

NEW CLASS

July, 1974

25 cents

Issue no. 5

SOCIALISM OR SOCIAL-FASCISM ?

PART ONE : THE NEW CLASS

A New Class has entered the arena of world history. A New Class has been created under the crisis conditions of the past century of capitalism, thrusting itself into the midst of the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, sometimes on one side, sometimes on the other, but increasingly in terms of its own class objectives and values, and historically bound to actually play the vanguard counter-revolutionary role in this final and most crucial period of the world proletarian revolution. The New Class is the modern bureaucracy.

What is it that differentiates the modern bureaucracy as a new class, actually the only new class created in the epoch of capitalist decline, a non-proletarian and anti-proletarian class which is capitalist but not bourgeois, from the traditional bureaucratic strata to be found at various stages of social development, including ancient societies ?

The objective and subjective factors here are so intertwined that it is necessary to present the process as a totality, furthermore as a totality in which the specific elements, even their once-"lawful" apparent behaviour, is completely transformed—most importantly in the sense that the very inter-relationships of the basic elements of reality are transformed, that the subjective is now the determinant, acting upon the base, that ideas are material force and material force is itself transformed, expanded, and redefined. The proletariat, unlike every other class and against every other class—bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, peasantry, bureaucracy—though not necessarily all at once, is able to chart its path, our path, through the process of the transformation
(continued on page 2 . . .)

PROLETARIAT AGAINST BUREAUCRACY IN CHINA—

IN THE SOVIET UNION—

"The storm of the January Revolution (in 1967—ed.) turned all this within a very short time from the hands of the bureaucrats into the hands of the enthusiastic working class. Society suddenly found, in the absence of bureaucrats, that they could not only go on living, but could live better and develop quicker and with greater freedom. It was not at all like the intimidation
(continued on the back page....)

"Can the usurpation of power on the part of bureaucracy and the fight against it be considered as a manifestation of the class struggle ? As is known, the opportunists generally deny the existence of the class struggle in the Soviet Union. It is self-understood that it is not in their interest for them to speak of the class struggle in which they play such an anti-popular role because this is dangerous for them.
(continued on the back page....)

(continued from page 1)

of totality in a manner that continually eludes the historical entrapments of what has been "determined". The proletariat itself plays the most conscious and deliberate role in the "rise of subjective over objective", and both bourgeoisie and bureaucracy, in taking up the weaponry of psychological warfare, is actually entering a new battlefield, a battlefield that will prove even more unfamiliar and difficult for the bourgeoisie than the jungles and paddy-fields of southeast Asia, the world-wide battlefield of consciousness.

The major factor which allows for a new understanding of the modern bureaucracy as opposed to its earlier prototypes, is the increase of violence as an economic factor, specifically the growth and qualitative development of the State in capitalist society, including the military exchanges (wars) between States and the military and/or police operations of States against "their own citizenry", i.e. the political workingclass and its allies (counter-revolutions, civil wars, etc.). It is within this framework that the modern bureaucracy has emerged, developed, and arrived at its own semblance of historical consciousness, seeing itself as a class, but even more, as a "revolutionary" class, a vanguard elite of a world-wide network of social-fascist counter-insurgency taking over and running the world, a pseudo-proletariat, which appropriates the forms of certain historical workingclass institutions, looting them of their revolutionary content, and replacing that content with their own—"workers' councils", not as class-wide, class-for-itself institutions, but as class-against-itself countergangs! (The recent "Ulster Workers' Council" comes to mind.)

The major problem in understanding the modern bureaucracy is that what has passed as the "radical", even "revolutionary" "anti-bureaucratism" for an entire historical period is nothing less than the reactionary petty-bourgeois and labor-aristocrat protest against the bureaucracy as either a cause or an effect of the centralization of the state, which the petty-bourgeoisie and labor-aristocrats oppose whether it is carried out by bourgeoisie or proletariat. The anti-bureaucratism of the pre-bureaucratic layers, the layers which were the major "intermediate strata" in capitalism before the bureaucracy emerged as a new class, is nothing less than an essentially anarchist radical-democratic trend, expressing the final wretched outbursts of obsolete and fading social layers. The anti-bureaucratism of the decaying intermediate layers of the past has absolutely nothing to do with the revolutionary anti-bureaucratism of the proletariat, with the Communist Program of class war against the bureaucracy such as has emerged out of the past decade of the development of the world proletarian revolution. (See Chinese and Soviet material in this issue.)

We oppose the bureaucracy not, like the anarchists, because it is centralized but because for us as communists, as fighters for the world dictatorship of the proletariat with a single world plan for socialist construction, it is not, and can never be, centralized enough. In fact, the bureaucracy everywhere leads the social-fascist populist campaign to decentralize, from community control in the U.S. to "regional planning" and Liebermanism in the Soviet Union.

We oppose the bureaucracy not because it is "elitist", but precisely because it cannot and will not lead. Its actual world-historical role, as dangerous as it has been in terms of the "internal" development of the proletarian revolution, falls far short of its self-delusions. It is a new class but it is not a revolutionary new class. Its "radicalism" is akin to the nationalist petty-bourgeois radicalism which spawned fascism, but more dangerous.

The historical role of the bureaucracy depends on the general battlefield disposition of the two main world-historical contesting forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Given the relative weakness and deep divisions within a still-immature national-bourgeoisie, the rising elements of the bureaucracy saw that the only class that could bring into being higher modes of economic and political organization, which could ensure its own development as a "managerial" and "administrative" social layer, was the proletariat, even in countries where it constituted a small minority. Therefore, large sections of the "young turks" of the rising modern bureaucracy, from military as well as other layers of the bureaucracy, merged themselves with the historical mainstream of workingclass struggles, applying their skills, which often lacked in even the more sophisticated political workers, to the needs of the early workers' parties, trade unions, and, in the case of the new-born Soviet Socialist Republic in Russia, to the economic, political, and military arms of the first workers' government since the 1871 Paris Commune. In the west, with the degeneration of most of the traditional workingclass institutions, the modern bureaucracy directly developed the theory and practice of social-fascism, as is documented in this, the first section of Class War's new analysis.

(continued on the next page.....)

The traditional Marxist movement for the past half-century, during the rise and fall of the Communist International as well as the post-Comintern revisionism and anti-revisionism of recent history, has been crippled by its inability to recognize the emergence of the modern bureaucracy as a new class, and thereby, its inability to develop the theory and praxis of the proletariat's new tasks in the light of this development.

In the light of the world-historical role of the modern bureaucracy as the direct and conscious agency of capitalist counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, as well as its present dangerous restorationist course in China and elsewhere, the proletariat has already begun to create, admittedly often under primitive political conditions, its critique of bureaucratism, its class struggle against bureaucracy as well as bourgeoisie. We must take up and continue to develop that critique and that struggle, to conceptualize the form and content of the continuing class struggle under socialism, the class struggle as waged by the proletariat in power, the permanent revolution in a sense that terrifies the most fanatical Trotskyite!

