country, under the name of Americanism, are widely appreciated not only by the 'native stock', but also by organized labor, which prides itself on its share in the passing of certain immigration-restriction laws to combat cheap foreign labor and to safeguard the American standard of living.

It is true that a shortage of workers makes it rather difficult for the capitalists to pay the lowest possible wages. However, should these lowest possible wages be the only guarantee for the maintenance of capitalism, no labor shortage would prevent their introduction. Under unprofitable conditions bankruptcies of some capitalists would throw workers on the streets, and this in return would lower the wages of the workers still employed. The law of supply and demand, whatever its function, ceases to have any meaning in regard to labor power when threatening the profitability of capital necessary for its continuation.

From a profit point of view a labor shortage may also be warded off through the introduction of more efficient means and methods of production; that is, a sufficient increase in exploitation may offset the danger of a rigid wage standard. The relatively high wages of some American workers are rendered pos-

sible by the extremely high productivity of these workers. The exploitation is here increased not by way of taking actual commodities from the workers, but by making them increase their output. This method of maintaining or even raising the 'living standard' of the workers presupposes the existence of sufficient capital to make the necessary social and technological changes possible.

Capital concentration, credits, and foreign loans often permit the introduction of better means of production without a direct increase of exploitation, which might be difficult because of insufficient unemployment. However, the displacement of workers, connected therewith, creates unemployment, which then brings back a certain wage flexibility; unless accumulation proceeds so fast that the displaced workers are at once absorbed in new industries.

A shortage of workers, the ideal of all trade-unionists, leads under capitalism inevitably to unemployment, and it is not the law of supply and demand which finally determines the wage rates. That means also that the 'defeat' of this law by way of trade-unions, conceived as 'job trusts', turns out to be an illusion in regard to final realities. Wage limits are not to be found in the realm of the market. It is true, we repeat, that if there are too many workers asking for jobs, capital can force the wages lower than would be necessary to maintain the system. It gets extra profits besides the necessary ones, thus enabling faster accumulation. The struggle of trade-unions can be concerned only with extra profits and is bound thereby to periods which allow of such extra profits. No scarcity of labor and no trade-union activity can result in wages which would eliminate the profitability of capital. For this reason trade-unions will not of their own accord enter a wage struggle at times which preclude a possible success, that is, times in which a wage struggle becomes a struggle against the wage system. For as John L. Lewis has pointed out recently:

"Unionization presupposes the relation of employment; it is based upon the wage system and it recognizes fully and unreservedly the institution of private property and the right to investment profit."

To increase or maintain wages, reducing the profits to the exclusion of accumulation, means depression and unemployment. An organized or unorganized scarcity of workers must sooner or later cause unemployment and restriction of trade-union activity. From which it follows that if workers think all evil comes from the fact that too many people are asking for jobs, they are in error. If they hope, as many do, that measures like the expulsion of foreigners, the restriction of immigration, the return of the women to the kitchen or the abolition of child labor would solve their problems, they are mistaken. Apart from the fact that all laws related to questions of labor supply are made in a capitalist society, and therefore in favor of capital, even the acceptance of policies forcing the above mentioned

restrictions on the 'right to work', would mean only a temporary service to capital, without any benefit whatsoever to the workers. Practically it would mean relief savings and the nourishing of such ideologies as distract the workers from the real source of their misery.

The scarcity of workers in some branches of industry may often lead to higher wages than would be the case otherwise. Monopolistic positions often allow of extra profits and therefore of exceptional wages. But these monopolistic extra profits are largely obtained through the robbing of weaker capitalists, forcing the latter to employ cruder means of exploitation. In this way exceptionally high wages for some workers find their parallel in exceptionally low wages for others, just as profits above the average necessitate profits below the average. For this reason William Green, for instance, refuses to "digest" the whole of the C. I. O. offered to him, and would feel satisfied with an additional million of organized workers. An organized minority of workers attempts to maintain its high wages at the cost of the working majority. The social average wage, however, moves within the limits of capital necessities. Never could wages rise, with or without unemployment, where they would reduce profits to the danger point. But, unfortunately for capital wages too cannot be reduced, with or without unemployment, to a point where this would exclude the necessary productivity on the part of the workers. Wage reductions doing away with a necessary efficiency in production are self-defeating. In a depression, for example, due to the fact that the workers are willing to endure greater miseries to hold their jobs, and as the less efficient workers are fired first, the average productivity will be raised. After a while the situation will be reversed, as the productive apparatus deteriorates and wage reductions make it increasingly difficult to maintain high-speed production. In the **Brookings Institution's** analysis of the "Recovery Problem in the United States" (p. 167) it is stated:

"During the first two years of the depression productivity ran according to expected behavior. The index rose in 1930 and again in 1931. However, instead of continuing to rise as the depression progressed, productivity fell sharply in 1932 and then again in 1934. This downward movement in the productivity index is not contradictory to the experience in previous depressions. It simply indicates that the factors favorable to increased productivity per man-hour cannot be depended upon to operate when the depression lasts for a long time, for then the adverse forces become strong enough to offset the gains."

It is true that an abundance of workers will induce many individual capitalists to ruin their workers physically in a short time and to replace the outworn with new ones from the overcrowded labor market. Just as many slave-owners had found it more profitable and more to their taste to work their negroes to death within a seven-year period rather than stretch their exploitability over 30 or 40 years. But under modern conditions this is not generally possible without inviting revolution. The

complexity of present-day society and its production mechanism excludes such simple solutions. And then — even granting the possibility of such solutions — it would solve nothing for capitalism, because it is not a reduction, but an increase in the army of labor that capitalism requires for its further welfare and progress.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ACCUMULATION

To anticipate the future of unemployment it is necessary to investigate the past and the present employment relations. So far, capitalist economists have contributed very little to the understanding of this admittedly most urgent problem. Only lately the force of necessity has led to some investigations which, however, were restricted to the field of statistics, without adequate theoretical support. Economists learned to think in psychological terms. The cry for exactness pertained only to the home, the bank, and the factory. The problem was how to make money, and its investigators saw in their researches only another way of making a living for themselves. As Hitler is held responsible for Nazi-Germany and as it is believed that the present depression belongs to Roosevelt as the previous one to Hoover, so the economic development and its changing aspects were to be discovered in the changing moods of the business leaders. At the bottom of everything was the mentality of the financial wizard, the ingenuity of the industrial pioneer — and sometimes their disappointment in the governments or the world at large, which caused them "to go on strike" as H. L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, laments today over the radio. Other economic schools investigate the institution of exploitation in a more "scientific" manner, by abstracting from such secondary influences as psychology. But their 'realism', manifested in their sense for abstractions, goes so far as to overlook exploitation in an exploitative society. It may be said that the greatest discovery of modern economics was the recognition of the wisdom to discover nothing. This caused still another school to find satisfaction in scholastic elaboration of Adam Smith's position on capitalism of about 200 years ago. The more realistic capitalist practice becomes, the more mystified become the concepts related to this practice. The more open and cruder the exploitation, the more 'socialism' enters the phraseology, till one comes to believe with Spengler that a starving worker is a luxury animal, and that in reality the workers exploit the capitalists, as was not so long ago proved by the honored scientist Kotany. Unfortunately he died too soon to see himself fully appreciated, as it is only now that the need to explain starving as a symptom of overfeeding becomes really urgent, especially in such progressive countries as Russia. However, the employment of science for the needs of capital is imperfect like everything else. The scientists can not always escape the discovery of certain truths, though the truth has different meanings for workers and

capitalists. Facts produced by bourgeois scientists may very well enrich the theory and practice of the proletarian class struggle.

Capitalism developed within feudal-agricultural conditions. A small capital means a small number of workers. To exploit more workers, capital must be increased. For this reason capitalist exploitation was particularly ruthless at its starting point. To exploit additional workers, for which capital is needed, always implies greater exploitation of the already existing working population. As capital grows, transforming all social activity into capitalist activity, the modern proletariat develops with modern industry. Accumulation of capital means an increasing working population. Exploitability also grows. Earlier crude forms of exploitation are replaced by more refined and more efficient ones. The primitiveness of exploitation can not only be dispensed with; it has to disappear, for capital development needs greater ability on the part of the workers for the modern requirements of industry.

Capitalist development is identical with the creation of world economy. All capitalist activity is based on expansion. Whenever expansion slackens, the products of the previous production period, which includes the increased labor army, become temporarily unusable. A stoppage of accumulation means that it is no longer possible to exploit the increased working population. More capital is necessary to continue accumulation, the needed capital must be raised through intensified exploitation. If capital fails to bring this about, the unemployed army must become permanent.

Unemployment is as old as capitalism. But so far, that is, until 1929, each depression with its large-scale unemployment, was followed by a renewal of accumulation. As life is tears and laughter, so also society "naturally" was made up of booms and depressions. Since the biblical Joseph, people had learned to understand that seven fat years are followed by seven lean years. And as regards those unfortunates falling by the wayside in the course of depressions, this also was only natural, as it is obvious that not all trees bear fruits.

To exploit more workers, we said, it is necessary to exploit a given number more intensively to create the capital for the employment of the additional workers. As long as exploitation can be increased, the number of workers may be enlarged. So far this process has been interrupted, but not ended by depressions, which were to be regarded as breathing spells in the exciting race of capital production over the world. But nothing breathes forever. The business cycle is not made for eternity. The reasons for the eventual end of capitalism must therefore be discoverable at any particular stage of its development.

Profits and capital are nothing but unpaid labor power. Labor power is to be measured in labor time, which is limited as

regards duration by nature as well as by forms and methods of production. The workers cannot possibly work longer than 24 hours a day, for the day cannot be stretched. Under present conditions in the more important branches of industry they cannot continuously work much longer than, say, 8 or 10 hours. If production itself limits exploitation in regard to time, an increase of exploitation can be brought about only by reducing that part of the expended working time in which the laborer creates the equivalent of his wages. This part of the working time cannot be reduced to nothing; zero would mean here the absolute end of capitalist production. To employ more workers, necessitating an increase of capital, implies the reduction of that part of the working time of the employed workers in which they create their own livelihood, that is, implies an ever greater increase in the productivity of their labor, which in turn presupposes more and more capital invested in means of production. As long as this is possible—and it has been, for at a certain period in the development of capital, profitability is high enough to permit this—both will be increased (the labor army and capital which employs it) though the latter increases faster than the laboring population. P. H. Douglas produces in his "Theory of Wages" (p. 129) a table showing the ratio between quantities of labor and capital. We copy only a few lines to illustrate our statement.

Year	Relation of Labor to Capital	Relation of Capital to Labor
	$\frac{L}{C}$	$\frac{C}{L}$
1899	1.00	1.00
1905	.84	1.19
1910	.69	1.45
1915	.58	1.72
1922	.37	2.70

This shows, Douglas writes,

"that a decreasing amount of labor was combined with each unit of capital and reciprocally that an increasing quantity of capital was united with each unit of labor. This process continued throughout the period save for some cyclical changes, until in 1922 only 37 per cent as much labor was combined with each unit of capital as in 1899, and reciprocally 270 per cent as much capital was combined with a unit of labor as then.

Any newspaper almanac will show that throughout capitalist development the labor army increased tremendously, even faster than the population as a whole. But, to repeat, not so fast as capital. This is the secret of capitalist progress,—the ability to exploit more and more workers by exploiting the original number more intensively. However, this situation implies a new contradiction.

Profits and new capital can be gained only through exploitation. If the number of workers becomes smaller in relation

to the growing capital, although both are increasing, than in relation to the total capital (the wage and the investment capital together), profits and funds for accumulation must decline, as profits are only unpaid labor time which decreases with the capital increase. The faster the accumulation the more it hampers future accumulation. Finally accumulation must lead to stagnation. It must come to a stop when the capital needed to employ sufficient additional workers to counteract the previous decline in profits demands an amount of capital which can no longer be created by the existing army of labor. All attempts to overcome this shortage of profits in regard to continuation of capital formation will then lead to an ever greater replacement of workers by machinery, although this increase in technological devices will not be sufficient to permit sufficient capital formation. The previous relative displacement of workers now becomes absolute. David Weintraub, without being a Marxist or employing Marx's method of inquiry, but by simply examining the facts, describes such an actual situation quite well in his article in "Technological Trends and National Policy" (p. 87):

"The growth in total output from 1920 to 1929 was not sufficient, in the light of the increased productivity and the growth of labor supply, to absorb all the available man-power; the result was a substantial volume of unemployment during this entire period."

During this entire period, compared with previous periods, the rate of accumulation was slackening. Recent investigations of the trend of American rates of profit led to the discovery that with the rates of profit the rate of accumulation was declining as compared with the rates before 1920. The tendency toward stagnation was reflected long before 1929 in an increasing army of unemployed. The exceptional became the norm. The recovery since 1933 has not led to a return of the already precarious position of 1929, least of all in the field of employment. Weintraub goes on to say:

"...we must look to a much more rapid expansion of production than has taken place between 1933 and 1935 before we can expect a return either to the employment or to the unemployment levels of the pre-depression period. A rough calculation indicates that, in order for unemployment to drop to the 1929 level by 1937, goods and services produced would have to reach a point 20 per cent higher than that in 1929, even if the productivity level of 1935 remained unchanged."

The **Brookings Institution** has estimated that for the nation to return by 1941 to the living standard which prevailed in 1929 it will be necessary to increase production of durable goods 60 per cent above the 1936 level. The production of these durable goods would furnish employment for from 8 to 9 million additional workers for a period of five years. It would, it would; but it doesn't. Before reaching the production level of 1929 a new decline has set in again; the army of unemployed grows by leaps and bounds, nearing again its previous established record at the deepest point of the crisis. In November, 1937,

there were, according to the National Unemployment Census, 10,870,000 people out of work in America. Since then, according to most of the published reports, this number has been increased by about 2 more millions, and no one dares to predict a change in this situation for the near future.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE UNEMPLOYED

Only periods of capitalist expansion are boom periods. Stagnation means depression. But all capitalist production is based on expansion, and if it stops, commodities designed to satisfy the expansion needs and also the commodity labor power, find no buyers. The depression, although the result of a miserable exploitation system of production, incapable of creating enough goods for humanity because it is incapable of producing sufficient profits for the capitalists, appears to the superficial mind as an overproduction of commodities. The superficial explanation of depressions brings forth similar suggestions for solutions: shortening the working day to employ all workers and increasing mass purchasing power, so that the workers may buy back what they have produced. The proposals sound 'logical' and find acceptance. However, this 'realistic' approach is pure utopianism. For it presupposes an ability on the part of capitalism to initiate socialism, that is, it expresses the wish for capitalist suicide. In reality the shortage of profits in relation to accumulation needs, appearing on the market as over-production of commodities, only sharpens the competitive struggle, which means a greater effort on the part of capital to increase exploitation. If successful, leading to another temporary economic revival, it is accomplished at the cost of the workers. Even if hours are shortened, productivity will be increased fast enough to preclude the employment of additional workers. As far as the increase of mass purchasing power is concerned, the whole history of capitalism shows that this has been possible only so long as production increased faster than wages, and history since 1929 has shown that even this improvement by way of better exploitation has ceased. Since that time wages stagnate or decline in spite of increasing productivity. Competition among the workers sharpens to the point of the development of new class ideologies within the class. Hatred, not solidarity, grows between the lucky ones and those unable to sell themselves, — a situation which is well employed by capital in its competitive struggle, continuing in spite of all monopolization, which after all is only able to prove the sharpening of competition. Just as the competitive struggle of capital turns more and more from the national to the international scene, the sharpening of the workers competitive struggle for the remaining jobs tends more and more to be reflected in the nationalization of their ideologies, in preparation for the coming struggle for power of their respective imperialistic rulers. Who shall live and prosper, the Japanese capitalism or the English? Who

shall work, the Japanese workers or the English? — And so all over the world. If there is no open struggle between capital and labor, there can be only a united front between them both. The "Peoples' Front" movements of today, which includes Fascism, reflect only this reality. So long as the class struggle is only latent and not actual, continuously sharpening, the future of unemployment can only be deduced from the future of capitalism, which points to war and increasing barbarism.