As will be shown in the next issue of Class War (issue no. 6) that will deal with the origins and development of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union and China, as the Counter-Revolution in the Revolution, the same error which causes the Labor Committees to consider the Soviet Union and its social-imperialist neo-colonies as "workers' states" is that which also makes them either ignore or heap ridicule upon the opposite process, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, which is the first world-historical proletarian struggle against the new class. That error is to ignore the dialectic of the emergence of the new class, to stick to the "orthodox Marxist" definitions of what constitutes socialism, capitalism, a workers' government, etc. as Lyn Marcus does in "The Lessons of Eastern Europe" (The Campaigner Winter 72-73) and thereby, to confuse the correct tactic of splitting up the various bourgeois capitalist and bureaucratic factions (the Golden Snake, etc.) with the general strategy and programmatic line of building an International United Front of the workingclass, which the L.C. is genuinely fully committed to.

The recognition of the new class, the ruthless unmasking of the bureaucracy's "radicalism" in particular, and the creation of the weaponry which is suitable to our new tasks in this regard are all the signals of a new world-historical period in the class struggle, which demands ever newer developments on the part of all those conscious agents of the international revolutionary process. To arm the international proletariat anew for class war against bureaucracy as well as bourgeoisie, such is the concern of a new international revolutionary tendency in the political workingclass, which must become conscious of its consciousness, which must, if it will not become the New Marxism, develop Beyond Marxism—but always along Marx's own revolutionary-dialectical path.

It is the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie that has brought the new class into being, that created what is actually an abortion as opposed to a birth. Because the bureaucracy cannot really rule on a world scale, they cannot really rule at all, they can only share power as a junior partner to certain specific bourgeois-capitalist factions, in this period, the Rockefeller faction above all. The specific role of the bureaucracy internationally in relation to the Rockefeller faction's conspiratorial bid for military takeover in 1974 makes it absolutely essential that the question of the bureaucracy be fully discussed in the polemics of the political workingclass everywhere.

This period that ushers in the greatest potential and the greatest dangers is of course the most revolutionary period in history. We are living in the peak period of the whole epoch of the emergence and development of the world proletarian revolution. The workingclass must demand the highest qualities of revolutionaries and especially of the revolutionary leadership no matter how immediate and urgent the tasks of the moment appear to be. But, more importantly, the whole conception of leadership itself must be revolutionized in this period, and it is here that the anti-bureaucratic revolution is key. The immense tasks of the whole period that is opening up before us, during and after the seizure of power on a world scale by the workingclass, demand hundreds and thousands, not one or two, Lenins and Luxemburgs. The new period demands that a continually-expanding "critical mass" of revolutionary leadership be developed world-wide and centralized at the highest levels, a collective revolutionary leadership which remains vigilant after the seizure of power.

When we seize power, in one important respect the process of development of the workers' government here will be the opposite of that which befell the young proletarian rule in the Soviet Union, and to a certain degree, China and other revolutions as well. What is involved here is, of course, the fate of the soviets themselves, the institutions for which the U.S.S.R. was originally named. Today, we

(continued on the next page . . .)

must say misnamed, since nothing resembling genuine soviets has been seen in the USSR for at least four decades. By soviets we do not mean a form, because the name and the form of the "workers councils" has been appropriated by everyone from "libertarian socialists" to fascists, and in direct opposition to the genuine communist program of the direct march from dual power—Stalin once called it diarchy—to state power, the program embodied in the "demand" which is not really a demand but a declaration of war against capitalist state authority as a whole, the point that Lenin, at one point, had to struggle for all alone against the entire collective leadership of the Bolshevik Party—"All Power To The Soviets !"

Comrades—in previous revolutions, the soviets, or other class-wide institutions, became less and less important following the seizure of power which was proclaimed in their name and was actually carried out by them, becoming either smaller and smaller, or simply more and more ritualistic and without real content. Often, the very class-wide organs of power are dissolved by the post-revolutionary organs of bureaucratic administration, not so much in the name of "centralism", but quite the opposite, as Marcus correctly points out in his polemics on this question.

The vanguard of the capitalist counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe, and what is now dangerously threatening the remaining gains of the Chinese revolution as well, namely the bureaucracy, is everywhere waving the banners of decentralization, regional planning, and autonomy, what the CIA's "experts" call "polycentrism", and the Chinese Left in the Cultural Revolution called the "theory of many centres".

In the forthcoming Proletarian Revolution in North America and Europe, including Eastern Europe (Russia), the soviet-type organs will actually grow in quantity and develop in quality, and will, as made possible by the immediately practicable revolutionization of the entire communications, and related computer and electronics industries (as Class War has pointed out in two previous papers on Socialist Communications Systems produced and distributed within the past year, mainly within NUWRO and the Labor Committees), draw in the self-conscious and collective participation (in the anti-Tavistock and genuinely democratic sense) of millions, expanding to tens and hundreds of millions of workers, peasants, unemployed, scientists, ex-soldiers, students, etc. around the world.

The soviets of 1917, the Councils of Deputies of Workers, Peasants, and Soldiers, lawfully centralized at the highest levels to develop planning and direct the functioning of the severely-damaged economy, could not maintain a high enough rate of reproduction of proletarian leaders, organizers of socialist construction as well as soldiers in the continuing class war against the internal and external counter-revolution. The best leaders were lawfully drawn out of the soviets themselves into the special extensions of the soviet proletarian state power, especially the military and the emergency administration of War Communism as well as later periods, and the soviets, with the increasing vacuum of proletarian leadership created out of the dire necessity of war and civil war, became increasingly hollow, formal, impotent and empty, a pale reflection of their former selves, actually, the participatory, or co-participation organs of slave-labor speed-up and human recycling, as well as the other counter-revolutionary polices of the rising bureaucracy.

As Lenin repeated many times, the proletarian revolution is not a question of forms. As shall be pointed out in the second and further parts of this article on Socialism Or Social-Fascism, which shall be continued in the forthcoming issues of Class War, the Social-Fascism of the New Left, which is nothing less than the ideology of the world-historical mission of the "insurgent" (actually counter-insurgent) bureaucracy, has been based upon the specific appropriations of the historical forms of the traditional working-class movement, including the concept of the Party as a cadre-based vanguard. The form and the content of the real organs of the proletarian revolution, the real party and soviet expressions, whatever their form, is identical. The proletariat's struggle for power—and that power itself—one and the same.

In this period, it is the unity of the struggle against the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy, the unity as well of polemics-dialectics with international class war practice, that is the form and content of the organs of struggle for power, the organs of power, and the organs of class struggle after the seizure of power. Against the reactionary Kronstadt anarcho-syndicalism of "soviets without Bolsheviks" as well as the Stalin-Bukharin-Trotsky bureaucratism that resulted in Bolsheviks without soviets, and eventually the abandonment of Bolshevism as well, the Proletarian Revolution in this period raises the battle-cry—For the Revolutionary Party and the Soviets—Without Bureaucracy !