Yes, as matters stand today, the workers might find large-scale employment in the diverse armies; and will accept it, for it is 'better than nothing', just as 25-cent wages in the depression are also 'better than nothing'. And they will kill for less than 25 cents an hour to assist a capitalist reorganization of economy in favor of the strongest competitors, and to bring to themselves, besides the glory, a new wage rate of 15 cents an hour. But the unemployment problem would still be unsolved, or solved only for those who died in the heroic attempt to prove the immutability of capitalism in a changing world.

Capital has once more — so it seems today — to reorganize the world in its own way, that is, by adjusting the number of exploiters to the number of exploitables. "Progress" lies in liquidation. To prepare for this day of 'sudden progress', capital will be human, it will at least try to organize the misery it cannot abolish. It will appear a great leveller, spreading the existing misery over the greatest possible number, itself always excluded. It will regiment and fascize even within the greatest of democracies. The order of war will be practiced in peace; production for destruction climaxing the era of capitalism. The curtain for this act of history will close also millions of hungry eyes.

Once more unemployment is being converted, for capitalism, from a source of income into a nightmare. Becoming rapidly valueless as a means of wage cutting, it becomes an ever greater item of taxation, eating into the diminishing profits. Capital will always try, although with increasing difficulties, to cut down this item of expenditures. Workers, regardless of all other implications of the problem, will be increasingly forced to fight relief reductions. To eliminate relief altogether is not possible, to live like humans on Hopkin's canned beef, which would be rejected by many a Park Avenue dog, is also not possible. The unemployed struggle is bound to increase in spite of all war preparations, though the latter will be hastened the more the internal struggle sharpens. There are further temporary 'solutions' given to capitalism. For instance, a new inflation of credits or money, setting present miseries aside to be reckoned with in the near future. Prices may rise faster than wages, the capitalist will gain as much as the workers lose. Rents collected in depreciated money means the expropriation of the landlord, paper for potatoes ruins agriculture, money in the banks elimi-

nates itself legally, life-savings lead to suicide, etc. The pump may be primed till it spills blood.

A capitalism forced to feed the workers instead of being fed by them has no future. This situation excludes all demands for work. To ask capital for a job is in many cases just as ridiculous as to ask it for a million dollars. Those labor leaders who tell the world and their masters that you, the workers, want work are in reality, only trying to prove to their masters how well they have trained you. These unofficial 'social workers', trying to become official ones, have to prove their ability by proving their total absence of all social understanding. They are not realists, however realistic their proposals may sound, but they are not dreamers either; they are simply engaged in maintaining or securing their chosen profession. There are no jobs to be had, and crying for them does not create any. You will have to **fight** for your very lives. Soon this will be literally true, for soon the only way of making a living will be to learn the trade of dying.

Don't ask for work; simply fight for food, clothing and shelter. Down in Palm Beach the unemployed don't ask for work either; they leave that to their servants. And, by the way, your labor leaders really also don't ask for work. How funny to imagine David Lasser asking for work! Those people are much too important for that sort of thing. If there were work to be had, don't worry, you would get more of it than you could stand. Make demands for your most direct needs, but not demands for yourselves only. Individualism presupposes cash to exert itself. Unless you can show the 'proper authorities' that there is something more behind your demands than a lonely frail voice in the age of the loudspeakers, you will be out of luck. Combine your voice with others. There are relief stations, there are also the streets, and there are the factory gates. Don't wait till some ex-ministers of the **Workers Alliance** have collected enough for a flag and a meeting hall. Your relief station is an excellent starting point for an organization; yes, you can even turn it into an organization. And if you simply must belong to the **Workers Alliance**, at least see to it that it becomes your organization and not Mister Border's vehicle to a job in Washington.

Literature on Unemployment

It should be assumed that the close connection existing between unemployment and the decisive economic problems of society would lead to a most intensive study of the subject whereas as a matter of fact, and precisely because of that connection, it has been much neglected.

As far as the volume of unemployment and the trend of its development are concerned, data may be obtained from the monthly and other publications of the **International Labor Office** in Geneva, and the **U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics**, Washington, D. C. Of the publications dealing with the theoretical aspects of the problem, we can disregard entirely those which deny the displacement of workers by the industrial development of capitalism. Facts

have even forced the apologists of capitalism to admit this displacement, for which they created the concept of "technological unemployment", but as bourgeois economists they are engaged in finding solutions for the problem within capitalism. In connection with the discussions concerning the displacement theory we suggest the reading of Alfred Kaehler's article on "The Problem of Verifying the Theory of Technological Unemployment" in *Social Research* (Vol. II; No. 4).

Workers capable of finding their way through the technical terminology of the specialists may consult **Wladimir Woytinsky's** "The Source of Unemployment" (International Labor Office, Geneva, 1935). This book contains important data but lacks sufficient theoretical insight. **Harry Jerome's** "Mechanization in Industry", a book which also deals with agriculture and mining, was published in 1934 by the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York. It stresses the fact that "technical progress outruns actual practice in capitalism", and makes the profit-necessity responsible for this state of affairs. In the last twenty years many studies have appeared dealing with the displacement question in specific industries. As an example, we only mention here **Isador Lubin's** "The Absorption of the Unemployed by American Industry" (Washington, 1929.)

As far as the white collar workers and the learned professions are concerned we suggest the reading of **Lewis Corey's** "The Crisis of the Middle Class" (Covici-Friede, New York, 1935), and **Walter M. Kotschnig's** "Unemployment in the Learned Professions" (Oxford University Press, 1937). Corey treats his problem from a Marxian point of view, Kotschnig from the standpoint of the bourgeois democratic sociologist. But for the latter, too, economic stagnation limits the expansion of education. His survey is significant for its international scope. The radicalization of the intellectuals working with Fascism or Bolshevism he explains as due to the overcrowding of the universities and the impossibility of finding jobs for the graduates. However, the only solution he offers, is for a better organization of the labor market for the academic professions.

Many books published lately and dealing with what appears to the bourgeois sociologist as the "broader" question of "social security", often contain very interesting chapters on the unemployment problem proper. For instance most of the writings of **Stuart Chase** and also **Maxwell S. Stewart's** "Social Security" (Norton & Co., New York, 1937). The best example of the books in this category is the liberal reformer **P. H. Douglas's** "The Unemployed Problem" which he wrote in collaboration with **Aaron Director**, published in 1931. Unemployment is here admitted as an out-growth of capitalism; however it is believed, that capitalism will be able to solve its problem. The suggested means to this end were later partly practised by Roosevelt's Relief Program. The refutation of this idea is very well expressed in **Lewis Corey's** "The Decline of American Capitalism", in chapter V. Covici-Friede, New York, 1934.)

W. T. Colyer's "Outline History of Unemployment" appeared in 1937 in London (N. C. L. C. Publishing Co.), which, written for workers and from a Marxian point of view says concisely as well as comprehensibly almost all that is necessary for workers to know of this subject.

Recent publications incorporating the unemployment question within general theories are the findings of the **Brookings Institution**, which have appeared under the title "Income and Economic Progress". The connection between unemployment and capital formation is recognized but not understood. The solution proposed lies in the field of greater exploitation despite the underconsumption theory underlying the Brookings report. In chapters 6, 7, and 9 of another Brookings publication, "The Recovery Problem in the United States", the reader may find interesting facts and observations regarding the unemployment question in recent history. **David Weintraub's** contribution "Unemployment and Increased Productivity" in the Government Publication "Technological Trends and National Policy"

(Washington, 1937,) comes very close to an Marxian explanation of Unemployment as it stresses the intimate connection between employment and progressive accumulation. In a certain sense also **J. M. Keynes** in his "General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money" comes closer to the Marxian unemployment—accumulation theory than other bourgeois economists. He maintains that "employment can only increase with an increase in investments". The question of investment is, however, for him primarily dependent on the rate of interest, which means nothing to the Marxist.

On the basis of Keynes argumentation **Joan Robinson** elaborates on the unemployment question in her recent "Introduction to the Theory of Employment" (Macmillan, New York). This book is addressed to the layman. The chief function of the rate of interest, according to her, seems to be "to prevent full employment from ever being attained". Longmans, Green & Co. (New York, 1937) published **R. G. Hawtrey's** "Capital and Employment". In opposition to the ideas presented by Keynes, Hayek, Pigou and others, Hawtrey's explanation of employment is a purely monetary one. The status of the discussion around the employment problem among the bourgeois economists might be obtained through a reading of these books.

For empirical data in relation to types of unemployment, occupational characteristics, etc., workers may consult the publications of the W. P. A. Research Administration as for example "Urban Workers on Relief", Certain state publications, as "Labor and Industry in the Depression", published by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and "Unemployment and Relief in Michigan", by the State Emergency Relief Administration, Michigan, can be recommended, for data and observations pertaining to the American scene and unemployment. However, indispensable for workers interested in the serious study of their problems is **Marx's** "Capital", especially its chapters on the effects of machinery on the workman, and his theory of capital accumulation.

Planning New Depressions

(From the book "Karl Marx" by Karl Korsch to be published this season by Chapman & Hall, Ltd. London, and by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.)

The social organization of labor which is hidden under the apparent value relations of the commodities, is achieved in the bourgeois mode of production without the will and knowledge of the individual commodity producers. Bourgeois "commodity production" is therefore at the same time a private and a social, a regulated and an unregulated (anarchic) production. It seems as if by an undisclosed decree of "God" or "Providence", "Fortune" or "Conjunction" it were laid down beforehand what kinds and what quantities of socially useful things should be produced in every branch of production. But the individual capitalist "producer" learns only after the fact — through the saleable or unsaleable quality of his commodity, through the price vacillations of the market, through bankruptcy and crisis — if and how far he has acted in accordance with that unknown rule, the economic "plan" of capitalistic reason. Bourgeois economists have referred over and over again in poetic metaphors to this inscrutable mystery of their own social ex-

istence. Just as Adam Smith* spoke of an "invisible hand" which leads the individual trader to promote an end which was no part of his intention, so other economists before and after him referred to the "play of free competition" to the "automatism of the market", or to a "law of value" which would apply to movements of production and circulation of commodities in the same way as the law of gravity applies to the movements of physical bodies. In fact, the concept of an entirely automatic regulation of the whole industrial production brought about by the mere exchange of commodities among totally isolated commodity producers on a national and international scale was not more than an abstract "ideal type" even in those earlier periods when it first struck the eyes of the bourgeois classical economists. It was never fully realized in actual capitalistic production.

Nevertheless, there is in bourgeois commodity production an unwritten law which rules the production and exchange of labor products as commodities. But this is by no means an unchangeable law of nature; it is a "social law" which resembles a genuine physical law only in its apparent independence from our conscious volition and purpose. Like any other social rule, it holds good only under definite circumstances and for a specific historical period. In dealing with the "so-called Original Accumulation of Capital", Marx showed what enormous effort was required to give birth to this fundamental law of the modern bourgeois mode of production and the other "eternal" laws connected with it. He exposed a series of more or less forgotten sanguinary and violent acts by which (in real history) the actual foundations of those so-called natural laws were brought into existence. (The expropriation of the workers from their material means of production forms the basis of this process.) Marx has likewise shown in detail that even in completely developed commodity production the "law of value" does not apply in the sure and efficient manner of a genuine natural law or of a generally accepted "providence", but is realized solely by a succession of frictions, vacillations, losses, crises, and breakdowns. He says that "in the haphazard and continually fluctuating relations of exchange between the various products of labor, the labor-time socially necessary for their production forcibly asserts itself as a regulating natural law just as the law of gravity does when the house collapses over our heads."**

With all these deficiencies, the law of value is the only form of social organization of production which exists today and is, indeed, the only kind of social "planning" which conforms to the principles of modern competitive or commodity-producing society. It is an ironical whim of history that just that self-con-

*See "Wealth of Nations", Book IV, Chapter 2.

**See "Capital", Book I, Chapter 1, subsection 4.

tradictory belief in a "consciously planned commodity production" which lies at the bottom of the first utopian schemes of a "National Bank", at which "any member of the community might lodge any kind of produce and take out of it an equal value of whatever it may contain"*** and which was afterwards voiced in various forms by the successive schools of "social reformers", has been adopted today even by the official spokesmen of the bourgeois class. But though this illusion is as old as capitalism itself and obstinately persists in spite of theoretical arguments and in spite of the breakdown of all projects brought forward for its realization, it is unsound both from the orthodox principle of bourgeois economic science and from the materialistic viewpoint of Marxism. It is interesting only as an ideological reflex of the deep-rooted contradictions inherent in the very principle of capitalistic commodity production.

Such differences as exist between the earlier epoch when the progressive Free Traders regarded every "interference" of a state not yet entirely their own — as an oppressive disturbance, and the present phase when even some of the most "orthodox" economists have turned from self-help to state intervention does in no way indicate a gradual conquest of the animal-like "struggle for existence" prevailing among the isolated producers of early bourgeois society by the growing collective reason of all capitalists grouped together and organized in the modern bourgeois "state" and in the more or less authentic institutions of a so-called "public opinion". There is thus only a difference of degree between the early more or less numerous "interventions" (of the early bourgeois state into the "free play of competition") and the increasingly rapid succession of more intrusive measures, by which today everywhere in the old and in the "new", in the fascist and in the still democratically governed capitalistic countries, an apparently new attempt is made to "control", to "correct" or to "steer" the existing economic system. Such measures serve at the utmost to weaken temporarily or even merely to disguise some of the most obstructive results of capitalistic production. Instead of ousting the planlessness resulting from the fetish-form of commodity production, they merely stampede the unique form in which production had been heretofore "planned" within capitalistic society and utterly destroy the only "organization of labor" possible under capitalism.

This increasing destruction of its own foundations is forced upon present-day capitalism by an objective development of its inherent tendencies. It is produced by the ever increasing accumulation of capital, by the growing monopolistic tendencies

***See John Gray: *The Social System, a Treatise on the Principle of Exchange*, 1831, and for a critical refutation: Marx "Critique of Political Economy", 1859.

of the big industrial and financial combines; by the increasing appeal to the state to rescue "the community at large" from the dangers brought about by the impending collapses of hitherto proud and tax evading private enterprises; and by the hyper-ultra-super-dreadnought demands for subsidy raised by the various direct and indirect producers of armaments, encroaching evermore on the field formerly occupied by the activities of the less directly war-producing industries. In trying to escape from the periodical crises which threaten more and more the existence of bourgeois society, and in a desperate attempt to overcome the existing acute crisis of the whole capitalist system, the bourgeoisie is compelled, by continually fresh and deeper "interferences" with the inner laws of its mode of production, and continually greater changes in its own social and political organization, to prepare more violent and more universal crises and, at the same time, to diminish the means of overcoming future crises. In organizing peace it prepares for war.

The futility of any attempt to deal with "competition's waste" within the existing forms of production and distribution becomes even more evident when we proceed from the elementary form of the "commodity" to the further developed form of "the worker transformed into a commodity," or from the general historical character of bourgeois production to its inherent **class character**.