PART TWO : THE ORIGINAL TAVISTOCK

In his book "The Dialectical Imagination", subtitled "A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research, 1923-1950", published in 1973, Martin Jay, a kind of Frankforter himself, clearly points out both the counter-revolutionary origins and further development of this original think-tank of social-fascism and vanguard ideological organ of the rising modern bureaucracy. In the first chapter, in fact in the first few sentences, he lays out the ideological basis of this entire trend :

"The unexpected success of the Bolshevik Revolution—in contrast to the dramatic failure of its Central European imitators—created a serious dilemma for those who had previously been at the center of European Marxism, the left-wing intellectuals of Germany. In rough outline, the choices left to them were as follows: first, they might support the moderate socialists and their freshly created Weimar Republic, thus eschewing revolution and scorning the Russian experiment; or secondly, they could accept Moscow's leadership, join the newly formed German Communist Party and work to undermine Weimar's bourgeois compromise."

Although Jay goes on to claim that in some metaphysical way the Frankfurt School represented a "third course of action", what he actually makes clear is the close connections between the Frankfurt School from its earliest beginnings with those so-called "moderate socialists", Noske, Schiedemann, and the other social-fascist butchers who murdered Luxemborg, Liebknecht, and thousands of others, the blood-sacrifice to "freshly created" Weimar. Furthermore, the Frankfurt School is a most important link between the social-fascism of the pre-World War II period, and the social-fascism of the present, between the social-patriotism that Lenin polemicized against and broke from to form the Communist International, and the Woodcocks, Hurfs, and "New Left" counter-insurgency that we must destroy today in order to create the new international party and soviet-type formations appropriate to the totality of needs and potentials of today's multi-millioned international workingclass.

The Institute of Social Research was formed in 1923 with the funds of one Felix J. Weil. Weil was the only son of a German-born Argentine grain-merchant. Sent by his father to study in Germany, he came under the influence of the general radical ferment and in the course of time, donated much of his wealth to one or another radical cause. Weil had first developed a circle of "dissident" and oppositional Marxist and pseudo-Marxist intellectuals, including some oddballs from even official Comintern machines, in a "First Marxist Work Week" which met in the summer of 1922 in Ilmenau, Thuringia. Its purpose, according to Weil, "the hope that the different trends of Marxism, if afforded an opportunity of talking it out together, could arrive at a 'true' or 'pure' Marxism."

This circle became the basis for the Frankfurt School, which, at the suggestion of the official government Ministry of Education, was to be called "Institute of Social Research" as opposed to "Institute for Marxism", the name hoped for by some of its more ambitious founders. Their obvious intent was to establish the German Social Democrat equivalent of, if not opposition to, the institutes being set up at that time in the U.S.S.R., the Marx-Engels Institute, etc. Its actual development since that time has taken it well beyond those original purposes.

The first director of the institute, a former Fabian "socialist" named Gerlach died soon after assuming his post, and was replaced by Carl Grunberg, a professor of law and political science from the University of Vienna, and known as the "Father of Austro-Marxism." Grunberg gave the opening address at the official opening of the institute on June 22nd, 1924, stressing the difference between the new institute and other such academic research institutes—the new institute was to be run on a completely top-down basis, with one director with absolute control. In subsequent years, this single dictatorial post was to be assumed by Max Horkheimer, but Grunberg is important to understand as the main pace-setter for the institute, especially in terms of his relationship to "Austro-Marxism". What exactly was "Austro-Marxism", and why should one of its leading exponents be chosen to direct this new think-tank institution for the German, and later, Angle-American Social-Fascism ?

"Austro-Marxism" was the Austrian particular of the general disease of the social-democracy. The Austro-Marxists, like the rest of the European (and North American) social-democracy, as the historical expression of the hegemony of labor-aristocrat class-in-itself interests over the general political workingclass movement was destroyed in World War I. In the postwar conditions of civil war and near-revolution in central Europe, particularly Germany, the form of the traditional social-democratic institutions, party, trade union, youth leagues, cooperatives, etc. was revived, but

(continued on the next page....)

with a different content, actually a much more advanced application of the general traditional practices of class-collaboration, "social pacts", and the like, by which the workingclass polices itself into slavery. Driven into exile by the rise of Hitlerite and Mussolini-style fascism, Social-Fascism of the "Austro-Marxist" and Moske variety went into exile, many in England and North America, where their services were put to the use of the most dangerous faction of North American bourgeois-capitalist imperialism, to be deployed in the post-WWII period to spearhead anti-communist "labor front" activity throughout Europe. This has been particularly well documented in terms of the role of German and other Social-Fascists in Renee Sigerson's excellent article "Postwar Germany: The Grooming of the Working Class" in the July 21, 1974 issue of New Solidarity, which gives good background detail on such leading "Austro-Marxists" as the notorious Otto Bauer. Sigerson clearly shows the "internationalism" of the various Social-Fascist emigre-exile and native groups, which were increasingly deployed more and more directly by the Rockefeller-OSS-CIA cabal, before, during, and following World War II. However, we must examine Bauer's own ideology clearly to understand the roots of the Social-Fascism of the Frankfort School and the way in which that kind of politics has been made use of throughout this period. Bauer wrote in his 1921 "Bolshevism Or Social-Democracy ?" :

"In a modern highly-civilized society, where all the classes take part in public life, no other form of class-rule is any longer durably possible save one which permits the subject classes freedom to influence "public opinion", to participation in the formation of the collective will of the State, and control over its working: a class-rule, therefore, whose basis rests on the social factors of influence of the ruling class, and not on the use of mechanical instruments of force."

Bauer applied this concept, an early expression of social-fascist co-participation, to the concrete situation of the threatening proletarian uprising in Austria in 1918, when the Austrian proletariat, spurred into the world-wide mass strike upheavals following upon the Bolshevik seizure of power the year before, bypassed the Social-Democracy and its leadership for a period. In another book of his, ironically titled "The Austrian Revolution of 1918", Bauer openly brags of the unique ability of the Social Democracy to crush revolutions in this historical period:

"There was deep ferment...The people's army (Bauer is here talking about the regular Austrian bourgeois army) felt that it was the bearer of the revolution, the vanguard of the proletariat...'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' 'All Power To The Soviets' was all that could be heard in the streets."

"No bourgeois government could have coped with such a task. It would have been disarmed by the distrust and contempt of the masses. It would have been overthrown in a week by a street uprising and disarmed by its own soldiers. Only the Social Democrats could have safely handled such an unprecedentedly difficult situation because they enjoyed the confidence of the working masses. Only the Social Democrats could have peacefully stopped the stormy demonstrations by negotiation and persuasion. Only the Social Democrats could have guided the people's army and curbed the revolutionary adventures of the working masses. The profound shake-up of the bourgeois social order was expressed in that a bourgeois government, a government without the participation in it of the Social Democrats, had simply become unthinkable."

Bauer here shows his embryonic class instincts as an early expression of the new world-historical phenomenon, the modern bureaucracy. Initially arising out of the decay of the traditional workingclass institutions, the proto-bureaucracy is here declaring, through the pen of Otto Bauer—the bourgeoisie cannot rule alone anymore, it must share power with the bureaucracy, only the bureaucracy can capture the trust of the proletariat as well as provide the cadres, often military, for the mass regimentation of the peasantry, in other words, the bourgeoisie alone cannot in this period of general crisis sustain capitalism, for capitalism to survive, a new class, capitalist but not bourgeois, must assume a world-historical role, the modern bureaucracy emerges and the era of bureaucrat-state-capitalism commences, to be ended abruptly and violently before it even has a chance to determine for itself a clear direction, ended by the world-wide victory of the proletariat. Bauer's voice is not the voice of the labor-aristocracy, nor the voice of the radical-Jacobin petty-bourgeois Left, the pre-bureaucratic intelligentsia, or the utopian artisans. It is the voice of the modern bureaucracy, emerging to assume its historical role in the class struggle throughout the world.

Thus, the Frankfort Institute inherits a strong counter-revolutionary dosage of bureaucratic "socialism" from Austro-Marxism, in particular, the germ of the concept of co-participation and "quality of life" politics which are the core of Social-Fascism as we know it today. Norbert Lesser, a modern-day admirer of Austro-Marxism, decalres in his article "Austro-Marxism, a Re-appraisal",

(continued on the next page.....)

"The Austro-Marxists believed that a political movement based on socialist traditions should offer the masses something more inspiring than gradual material improvements; it ought to excite the imagination and kindle a fire that would illuminate and transfigure the drabness of their condition..."

This concept of "transfiguring the drabness of their conditions" as opposed to removing and eliminating those monstrous conditions, especially such as develop in periods of general crisis like the present, becomes a key element in the later ideology of the Frankfurt Institute as well as the "New Left". Today's "Puerto Rican Socialists" (P.S.P. variety) following the traditions of yesterday's "Austro-Marxists", "transfigure the drabness" of the Lower East Side and other decaying ghettos by helping to paint "revolutionary murals" depicting especially the "people's suffering" on the walls of houses slated for rapid primitive accumulation, arson, etc.

In its early period, the Frankfurt Institute attracts some elements around the German and Austrian Communist Parties, and they also maintain contact with the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow. In fact, much of the theoretical precepts of the Frankforters are similar to the political views put forward by the budding bureaucracy in the U.S.S.R. itself, particularly the Bukharinite right-opposition elements. As shall be pointed out later, the Russian bureaucracy, unlike its counterparts in most of Europe, did not have a native modern bourgeoisie that it could come to terms with. This fact had been foreshadowed in the entire historical tradition of revolutionary-conspiratorial struggle in the late part of the 19th century in Tsarist Russia, a struggle which expressed the hint of an element present other than the historical petty-bourgeois radical-Jacobin Blanquism and peasant-based anarcho-populism. Partially nurtured in this tradition, unlike its historical counterparts in the proto-bureaucratic strata in Europe or North America, the emerging bureaucracy in Russia at first chose to unite with the proletariat and poor peasantry against the capitalists and landlords. Later on, the bureaucracy itself is to split, with its relative left-wing, expressed in Stalin, maintaining its alliance with the proletariat in Russia at the expense of both the peasantry and the other sections of the bureaucracy. Trotsky, originally based upon flimsy pre-bureaucratic middle strata, labor-aristocrat and petty-bourgeois, later, creates for himself both a new political-class identity as well as a certain cult of personality, foreshadowing others to come, as prototype of the military bureaucracy, the new concept of the military itself, a notion which Trotsky himself is never able to come to grips with (witness his reactionary polemics against the Left-Communists' Theory of the Offensive in Trotsky's Military writings, where he completely denies the possibility of a specifically proletarian and revolutionary military methodology.) Trotsky is the utopian bureaucrat, hoping for a pure bureaucratic rule in the end, without the proletarian soviet-type forms (the program of Lenin), without the ruthless collectivization of the peasantry (as carried out by Stalin), and even, without aligning itself directly with one or another faction of the international bourgeois-capitalist class (as hoped for by Bukharin, and actually carried out by Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Kosygin, etc.). It is Bukharin's program that is now being carried out in the Soviet Union, not Stalin's or Trotsky's.

However, for the bureaucracy in Germany and Austria, resting on the consistently counter-revolutionary tradition of the Social Democracy, the split took a different form—one section sticking it out "at home" with the native bourgeois-capitalists; the other section, the one that we are particularly concerned with in terms of the Frankfurt Institute, strikes out to hook up with the most "internationalist" as well as conspiratorial of the bourgeois-capitalist interests world-wide, as represented by the Rockefellers and the Anglo-American Intelligence Establishment, the "Real CIA" as it is so aptly called by the Labor Committees in their explosive "Tavistock Grin" exposure of the Rockefeller-CIA plot for world fascist takeover.

By 1931, the Frankfurt Institute's members, realizing the possible threat to their existence if either the Nazis or the Communists took power in Germany, as well as the increased difficulties in sustaining itself under severe depression conditions, began to make the necessary contacts with like-minded political circles outside Germany, to prepare for what becomes their eventual lengthy, but for many not permanent, exile. What were these like-minded political circles?

Upon assuming his position as director, in January of 1931, Max Horkheimer outlines the new "internationalist" direction for the Institute as well as the Frankfurt Institute's first real counter-insurgency assignment. Horkheimer declares in his opening speech as director that under his direction, the main task of the Institute will be to conduct a study throughout Europe, including Germany, on the "attitudes of workers" towards a variety of issues, including psychological-profiling types of questions as well as "opinion poll" approach as a kind of "cover". To help

(continued on the next page.....)

collect information for this study, Horkheimer announced, the Frankfurt Institute had accepted the kind offer of Albert Thomas, the director of the capitalist-controlled International Labor Organization, to establish a branch office of the Institute in Geneva, with the close supervision and collaboration with the I.L.O. itself. Thus, at the brink of the capitalist crisis, the Frankfurt Institute completed its flight away from even the semblance of Marxist or workingclass politics, and linked itself directly with the international Social-Fascist machine, which the Rockefeller faction, above all others, is to make its particular stomping-ground.

The next year, Horkheimer suspended the old publication of the Institute and founded a new one, the "Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung" (publication for social research). The first issue of this publication, in 1932, contained articles by the whole collection of ideologists of social-fascism, many of which were to attain further prominence in decades beyond this time. Horkheimer himself, Erich Fromm, Karl Landauer, director of the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Institute, Karl Korsch (who had by this time totally renounced his previous Left-Communist politics, which were similar in some respects to early Lukacs) Wilhelm Reich, and none other than that brainwashing bastard Kurt Lewin. Lewin is to lurk around the edges of the Frankfurt Institute, and similar, later-to-be exiled groups of social-fascist bureaucratic cadres, who, often merely because of their Jewish ancestry, would be unwelcome in Nazi Germany or Austria. However, otherwise, their politics and the Nazis had more in common than in antagonism. In 1939, Kurt Lewin and Karl Korsch together collaborate on a study of field theory, together writing an article called "Mathematical Constructs in Psychology and Sociology" for the "Journal of Unified Sciences", vol. 9, which, from the title alone suggests possible usage in terms of psychological warfare and brainwashing, the modus operandi of the modern bureaucracy throughout the world today.

Undoubtedly Lewin, as expressed in his collaboration with Korsch and other members of the Frankfurt Institute on topics such as these, was used by the Rockefeller cabal as early as this to "psych out" the general mass as well as specific leadership of the workingclass, to lay the theoretical foundations for the methodology of Social-Fascist counter-insurgency for the entire historical period as well as provide, through intelligence gathered from individuals such as Karl Korsch, who was intimately familiar with certain Comintern functions and functionaries, specific points of weakness for immediate attack, or else long-range undermining.