Just as the utopian exchange banks, labor certificates and other endeavors to organize commodity production are repeated in the half-hearted "planning schemes" of the frightened economists and "socially minded" big capitalists today, so the first unwieldy attempts of the insurrectionary workers of Paris to wrest from the "revolutionary" government of 1848 some form of realization of the worker's "right to work", are echoed in the various measures by which the democratic and fascist countries try to overcome the increasing menace of **unemployment** by a more or less compulsory organization of the labor market. And just as in the first case Marxism answered the capitalist "planners" that the only organization of production conformable to commodity production is the law of value, so sober materialistic criticism of the schemes to supplant the glaring insufficiency of the free "labor market" by some form of public regulation must start from the premise that the transformation of the workers into salable commodity is but a necessary complement of that other transformation on which all modern capitalistic production rests both historically and in its actual existence today — the transformation of the workers' tools and products into non-workers' "capital". In fact, there is more apparent than real progress in the new deals offered to the growing numbers of the unemployed by their capitalistic rulers today, as against those now almost forgotten times when the only cure foreseen by the most "philanthropic" spokesmen of the bourgeoisie was the workhouse. Now as then, the final result of the endeavors to ex-

terminate both the old form in which unemployment periodically recurred in the industrial cycle, and the new "structural", "technological", "chronic", form in which it has come to stay, is one or another disguised form of that compulsory service whose real character is revealed in the Labor Camps and Concentration Camps of National Socialist Germany.**** Behind these "normal" remedies offered in times of peace, their stands, as ultima ratio, the mass-employment offered by a new war and already partially anticipated by a hitherto unheard of extension of the direct and indirect armament industries both in the fascist countries and in democratic Britain and the pacifistic U. S. A. The best form of "public works" under capitalist conditions is, indeed, war itself which above all other measures to "create work" has the incomparable advantage that it will never cause an undesirable glut of the market because it destroys the commodities it produces simultaneously with their production and, incidentally, destroys a considerable portion of the "excessive" workers themselves.

The apparent "**Fetish Character of the Commodity**" and, with it, the apparent validity of a fetishistic **Law of Value**, will not disappear, nor will the economic crises and depressions and the various forms of periodical and chronic mass unemployment, wars and civil wars cease to plague the modern "civilized world", till the present mode of commodity production is entirely destroyed and human labor organized in a direct socialistic mode of production. For this, however, as anticipated by Marx in **Capital**, a material groundwork is required, or a set of material conditions which are themselves the spontaneous outgrowth of a long and painful process of development."

The positive importance of all attempts made on the basis of the existing capitalist conditions to create a so-called "**organized capitalism**" lies in another field entirely from that presumed by its ideological promoters — the "planning school" of modern capitalistic economics. The hectic endeavors to supplement the defects of "free" capitalistic commodity production confirm the gravity of those defects and thus inadvertently reveal the fettering character of the existing capitalistic production relations. They put into sharper relief the incongruence between an even more efficient organization of production within the single workshop or private capitalistic trust and the "organic disorganization" prevailing throughout capitalistic production. The futile schemes to keep in "normal" proportions the increasing mass of unemployment and pauperism illustrate once more the capitalistic law of population first enunciated by Fourier and

****See the remarks of Engels in his letter to Bernstein (on page 21 of this journal), which are a prophetic anticipation of the ultimate capitalistic realization of the "right to work" in Nazi prisons, and other forms of unpaid compulsory work.

later scientifically demonstrated by Marx that "within the capitalistic system all methods for raising the social productivity of labor coincide with an extension of the relative surplus population, or the industrial reserve army kept at the disposal of capitalistic industry as a potential supply of labor power for the rapid increases of production in times of prosperity and for the full utilization of the existing capacities of production in war."

There is, furthermore, a considerable difference between the same measures when offered by the capitalists in distress and when thrust upon them by the conscious action of the workers themselves. That difference may, at first, not be a difference in the purely economic contents. Yet it is a difference of social significance. "The right to work, taken in its bourgeois sense", said Marx with reference to the struggles of the Paris workers in 1848," is a contradiction in terms, an impotent pious intention; but behind the right to work there stands the control of capital, and behind the control of capital the appropriation of the means of production by the associated working class, that is, the abolition of wage labor, of capital, and their mutual dependence. Behind the "right to work" stood the insurrection of June."*****

Finally, a few of the new developments which are today featured as achievement of the "planning idea" may serve to work out within the narrow bounds of the capitalistic production-relations some of the formal elements which, after the overthrow of the existing mode of production, will be totally stripped of the residues of their capitalistic origin and thus usefully applied in building up a really cooperative and socialistic commonwealth. For the time being there remains, along with the imperfect social organization of material production in the structure of the present bourgeois society, also the reversed form, in which the social relations of men are now reflected as mere relations of things. There remain unchanged, even in the newest "as good as socialism" models of a planned and steered state-capitalism, and there will remain so long as the products of labor are produced as commodities, all the fetish-categories of bourgeois economics: commodity, money, capital, wage-labor, increasing and decreasing total value of production and of export, profit-making capacity of industries, credits, etc., in short, all that which Marx in his earlier philosophic phase called "human self-alienation", and in his later scientific phase fetishism of commodity production". In spite of appearances such a system of production is not in the last analysis governed by a collective will of the associated workers but by the blind necessities of a fetishistic "Law of Value."

*****See Marx: Class Struggles in France 1848-50.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Translation of a part of Engel's letter to Bernstein, May 23, 1884 (on the occasion of the slogan Bismark threw into the election fight in those days).

"...The "right to work" is a conception invented by Fourier. But in his theory it can be realized only in the phalanstery.* It presupposes, therefore, the acceptance of this form of organization. The Fourierists, peace-loving philistines of the *Democracie Pacifique*, as their paper was called, spread this conception just because of its innocuous sound. As a result of their absolute theoretical unclearness, the Parisian workers took over this slogan. It seemed so practical, so non-utopian, so immediately realizable. The government put it into practice in the only way in which capitalism was able to, in senseless national public works. In the same way, the "right to work" was put into action during the cotton crisis of 1861-4 in Lancashire, England, through municipal public works. And in Germany, it is realized in the hunger and cudgelling working colonies for which the philistine is now enthusiastic. As a separate demand the "right to work" cannot possibly be realized in any other way. The granting of this demand by capitalist society can be accomplished only within its own conditions of existence. If the right to work is demanded from capitalism, it can only be under these specified conditions and thus what is actually being demanded are national public works, work-houses, and worker colonies. Should, however, the slogan be meant as an indirect demand for the overturn of the capitalist mode of production, then, considering the state of the movement today, it represents a cowardly regression, a concession to the "socialist laws"*** — a phrase which can have no other purpose than to make the workers confused and unclear about the tasks which they must strive for and the conditions under which these tasks can alone be achieved..."

*Phalanstery is the name of the self-administering community of production on which Fourier bases his utopian society.

**These are the laws which were then passed under the premiership of Bismark to suppress the socialist movement in Germany.

Marxism and Psychology

IN face of the present defeat of the labor movement all over the world, militant workers feel an increasing need for reorientation. The principles of class struggle are subjected to a radical criticism. We plan to formulate and discuss typical trends of such criticism. The following is a characteristic reflection:

The theory of the old labor movement was rational and objectivistic, but the masses do not act according to their clearly intelligible economic needs. The ideologies and not the economic interests seem to be the determining factor in the minds of the masses. It is only realistic to recognize this fact and to create the propaganda and organizational forms which correspond to this knowledge. An inquiry into the real motives of mass conduct, with the objective of finding instruments to control and to guide this conduct, should therefore become a principal part of every theory of class struggle. Psychology seems to have been

selected to complete and partly replace the "objective" knowledge Marxism has given us.

In spite of their growing influence a consistent theoretical formulation of these views does not yet exist in American radical literature. In Europe, because of the actual experience of fascism, we find many attempts to "complete" the Marxian theory of class struggle by "social psychology". We take the theory of some exponents of the **Freudian School** as representative of this theoretical current, because the arguments they give are, so far, the most clearly and uncompromisingly formulated. Though our criticism will be confined to a specific theory, its conclusions extend to the general problem indicated.

For the theories we will discuss originate in these general reflections. They criticize official Marxism for regarding the development of class struggle as mechanically dependent on "economic necessities", and for not sufficiently considering the importance of the subjective factor in history. It is necessary, writes Wilhelm Reich, one of the founders of the so-called Sex-Pol movement, to recognize the "ideologies as material power". In 1932 at least 30 million Germans wanted socialism, nearly the whole country was anti-capitalistic, yet the victor was fascism, the saviour of capitalism. "This is not a socio-economic problem but one of mass psychology". The "lack of understanding of the psychological factors involved" was one of the chief reasons why the German labor movement organizations were unable to resist fascism (Reuben Osborn). Analytic social psychology is therefore considered "essential to Marxists". It will "raise the quality of revolutionary propaganda and put it on a scientific level".

I.