When Hitler comes to power in 1933, the Institute loses the great part of their collection of books and papers but it finds a new home for itself, eventually ending up in the United States, connecting up through its I.L.O. sponsors with "left" and "liberal" intelligentsia around Columbia University. A couple of the Institute's members choose not to settle in America. Borkenau settles in London, and after one last venture with the Institute as part of the Institutes "Studies on Authority and the Family" in 1936, this embittered ex-Comintern functionary drops out. However, as Martin Jay says, "Despite the Institute's Marxist image, at no time was the thought of going eastward to Stalin's Russia seriously entertained.... The only serious possibility left was America."

Following the transfer to America, the last nominal vestiges of "Marxism" are rapidly dropped by the Institute, and under Horkheimer's specific direction, the Institute begins to put together its own unique contribution to the politics of the historical period as the most advanced expression of the class ideology of the modern bureaucracy. This ideology is called at first "Critical Theory".

As Martin Jay points out in the chapter in his book on "The Genesis of Critical Theory", following 1934, Horkheimer begins to express an admiration for Nietzsche. Horkheimer probes the irrationalist and nihilist roots of fascist ideology, the petty-bourgeoisie's elitist "will to power", complaining that the Nazis have "domesticated" (!) Nietzsche for popular consumption, Horkheimer is searching for the components of a new, even more advanced and elitist world-outlook for his own class, the modern bureaucracy. As Martin Jay describes it :

"What he (Horkheimer) valued most in Nietzsche's work was its uncompromisingly critical quality.... Horkheimer was also impressed by Nietzsche's critique of the masochistic quality of traditional Western morality. He had been the first to note, Horkheimer approvingly commented, how misery could be transformed into a social norm, as in the case of asceticism, and how that norm had permeated Western culture through the 'slave morality' of Christian ethics. When it came to the more questionable aspects of Nietzsche's thought, Horkheimer tended to mitigate their inadequacies. The naive glorification of the "superman" he explained away by calling it the price of isolation.

(continued on the next page.....)

Nietzsche's hostility to the goal of a classless society he excused on the grounds that its only champions in Nietzsche's day were the Social Democrats, whose mentality was as pedestrian and uninspired as Nietzsche had claimed.

In fact, Horkheimer argued, Nietzsche had been perceptive in refusing to romanticize the working classes, who were even in his time beginning to be diverted from their revolutionary role by the developing mass culture."

As these themes became more pronounced, the Frankfurt Institute's members took up attacks against the most important revolutionary concepts of Marxism, even turning to pre-Marxist utopians for inspiration:

"The new conception of labor (of Marx) amounts to the exploitation of nature (sic) which with naive complacency is contrasted with the exploitation of the proletariat. Compared with this positivistic conception, Fourier's fantasies, which have so often been ridiculed, prove to be surprisingly sound."

Theodor Adorno, another major social-fascist theorist connected with the Frankfurt Institute, is to further develop this opposition to Marx's concept of labor, which is nothing less than an indirect attack on the concept of expanded reproduction, and thus, in actual content, a polemic in favor of Zero Growth! Martin Jay relates this further in referring to a conversation that he had with Adorno in 1969 in which Adorno attacked Marx for allegedly wanting to turn the whole world into a "giant workhouse". The Frankfurt Institute's allegations that Marxism "fetishizes" the workingclass, labor, and everything else of positive value in humanity's history is the bureaucracy's impotent cry of fear and pain in the face of the truly immense world-shaking capabilities of the international proletariat, the real revolutionary class in history, besides which the bureaucracy's, petty-bourgeoisie's, and even many-numbered peasantry's wildest delusions of "historical mission" appear puny by comparison. On the eve of the Age of the Aton, when vast resources of energy will come into the use of all of humanity for the first time, the pitiful whining about the "exploitation of nature" will not deter us one instant from remaking the world, including ourselves.

In fact, Zero Growth is the common program of both the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie, a common point of struggle against an international workingclass whose creativity threatens to sweep over the petty powers-that-be in both the advanced and the colonial sector, to engulf bourgeois property-titles and bureaucratic procedures with the proletarian Project. The most advanced Zero Growth economies in existence today are not the bourgeois-capitalist ruled nations of western Europe and North America but the bureaucrat-capitalist ruled areas of central and eastern Europe, including the formerly-socialist Soviet Union.

Class War agrees with the Labor Committees about the hideous nature of Zero Growth, and the question of Socialist Expanded Reproduction as being central to the program of the new-born proletarian state power. However, Class War holds that it is the class struggle itself that is the dynamic of world history, even more so than the law or laws of expanded reproduction. Contrary to popular belief, including within the Labor Committees itself, there was within the Communist International in the Third Period, not only some real understanding of the question of Social-Fascism, (the term itself was first used by the Comintern in the Third Period) but also of the concept of expanded reproduction. This is expressed in R. Palme Dutt's extremely valuable work, "Fascism and Social Revolution", 1934, commissioned by the Communist International before the Popular Front retreats and far superior to anything produced by the wretched Dimitroff and his imitators. The central theme of the book is the confrontation between Socialism, as the liberatory productive powers of the working class, guided by Marxist science, and Fascism, as the deliberate destruction of the productive forces, including the working class itself, under conditions of depression and world capitalist crisis. Likewise, even the later-rightist Bukharin, during his Left-Communist phase in 1919-1920, wrote a book called "Economics of the Transformation Period", which Lenin wrote some very interesting comments about, many of them in praise. In Chapter Three of this book, "Collapse of the Capitalist System", Bukharin puts forth an analysis of capitalist crisis very similar to that presented by the Labor Committees tendency since the beginning of the last decade. Bukharin uses the terms "simple reproduction", "extended reproduction", and "extended negative reproduction". The last term represents the capitalist crisis, the process, not simply of no growth, but of backward "development", of the massive destruction of the productive forces, the holocaust of destruction that lies at the end of the tightening spiral of anarchic capitalist relations--and the capitalist state, bourgeois or bureaucratic, is no less anarchist than any individual pirate or gang of capitalist freebooters!

(continued on the next page.....)

Social-fascism, as it relates to fascism (Hitler, Mussolini, etc) is both understood in one sense and very misunderstood in another sense by the analysis developed by the Communist International in the Third Period (1928-1934). Whereas the Third Period Comintern is generally correct in determining the interconnections between the Social Democracy and the counter-revolutionary process in this period, they fail to locate the actual class basis of the phenomenon of Social-Fascism, namely the emergence of the bureaucracy, and its essential superiority over the petty-bourgeois based Hitler and Mussolini movements. Although it is true that, for a period of more than a decade, social-fascism is eclipsed by "pure" fascism and Naziism, actually it is social-fascism which emerges victorious at the end of the second imperialist world war, through the particular benevolence and guidance of the Rockefeller-Anglo-American imperialists. This, in a sense, it is not social-fascism which precedes fascism-Naziism as a less brutal junior partner, but rather fascism and Naziism which prove, in the long run, to be the cruder junior partners, incomplete, and with certain basic flaws connected with its sometimes explicit anti-bureaucratism, to social-fascism.

What the Frankfurt Institute expresses, which becomes clearer and clearer in the ideological complexion of its members as we enter the new historical period of general crisis, is not only the bureaucracy's need for forms, for structures, but also the need for a fundamental world-outlook, an alternative to both the proletarian and bourgeois world-outlooks, which the bureaucracy would not accept for entirely different reasons. As Martin Jay points out again and again, in creating their "Critical Theory", Marcuse, like Horkheimer, saw the necessity to go back before Marx and Marxism, to poke around in pre-capitalist ideological rubbish to find the bits and pieces from which to fashion their "Critical Theory".

Marcuse, rejecting the "positivism" of Marxism, especially the concept of political program per se, looks to his early guru Heidegger, with whom he personally studied in Freiburg University between 1923 and 1932, who is of course publicly identified with the Nazis. Marcuse praises Heidegger's contemporary "masterpiece" "Being and Time" as "the moment at which bourgeois philosophy dissolves itself from within and opens the way to a new 'concrete' science." Marcuse sees Heidegger, rather than Marxism, as the genuine continuator of Hegel. Heidegger's concept of "authentic being" translated by Marcuse and the Marcuseites into a basis of their "quality of life" and "self-determination" politics, is also related, as Martin Jay points out, to existentialism. As Jay explains, Marcuse himself never engaged in the "empirical" work of the Frankfurt Institute. Marcuse is the "theoretician" of the Institute during the period up until World War II, where he reveals his further talents as an agent for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), forerunner of the CIA.

Another extremely important element in the development of "Critical Theory" was the integration of psychoanalysis as Jay calls it; this element has the most crucial immediate importance in terms of the later capacities of the Frankfurters in the development of the basis for psychological-warfare in general, behaviour modification (brainwashing) in particular. Behaviourism is an essentially bureaucratic contribution to capitalist ideology—it is explicitly anti-bourgeois, anti-individualist and collectivist, and is a world-wide trademark of the modern bureaucracy. Behaviourism, whether based on Pavlov in the Soviet Union or Rees and Skinner in the United States and western Europe, is psychological methodology of Social-Fascism.

the

The Frankfurt Institute, more than any other single force, Jay claims in his book, was responsible for endeavouring to "merge the contributions of Marx and Freud", a project which is today "all the rage" in the Counter-Culture and the New Left. Of course, what they meant by this is the absolute opposite of the contributions made by Lyn Marcus in his "Beyond Psychoanalysis" (which as somebody correctly pointed out should not be called "the new psychoanalysis"). The Frankfurt and New Left appropriation of this project, which is actually only one small part of developing Marxism according to all the post-Marx developments in human science and culture as a whole. The introduction for the need for this project, as the social-fascists understood it, was suggested by the leading Belgian social-fascist theoretician Henrik De Man, who later on actually joined the Hitlerite fascist movement—a "flirtation with fascism" is the way Jay describes it! During the early thirties or late twenties, Henrik De Man was actually a member of the Frankfurt Institute. In 1927, before joining the Institute, De Man had written a book entitled "On the Psychology of Marxism", in which, under the cover of struggling against "economic determinism", like the Austro-Marxists, he introduced "quality of life" politics, specifically orienting his analysis to psychological questions. In 1928, Horkheimer himself decided to undergo psychoanalysis, selecting as his psychiatrist Karl Landauer, who had been a student of Freud.

(continued on the next page.....)

On the basis of this initial contact, Lendauer was persuaded to establish the "Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Institute" affiliated to both the Frankfurt Institute and the Southwest German Psychoanalytic Study Group which had been created around Heidelberg during this same period before Hitler took power. This institute became Erich Fromm's main base of operations, and Fromm later on served as liaison between the would-be "Freudian" and "Marxist" wings of the New Left.

Importantly, in terms of Fromm's own theoretical development and its influence on the Frankfurt Institute, Jay relates to the question of Matriarchy. This is particularly of interest to us in that the Tavistock Institute, the more-developed England-based version of the Frankfurt School, picks up later at the precise point where the Frankfurters leave off. The Frankfurters help uncover a certain reality, but it is Tavistock, with its unique opportunities in terms of selection of officers for the British military, not to speak of Tavistock's greater financial resources, which fashions this understanding into a weapon against the workingclass.

Studying Lewis Morgan, Johann Jacob Bachofen, and others on the question of the origins of the family, Fromm, echoed by a host of present-day feminist-fascist countergangs, comes to the conclusion that matriarchy is the most "natural" and free form of society. Like the St. Simon followers of almost a century before, as well as Ludwig Feuerbach's "mother problems" which Marcus has brilliantly examined in terms of their general implications to philosophy, both rightist and leftist intellectual circles in the 1920's and thirties developed a strong interest in matriarchal societies and the quest for the "Mystic Mother". As Jay points out, "antimodernist critics of bourgeois society on the right, such as Alfred Baumler and Ludwig Klages, were attracted to it (matriarchy) for its romantic, naturalistic, anti-intellectual implications." Then, referring to the source of the appeal of matriarchy to the Left, Jay points out almost identical content as the appeal to the right—"Matriarchal society stressed human solidarity and happiness. Its dominant values were love and compassion."

Fromm argued, in reviews of Bachofen's writings, and in reviews of the works of Malinowski ("Sex and Repression in Savage Society", 1927) and Robert Briffault ("The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments", 1927), that maternal love was "unconditional" and "less responsive to social pressures" than paternal love. Fromm also argued that Protestantism had increased the role and rule of the father and of patriarchal institutions generally, and that socialism had to "preserve the promise of the return of the security of medieval Catholicism with its womb-like church and cult of the Virgin Mother". (These are Fromm's actual words!) Fromm attacked Freud, beginning in an article in the Institute's official organ in 1935, as the "prisoner of bourgeois morality and patriarchal values". As superior alternatives to Freud, Fromm looked to Georg Groddeck and Sandor Ferenczi. These two stressed what they believed to be a more "egalitarian" relationship between patient and analyst, more "motherly and loving" than what Fromm alleged was Freud's "patriarchal authoritarianism"—this, an anticipation of Tavistock's "leaderless group" principles of control. As Jay says, "Fromm and his wife also remained friends with Groddeck, despite Groddeck's political naivete—at one time he hoped to get Hitler, whose anti-semitism he doubted, to sponsor some of his work...." However in 1939, Fromm broke completely from the Frankfurt Institute, two years later publishing his "Escape From Freedom", which was part of the general "anti-fascist" and Democratist propaganda that mobilized the American population, including the not entirely willing workingclass majority, for the "democratic participation" in World War II. In later years, Fromm, publicly associated with the Norman Thomas variety of anti-communism, completes his devolution with a new-found interest in Zen Buddhism...the dog returns to his vomit.