Analytic social psychology derives its fundamental conceptions and methods from the theory of human consciousness Freud developed as a working basis for his therapy of neuroses.

Freud's genuine discovery concerns the "unconscious". He found that underlying all consciousness is a large part of our mind of which we are unaware under ordinary circumstances. The unconscious contains all kinds of forbidden images and desires. The biological part of personality which expresses itself in the desires, Freud and the greater number of his disciples identify mainly with two drives, one of self-preservation, and the other, a broadly conceived sexual drive, the so-called "libido". Every living being is dominated by the "desire principle." He tends to achieve the maximum satisfaction of his impulses. The desires are irrational and amoral. They are not guided by the objective possibilities of fulfillment and have no conception of what is considered right or wrong in society. The "desire principle" thus clashes with the "reality principle" a conflict which makes it necessary to give up immediate gratification of the impulses in order to avoid pain.

In contrast to the drives for self-preservation which in the main can be delayed only for a relatively short time, the sexual impulses can be considerably postponed. They can be forced also into the unconscious (repression,) or their objectives can be substituted by other objectives on different spheres of reality (sublimation). While the self-preservation impulses need material means for satisfaction, the needs of what Freud calls the libido can be satisfied through the mechanism of sublimation, for instance by phantasy. The ruling class uses this mechanism in order to give the masses the kind of emotional satisfaction which is socially available. The faculty of the impulses to adapt themselves actively and passively to social conditions is the main concern of this socio-psychological theory. The adaptation is achieved by the rational and mainly conscious parts of the mind, which act as a kind of organizer of the personality.

Freud distinguishes a further aspect of the human mind which he calls the "super-ego". This conception is one of the most ambiguous parts of his theory, but because it is considered especially important for our problem, we cannot avoid dealing with it here. Freud designates its function mainly as "moral consciousness and the creator of ideals". The super-ego is regarded as the projection of social authority in the personality, as the introverted external force. The child who grows up in the family encounters the social force in the person of the father. His reason is not developed sufficiently for adaptation; it is not yet able to grasp rationally the possibilities of mastering the hindrances with which its desires conflict. The child erects in himself by identification with the parents an arbitrary authority which he adorns with the attributes of moral power, not subjected to rational judgments. Once the super-ego is established in the child's personality, it will always be projected on the authorities dominating in society. Man will attribute to the authorities the quality of his own super-ego and in this manner will make them inaccessible to rational criticism. Thus he will believe in their wisdom and power in a measure totally independent of their actual qualities. The real or propagandized attributes of the authorities in their turn will determine by the same mechanism the content of the super-ego and become identified with it. Through this process of identification the psychoanalysts explain how religion, the state, leaders and the other social fetishes can have such a tremendous influence. They have the same function in the adult mind the father and mother had in childhood. And, as the helpless child's fear of punishment was the decisive factor in the formation of the super-ego in that period, so the existence of direct social force is the decisive factor in the growth of the super-ego and its identification with social authority. The irrational commands of the super-ego would lose its power, the rational part of the human mind would easily triumph if the physical social force would cease to function.

As the function of the super-ego can be understood only by delving into the life history of the personality, the general structure of personality is, according to Freud, only understandable by an analysis of the development of instinctual life through which it normally proceeds in its adjustment with family and society. This is another phase of Freud's theory which seems rather strange especially in the condensed form presented here. Only a reproduction of the clinical material would make manifest its empiric proof. The rough outlines of how the psychological forces are traced back to the individual's childhood however, are clear enough. The infant first loves itself, then its parents. Freud characterizes its sexual structure in this second period with reference to King Oedipus, who loved and married his mother. After a stage of homosexuality, the development passes into the genital heterosexuality of the normal adult. But the child may not be sufficiently free of the ties to one of the infantile objects of his sexuality. Either his emotions can be **fixated** there, or because of unpleasant experiences in later life may **regress** to one of the earlier emotional states. Most psychoses and abnormal character traits are rooted in the recognition of emotional needs which are not permitted to enter consciousness. They all represent a retreat from reality. The method of psychoanalysis, with its delving into the life history of the patient makes conscious to him the unconscious causes of his neurosis and so helps him overcome it.

Because the main development of the instinctual life takes place in childhood, the research into the psychologic structure of the family is one of the chief purposes of the theories discussed here. The roots of morals and religion in man are reduced to the influences of education. The metaphysical character of morals is thus dissolved. The whole ideology of society is reproduced in the child during its first four or five years. The family is understood as the psychologic agency of society. It is the factory of ideologies.

The various forms of suppressing its emotional drives in the bourgeois family make the infant timid, susceptible to authority and obedient — in a word, it can be educated.

Through the family authoritarian society produces the authoritarian type of mind. It is the result of an incomplete development of emotional life and a weakness of rational power, both due to suppressions in childhood typical of that form of society. The authoritarian attitude is characterized through its different reactions, depending on whether they are directed against a strong or weak individual. If personalities can be roughly divided into two types, of which one is principally aggressive toward those in power and sympathetic to the helpless, and the other is in sympathy with the rulers and aggressive to the oppressed, then the authoritarian type is an obvious representative of the latter. One of its characteristics is to suffer without complaint. But the authoritarian man is ambivalent;

he loves and hates his gods simultaneously and thus often rebels blindly against the existing power. His irrational revolt, however, does not change his emotional structure or the structure of society. It merely substitutes a new authority for the old. The real revolutionary personality, as contrasted to the authoritarian type, is rational and open to reality; in other words, represents the fullgrown adult who is not governed through a combination of fear of punishment and desire for approbation by paternal authority. His heroism lies in the changing of the material world — the heroism of the authoritarian type in submission to destiny.

The more the contradictions in society grow, the blinder and more uncontrollable the social forces become, the more catastrophes as war and unemployment overshadow the life of the individual, — the stronger and more widespread becomes the emotional structure of the authoritarian personality. Its final abolition is conceivable only in the eradication of the planlessness of social life and the creation of a society in which men order their life rationally and actively.

So the findings of the psychoanalysts show that the planlessness in economics produces and is reproduced by men whose psychic structures are also planless. They are bound and subjected to the ruling class through the unconscious and, therefore, uncontrollable emotional forces, and through the irrational power of the conventional creeds they erected in themselves. Only the diminishing of these irrational ties, the increasing of rationality — can strengthen the ability of men to change the social conditions. Only a kind of propaganda and organization takes this into account will be capable of achieving a real revolutionary effect. As long as the masses tolerate a propaganda made up of ideological slogans and revolutionary organizations built on blind loyalty to leaders, the level of class consciousness necessary for a radical change of the ruling order is not attained.

II.

In considering the psychoanalysts' description of the mind of the individual in capitalism, we see that their findings do not oppose the criticism of society given by the Marxian theory. Because a criticism of psychoanalysis itself is not our concern here, we restrict ourselves to a few remarks on this point. There is no doubt that the super-ego hypothesis meets many objections. It is sometimes unclear and inconsistent in Freud's own presentation, but it contributes to the investigation in the psychological problem of authority.

The psycho-genetic conception of man's personality with its dissolution into a bundle of drives and its obvious simplifications of these drives is also open to criticism. These theoretical weaknesses are due to the fact that the basis of clinical observations on which psychoanalysis has been built is too narrow to in-

terpret the complex human and social activities it undertakes to explain. The practical psychiatrist, in drawing his bold generalizations from a constricted field of observations, often simply extends the intellectual attitude he had toward his patient. This is made possible by the conditions of our society which present a picture similar to the abnormal case in psychiatry. This abnormality of society which the Freudians with their method of inquiry find reflected in the individual, is the subject of Marxian analysis.

However, the conclusions of the psychoanalytic theory as we developed them here are not accepted by the overwhelming majority of its adherents. Neither Freud nor most of his disciples maintain these viewpoints. Because they accept bourgeois society as permanent, they do not believe in the possibility of changing the objective force-relationships which, as we explained, are decisive factors for the existence of the emotional structure. They vacillate between a progressive bourgeois attitude of the 19th century and the misanthropic pessimism of modern authoritarian society. Freud himself, as well as many of his most renowned disciples, tends more and more to a nihilistic attitude. This is partly due to the constructive tendency of the psychoanalytic theory which allows numerous intellectual loopholes.

Yet a consistent interpretation of man's emotional structure, on the basis of psychoanalysis, can only lead to a materialistic explanation of the individual in society. Erich Fromm justly criticizes the formalistic parallel Freud draws between the helplessness of the child in the family and the adult in face of social forces. This is not only a parallel but a complicated interconnection. It is not the biological helplessness of the small child which is the decisive factor in its specific need for a definite form of authority, but it is the social helplessness of the adult, determined by his economic situation, which molds the biological helplessness of the child and which thus influences the concrete form of the development of authority in the child. Only if the influences of the economic conditions on the libidinous impulses are sufficiently considered can the mental behavior of the individual be adequately interpreted.

A social psychology which, on this scientific basis, attempts to explain the socially relevant, common psychic structures of individuals in a group must be in accordance with the Marxian interpretation of society. The conformity of its results with the revolutionary criticism of society will not be due only to the general analogy between the neurotic person and our disorganized society. For, the larger the group considered, the more are the common life experiences of its members, from which it explains social behavior, identical with the socio-economic situation which is the subject of the critical theory of society.

In this identity lies the strength of analytic social psychology and its crucial weakness. It is extremely questionable if the

"results" achieved so far by this theory in explaining social behavior are really the outcome of its genuine research. It seems rather that the cart were put before the horse, that it is not social psychology which serves Marxian analysis but the latter which helps our psychology find its concrete conceptions. And in fact, the Marxian critical interpretation of the dehumanized existence of man under capitalism leads to a much more comprehensive understanding of the human traits and relationships which are decisive for the changing of society.

But how far removed has official Marxism become from this practical task! The Marxists and the Marxian psychoanalysts vie with each other in formalistic attempts to prove that the "methods" of their respective "sciences" are identically "dialectic". They waste their time in ascertaining the "philosophical parallels between the materialist conception of history and the dynamic and genetic character of Freud's understanding of the individual". The symptom formation in neuroses is discovered as "dialectic in nature". "The ego acts as a synthesizing agent". The development of the libido is regarded as a "process in which the accretion of quantitative change sometimes yields suddenly to qualitative transformation". How futile such discussions are, even from a limited scientific viewpoint, we will exemplify in one instance which Osborn greatly expatiated upon. He asks himself how the undialectical character of conscious representations are compatible with the "basically dialectical character of human thought". As solution of the riddle, he proposes that the dreams, the undisturbed expression of the unconscious, form the dialectical opposite of the waking thought process. The rational agency in man strengthens the repression of the emotions by exaggerating the incompatibility of its dialectical tendencies with conscious standards. Because reality is usually unable to offer unconditional gratification of the impulses, man's reason exaggerates the harshness of reality and represents it as rigid and unchanging in order to strengthen the repression of the drives.

Determining for the logical structure of our every-day thinking and for the distinction between primary and secondary qualities in natural sciences, is not our emotional mechanism but the necessity to order the stream of appearances of the outside world for the purpose of dominating it. This domination is further possible only on the basis of the **adequacy** of our conceptions and the objects we grasp through them. To explain the structure of these conceptions in terms of a reaction formation against man's impulses is simply nonsense. The function of the structure of conceptions in natural sciences as well as in our daily life must be explained primarily in terms of the social purpose both have to fulfill.

We understand that the assurance of its "dialectical" character is the official state ticket for any "science" to be ad-

mitted in Russia. But also, outside of that country and its subjects here and elsewhere, such discussions reveal the degeneration of Marxism to academic concerns. We therefore do not wonder that John Strachey hails this part of Osborn's exposition as "his most exciting theoretical discovery."

III.

The social psychoanalysts understand the practical function of their theory as a means of "activizing the masses". They want to help in the development of class consciousness by formulating and articulating the emotional needs of the masses. As they are especially concerned with the sexual needs, they maintain that it is particularly important to expose the reactionary social function of sexual morals and religion. By such propaganda they think they will be able to dissolve **bourgeois ideologies** and thus undermine "one of the principal pillars of capitalism—the willingness of the masses to bear social suppression and exploitation". The fate of the revolution is always decided by the broad "unpolitical" mass. The revolutionary energy emerges from every-day life. "Therefore", they proclaim, "politicalize the private life, the market, movies, dance halls, luna parks, bedrooms, bowling alleys, pool parlors!"

Although they admit that the socio-economic relationships determine the structure of the mass impulses in the ultimate degree, the psychoanalysts believe that the actual revolutionizing of the masses must primarily concern itself with the ideological superstructure of society. They justify this opinion with their psychological knowledge of the class-stabilizing effect of the emotional ties which bind the masses to the dominant leaders and ideologies. They are convinced that the present trend to fascism empirically sustains their theory and actual proposals.

In liberal society the authority was veiled to the individual. His lack of freedom was hidden from him by his acceptance of the fetishes of prices, property and law relationships as natural forces. That was the false consciousness which Marx had in mind when he analyzed the role of fetishism in bourgeois economics. This disguise disappears more and more. The direct and brutal authority of the totalitarian state economies is the direction in which present society is moving. It took all the efforts of the Marxists to "unmask" as Lenin called it, the false consciousness, to show the fetishistic character of legal equality, of bourgeois democracy, of religion, and primarily of the commodity. Now, all these fetishes are falling,—the masses do not rush to the defense of "their" democracy, "their" equality before the law, "their" freedom of exchange on the market or before God, or even "their" political leaders! That, our psychoanalysts cannot understand! There must be something wrong with the Marxian theory, they reason, and this they believe to have discovered in the "economistic" tendency of official Marxism.

There is no doubt that various schools of contemporary Marxism have joined the ruling class in the fabrication of ideologies. The objectivistic tendency in a certain direction of this Marxism is nothing but an expression of its ideological turning. But the psychoanalysts we discuss here are by no means justified in their objection because it is just their failure to recognize the workers' basic economic dependence on the owners of the means of production which characterizes their views. The **acceptance of this economic authority** by the workers was the basic relationship of the liberal system as well as it is the basis of the totalitarian society. As long as the masses regard this authority in production as necessary, as long as they do not rebel against it, so long will the leadership of the ruling class remain unshaken. That the existence of irrational authoritarian ties is also a factor which strengthens the deeper economic relationship will not be denied. But to believe that now when the fabrication of ideologies is increasingly the product of centralized agencies with the most efficient technical means, to believe that just **now** the main effort must be placed on agitation in the sphere of the super-structure is to invite a tilt with windmills.

The present change in the socio-economic structure brings about a condition in which the self-explanation and justification of the society becomes a conscious production, even in capitalism; and because the contradictions of capitalist production are intensified daily, the ideological rationalizations which disguise them become increasingly removed from reality. Just now, when the appearance seems more than ever to prove the decisive "material influence of the ideologies," the decision is totally dependent on a change in the **economic relationships**. It is not only impossible but also unnecessary to fight the propaganda agencies of the totalitarian rulers with their own weapons. These ideologies will break down as rapidly as they are now accepted by the masses. Their inconsistency with reality will become openly apparent at the moment the masses are forced to face the material overthrow of society. More than ever must the critical theory concern itself with this fundamental material change. More than ever is this theory bound to the development of the consciousness of that class which holds the key positions in the mechanism of production. And the direction of this development is prescribed by the necessity of clearing up the very simple questions concerning these basic social relationships. The moment the workers take over the means of production, they will control also the production of propaganda. The production of ideologies will be replaced by the systematic and all-embracing rationale of public self-interpretation. The masses will work in common effort to develop and clarify the principles which will determine the production and organization of society.