However, despite the departure of Fromm, the Frankfurt Institute is to further develop many of its notions in terms of its various "studies" on the theme of "Authority and the Family". Walter Benjamin takes up studies in matriarchal societies. In the 1940's Adorno takes up a polemic against Fromm for his attacks upon Freud, but, as Jay points out, this would-be defense of Freud against "revisionists" has reasons other than any genuinely humanist concern—"It was no accident that increased pessimism about the possibility of revolution went hand in hand with an intensified appreciation of Freud's relevance." It is Marcuse especially who sets out, in "Eros and Civilization" and other writings in the 1950's to "rescue" the "revolutionary Freud". What Marcuse finds specially important in Freud's later interest in Thanatos, the "death principle", which Marcuse saw as a "yearning for the tranquility of inorganic nature." Marcuse sees this "instinct" as "surprisingly similar to the life instinct: both sought gratification and the end of desire itself." Furthermore Marcuse actually declares the need to merge Eros and Thanatos through a "breakdown of the sexual tyranny of the genitals" and a return to the "polymorphous perversity" of childhood. (Salt-eating, anyone ??) Marcuse says

(continued on the next page.....)

that only if the entire body were "re-eroticized" could alienated labor, which he argues is "grounded in the nongenital areas of the body", be overcome. What would result from this "liberatory" process Marcuse openly calls the "pacification of existence" (The term appears in Marcuse's "One Dimensional Man"). Marcuse is here laying the theoretical foundations for the New Left and the Counter-Culture of the last decade and this one, the controlled environment by which the CIA and allied agencies under the direction of the Rockefeller family sought to murder the minds of an entire generation.

Another leading OSS-CIA agent, Norman O. Brown (shirt), is to further develop the historical framework for the "quality of life" ideology in his book written in 1959, "Life Against Death", which weaves together all the elements of the "youth culture" of the sixties, messianic-apocalyptic religion, anarcho-syndicalist "libertarian socialism", bisexual and homosexual "polymorphous perversity" with a particular emphasis on anality (Part Five of the book is called "Studies in Anality--The Excremental Vision"). Here, Fromm opposes Marcuse, arguing that genital sexuality is an expression of democratic, even revolutionary social values, and opposing what he believes is the "nihilism" implicit in Marcuse's advocacy of perversity as "liberating". As Jay relates, "Marcuse accepted Fromm's charge that he was a nihilist, arguing that the nihilism of the 'Great Refusal' was the only true humanism allowed in the present world." Allowed, yes, allowed by the Rockefellers, like the "humanism" of Corliss Lamont, president of the "American Humanist Association" who gave a "humanist of the year" award to brainwasher-criminal B.F. Skinner. But, the differences between Fromm and Marcuse are resolved on one basic point. As Jay relates: "...despite both men's insistence that their positions were miles apart, they seemed to converge on at least the one question of the strength and durability of an instinct to die." Indeed !!

The real differences between Fromm and Marcuse are based on their actual class allegiances. Fromm is unable to make the full transition from the essentially petty-bourgeois Democratism of the traditional reformists in the labor movement into the fully-developed bureaucratic-based Social-Fascism of today. During the war, Fromm is content to polemicize against the "escape from freedom" which he sees expressed equally in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Marcuse, on the other hand, joins the OSS, giving full expression to the "nihilism" which Fromm accused him of. As a major theoretician of "socialist humanism", alongside Telos magazine, Raya Dunayevskaya, C.L.R. James, and similar anti-communist "leftists", Fromm is simply allowed his place on a certain pedestal of capitalist-nurtured "Marxism". As an activist "in the field", Marcuse actually only begins his career as OSS agent in World War II. Marcuse gives ideological "focus" to the otherwise completely infantile gibberish of which the majority of "New Left leaders" were capable of, even in their most "inspired" programmed state. Furthermore, he has the distinction of being the personal guru to Angela Davis during her stay at the Sorbonne in Paris. In a letter to Angela Davis, published in the February 1971 Ramparts (CIA), Marcuse writes :

"People ask me again and again how you, a highly intelligent sensitive young woman, an excellent student and teacher, how you became involved in the violent events at San Rafael...you felt that the philosophical idea, unless it was a lie, must be translated into reality: that it contained a moral imperative to leave the classroom, the campus, and to go to help the others, your own people to whom you still belong--in spite of (or perhaps because of) your success within the white Establishment."

Yes, indeed ! Because of her "success with the white Establishment", because of her usefulness as a counter-organizer, as the leader of a CIA-controlled "third world nationalist" faction inside the CPUSA, Angela Davis did indeed return to "her own people" armed, not with the pitiful Browderism or Fosterism of the "old left" CPUSA, but with the advanced Social-Fascist "New Left" ideology of her Sorbonne philosophy professor, OSS-CIA agent Herbert Marcuse.

THE BUREAUCRACY AGAINST "AUTHORITY"

Although it is fairly well known that Marcuse and other leading figures in the Frankfurt Institute worked for the OSS and similar intelligence services during the war, it is less understood that their "anti-fascist" Social-Fascism was worked out well before its practice on behalf of victorious Anglo-American Imperialism in the defeated German and Italian nations.

(continued on the next page.....)

Along the lines of further "studies" of the "problems" of authority, the family, "mass culture", etc., the Frankfurt Institute made its specific contribution to the "great anti-fascist struggle" by preparing the broad outlines for the psychological profiling of the German population, especially the workingclass, for the ultimate postwar purposes of establishing an even more efficient slave-labor apparatus than that erected under the Third Reich. Most of the studies on "authoritarianism" in the German population done by the Frankfurt Institute had immediate military relevance and usefulness, to plan, for example the mass terror-bombings, such as the infamous fire-storm bombings of Dresden which killed 300,000 people in less than 24 hours. However, the Frankfurt Institute's polemics against "authoritarianism" have, to this day, an even more sinister counter-revolutionary purpose than the above.

The Frankfurt Institute's "anti-authoritarianism" is in no way related to the purely petty-bourgeois anarchism and individualism which sometimes makes similar sounding noises. The Frankfurters are against the traditional bourgeois-capitalist hierarchy, and the values which flow from it, which the Frankfurters, as ideological vanguard for the bureaucracy, see as unequal to the tasks presented by the new historical period of crisis, the new class war of an awakening international workingclass--and they are right! The bourgeoisie alone cannot maintain capitalism in this period, the "social pact" that establishes peace between bourgeoisie and proletariat cannot be maintained for long anywhere, the bureaucracy as the new class on the historical scene, must assume more and more of the functions of state power, of the creation and deployment of higher and higher "qualities" of organized force and violence upon an increasingly restive and angry humanity.

The bureaucracy upholds its collectivism, its self-disciplined cohesiveness and combativity, relative to the dinosaurs of the Bourgeois Republic. The superiority of the bureaucracy, as a political class capable of grappling with the rising revolutionary proletariat, first expressed only at the "theoretical" level, in the ability of the bureaucracy, through social-fascism of the Frankfurt Institute variety in particular, to produce a relatively passable false consciousness, soon becomes apparent at more and more "practical" levels of the class war, in more and more areas of the state machinery of capitalist rule. The second imperialist world war gives the modern bureaucracy the most unique opportunity that could have been offered to it, to integrate itself with the most specialized and heavily-armed sections of a bourgeois-capitalist military machine (the takeover of the British military by the Tavistock Social-Fascist bureaucrats, documented by the Labor Committees in the "Tavistock Grin" articles.)