The overemphasis of the sexual factor becomes especially apparent in the kind of propaganda the Sex-Pol movement proposes. But apart from that, the ineffectiveness of their attempt to tie a radical propaganda to the emotional needs of the masses is easily demonstrated by their own theory. This theory indicates that the special structure of the libidinous impulses which determine the attitude of the masses toward the authorities is wholly dependent on the social force these authorities represent. Thus they will always be capable of using the mechanism of repression and sublimation for their ends. This very faculty of the sexual impulses to adapt themselves to social conditions makes them much less fit to be used as a lever for revolutionary propaganda than self-preservation impulses. We certainly do not believe that the very complex problem of class consciousness can be adequately interpreted by a simplifying drive theory. But on the basis of such a formal division of man's emotional life the hunger drive will be of much greater influence for any insurrection than the easily adaptable sexual impulse. Furthermore, the socio-psychologic theory emphasizes the importance of childhood, especially of the first four or five years of life, for the development of the power of ideologies in man. If, therefore, the dissipation of ideologies in the masses must be a condition for the overthrow of society, the logical conclusion would be that we must first reform the family or, in other words, that we must revolutionize the kindergarten to effect a social revolution. This would be even worse than the old well-known social democratic illusion that the social revolution presupposes the "revolutionary man" who can only be the outcome of a long process of mass education.

The psychoanalysts' proposal practically lead to a propaganda of substitute satisfactions for certain impulses which can be supplied within the framework of capitalist society. This political propaganda is not new. It has always been used in the old labor movement. Its fundamental ideas were the basis of the tremendous organizations for singing, hiking, dancing, gymnastic and all other purposes—except the earnest preparation of fighting capitalism—which nearly all the worker organizations in Germany engaged in before 1933. However, the real social function of this "revolutionary" education and its practical achievements became apparent in Hitler's "Kraft durch Freude" (Strength through Joy).

BOOK REVIEWS

REUBEN OSBORN, "Freud and Marx".

Equinox Co-operative Press, New York, 1937; 285 pp.; \$2.50.

Osborn's book is, as far as we know, the first comparative study in English of the doctrines of Freud and Marx. He gives a survey of both theories, which in the manner of our modern Moscow annotators is composed chiefly of quotations.

His formalistic comparison of the two doctrines consists primarily in ascertaining whether Freud's theory and the human mind as described by it are "dialectic". One of his explorations in search of dialectics we discussed in another article of this issue. Osborn's superficial comparison does not touch on the theoretical connections between the two theories, on the basis of which an application of psychoanalysis as social psychology could alone be possible and of any concern for the worker.

In the last chapter of his book, Osborn gives "some applications" of what he learned from his comparison. His study of the emotional structure of man leads him to the recognition "that the need for leadership is universal" (p. 266). Leadership, he defines as "the faculty to stand in the emotional relationship of the father of childhood days" (p. 264). Thus he concludes we must give the masses what they are accustomed to. We must consciously develop leaders by "idealizing for the masses some one individual to whom they will turn for support, whom they will love and obey" (p. 266). To the objection that this is only a form of fascist demagoguery, he replies that fascism satisfies subjectively the same needs as does communism. And what does Stalin, the great father and leader of the iron cohorts of the world revolution say about the objective conditions in the fatherland of the proletariat? He says, and Osborn quotes this statement, that "the role of so-called objective conditions has been reduced to a minimum, whereas the role of our organizations and of their leaders has become decisive, exceptional" (p. 273). These sentences are not essentially different from those we are accustomed to hear from similar fathers of similar socialist countries who stress the "primacy of politics over economics". And who does not remember his first father-substitute in grade school preaching — "men make history".

In the article already referred to, we demonstrated that Osborn's conclusions cannot claim to result from a psychoanalytic interpretation of the authoritarian relationship. On the contrary, the analysis of social authority shows that the maintaining of the emotional ties which bind the masses to leaders and ideologies only weakens their faculty for revolutionary activities.

As a further application of the "unity" he achieved between psychoanalysis and Marxism, Osborn justifies point by point the whole party line of the C. P. He delivers "psychological" arguments for the united front policy and proposes to "associate the present struggle of the masses with the heroic figures of the past" (p. 268), — the national heroes of the bourgeoisie. This proposal which in the sphere of the individual's personal life means a preservation of all the moral and authoritarian ties to capitalist society reveals with especial clarity the fascistic social content of the ideas he promulgates. And as a final consequence he does not forget to mention that his psychology can serve also to "free the socialist movement of the influence of dangerous and undesirable elements" (p. 283) whose "main tactic consists in fierce denunciations of parliament and labor leaders" (p. 282). Thus Osborn is aware that to carry out the "revolutionary" program he defends, it is necessary to liquidate the revolutionists, psychologically now, physically later.

UPTON SINCLAIR, "The Flivver King."

Station A., Pasadena, California. 119 pp.; 25c

Upton Sinclair is primarily a pamphleteer, and only incidentally a novelist. His novels are only the mediums for his message. His thesis does not rise out of the lives of his characters; rather, the lives of his characters; rise out of his thesis. Consequently, the careers of his people are quite often unnaturally distorted, as in this pamphlet, where the three sons of a Ford worker develop, respectively, into a gangster, a Babbit, and a militant labor organizer, and his novels, though marked occasionally by passages of eloquence and beauty, are little more than social tracts. Yet as a pamphleteer Sinclair has few equals.

It is his capacity for collecting data and offering them in readable form that makes Sinclair so able a propagandist. The author describes here how

the competitive struggle has warped a young, ambitious inventor into a vicious and miserly exploiter of men. From this outline of Ford's career, we carry away some interesting facts, not the least important of which are his \$300,000 donation to the Nazi Party treasury, and his employment of "some of the worst gangsters of this city," to quote a mayor of Detroit, for the purpose of smashing all attempts to unionize the Ford workers, and of manhandling labor organizers.

But Sinclair's ability to amass and marshal data is not accompanied by a strength of insight and analysis. He still believes that the cause of crises is overproduction relative to purchasing power, and he still feels that capitalism can be voted out of existence. On all economic questions his approach is that of the middle-class mind.

And with this middle-class ideology Sinclair's behavior is quite consistent. Lacking a proletarian base, he has drifted into strange spheres for a socialist fighter. We need mention for illustration only his more flagrant behavior: his support of the first world war and his support and leadership of the Epic movement—a movement that was Utopian because, within the bounds of capitalism it would have operated industries in behalf of the workers, and that was fascist because it advocated government regulation of business by the state. Thus, in the two most critical periods of recent history—an imperialist war and an industrial crisis—Sinclair has done much to befuddle the workers.

Today, in this pamphlet, he supports Roosevelt and the C. I. O. and is apparently unaware that the measures sponsored by Roosevelt have only one purpose—the preservation of the profit system; and that the workers' movement "starting," to use his own words, "in a thousand different places, born of the workers' desperate needs" was led by the C. I. O. only to one end—the advancement of its leaders' ambitions. Like many another petty-bourgeois intellectual, Sinclair deserts to the enemy in the moments of crisis.

Apart from these lapses, Sinclair has been urging humanity towards the socialist commonwealth for the past thirty-five years. For thirty-five years he has been throwing his paper missiles against the battlements of capitalism and crying against its outrages. Yet this one-man literary barrage seems to have left no impress on present-day America. The explanation for Sinclair's futility lies not in Sinclair or his works, but in the objective conditions. Sinclair himself is but an expression of a stage in American economic development that fostered the reformism characterizing the radical labor and union organizations.

Bruce Minton and John Stuart, "MEN WHO LEAD LABOR"

Modern Age Book; 1937, 270 pp. 35c

This book, containing short biographies of W. Green, J. L. Lewis, H. Bridges, D. Dubinsky, S. Hillmann and others, is written by two inspired Peoples Front politicians. The party line within the C. P. today is here clearly visible. Nothing that will commit the authors to any decisive stand is uttered. Editors of the *New Masses*, they support anybody who is willing, no matter how vaguely, to pay lipservice to the fight for democracy and against fascism, and who will lend his mouthpiece to the coming Farmer-Labor Party. The past of such people as J. L. Lewis is forgiven and forgotten and he is celebrated as the "Samson of Labor". The dramatization of the "leaders" is copied from the Russian example. The question of organization is of no greater concern than the choice between "good" and "bad" leaders; whoever fits in the prevailing political schemes of the C. P. is good, and is booked as progressive. The book serves well to demonstrate the fact that the present-day trade union movement in America, in all its different forms, does no longer fulfill the present not to mention the coming needs of the working class.