In opposing "authoritarianism", the social-fascists are also declaring their superiority to Hitler and Mussolini fascism. These petty-bourgeois hoodlums were against science, against technology, declare the bureaucracy, they are dangerously psychologically unstable which makes them dangerous to capitalism's stability, whereas we the modern bureaucracy have learned from the mistakes of the past and we are prepared to develop a more efficient method of social control--self-policing, not "taking orders", co-participation not forced labor, "Spare the rod, use behaviour mod" as a teachers' magazine said recently.

The rule that the bureaucracy now plans to establish, under the direct guidance of those "vanguard" bourgeois counter-revolutionaries, the Rockefellers, is to be far worse than any "authoritarianism" that they have ever put under their scrutiny. They attack "authoritarianism", bourgeois-capitalist forms of class rule and social control, not because of their reactionary anti-workingclass historical role, but because the bureaucracy claims that the bourgeoisie has not fulfilled that role, that the bourgeoisie today can only be reactionary, when what is needed is not reaction, declare the bureaucracy, but counter-revolution.

The main initial purpose of the Frankfurt Institute's studies being fulfilled by the early fifties, with the importation by the American occupation officials of a hand-picked Social Democratic party and trade union leadership for the German workingclass in West Germany, Jay relates how the various Frankfurters were involved with the Anglo-American intelligence services during this period:

"Government consultation was also a means of supplementing income while doing useful work. Neumann was the first to go to Washington to aid in the war effort. In 1942 he joined the Bureau of Economic Warfare as its chief consultant and then, soon after, the OSS, as the deputy chief of the Research and Analysis Branch Central European section.... Other Institute members spent a considerable part of their time in Washington during the war. Kirchheimer also joined the OSS, as did Marcuse after completing "Reason and Revolution", his last extensive

(continued on the next page.....)

publication for more than a decade. Here (in the OSS) they were members of a remarkable community of intellectuals, which included such distinguished scholars as Hajo Holborn, Norman O. Brown, Carl Schorske, H. Stuart Hughes, Leonard Krieger, Crane Brinton, and Franklin Ford. Marcuse had served briefly with the Office of War Information before joining the OSS. The OWI was also the focus of Lowenthal's governmental work after 1943. Pollock was an occasional consultant to the Dept. of Justice's antitrust division and to the Board of Economic Warfare..."

Of course, as this "useful work" began, so the financial difficulties of the Frankfurt Institute and its members ended. The "remarkable community of intellectuals" in the OSS, OWI, etc. were to discover in their work with the budding Anglo-American fascist conspiracy the "activist" application of their initial social-fascist "studies" for the International Labor Organization and the German Social Democracy before that. In effect, the Frankfurt Institute and its members were given a Reesian Mission.

Initially, in the early years of the 1940's, Wittfogel, who was himself directly funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Institute of Pacific Relations, was probably an important contact between the Frankfurt School and the highest capitalist circles. In October, 1943, the Frankfurt Institute was set on a permanent grant from both the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish Labor Committee, both of these Rockefeller-controlled "liberal" countergangs used extensively in "ethnic polarization" counter-insurgency.

The connection with the OSS and the OWI was vital to the return of the Frankfurt Institute to West Germany just a couple of years after the end of the war. After picking up what Martin Jay calls "American technique", the social-fascist Frankfurters still integrally linked with the Anglo-American intelligence services, is returned under the direct sponsorship, and later even personal funding, of none other than the High Commissioner of the American Occupation in Germany, John J. McCloy himself.

McCloy was the head of the American military government in the US-occupied section of Germany, and thus helped to administer the slave labor and zero growth polices which placed German workers under worse overall conditions, lower daily caloric intake, etc. than they had suffered under Hitler. As Peter Cuskie's article, "The Shaping of the Anglo-American SS by War" in the May 1974 Campaigner details, McCloy was not only a key operative on the OSS payroll, but was specifically associated with the Rockefeller-directed "young turks" in the intelligence establishment, which had the most long-range and conspiratorial plans for the intelligence apparatus and the police and military machinery as well, for use long beyond the formal end of hostilities with the Axis powers.....

As Jay relates in the Epilogue to his book, Horkheimer was the first to return, followed, in 1950, by the Institute itself:

"The eagerness of Frankfurt officials to regain some of the city's pre-Nazi intellectual eminence by enticing the Institute back was considerable. And ultimately their efforts proved successful. With the encouragement of American occupation officials, including High Commissioner John J. McCloy, the city was able to make an offer that Horkheimer found impossible to reject."

As Jay goes on to relate, many of the members of the Institute, especially Horkheimer as director, although happy to return to Germany, were unhappy about severing their ties with the United States. But Rockefeller and his buddies solved that little problem:

"...Horkheimer agreed to remain in Germany only after being assured that he could retain his naturalized citizenship. Through special legislation sponsored by McCloy and signed into law by President Truman in July, 1952, he was granted a continuation of his American citizenship despite his return to the country of his origin."

Some of the Institute members declined to return to Germany, and instead severed their connections and opened up new ones, but usually associated with similar "liberal" anti-communist circles. Lowenthal quit the Institute, accepting in 1949 a position as director of the "research division" of the Voice of America (CIA). Marcuse also, as Jay relates, "chose to remain with the State Department until 1950, when he returned to Columbia as a lecturer in sociology and senior fellow at the Russian Institute"(CIA) In 1954, Marcuse switched to the "History of Ideas" program

(continued on the next page.....)

at Brandeis, where he remained in academic "mothballs" for eleven years, until in 1965, the Rockefeller-CIA forces re-activated him, sending him to the University of California at San Diego, to develop the psychological profile of the U.S. student radical and liberal layers, to lay the basis for the launching of the New Left and the Counter-Culture as the twin controlled environments to contain and destroy any student or other petty-bourgeois layers that might move in a workingclass direction.

As Jay relates, the Institute was reopened in West Germany primarily with 236,000 marks from the "McCloy Funds", a bag-man operation for the Rockefellers.

However, whether they were returned to Germany or remained in the United States, the eminent social-fascist scholars of the Frankfurt Institute played a key role in developing the psychological profiles on the Soviet and eastern European leadership, as well as actual of potential political leaderships amongst the workingclass in the rest of Europe. The Rockefellers pumped them for every shred of information that they could use to compile the most accurate psychological profiles of the Soviet bloc as a whole.

In fact their interests in such areas provoked the investigations of the McCarthyite witch-hunt at various times. One Frankfurt Institute eminent, Wittfogel, broke down before the pressure and offered to aid in the witch-hunt. He thus became despised by his colleagues, not because they were in any way upholders of the rights of communists, but because as part of the bureaucracy, they suffered under the petty-bourgeois based hysteria of the McCarthy period, which was itself nourished by a certain reactionary anti-bureaucratism which imagined that every government bureaucrat, especially intellectuals, was either a socialist "pinko" or a communist "red". With the opening of the decade of the sixties, and the decision by the Rockefeller-CIA forces to rely on the Tavistock counter-insurgency methods of class warfare against workers in every country, the social-fascists of the Frankfurt Institute and their ideological spawn throughout North American and western Europe, and even some areas of eastern Europe where they have been penetrating in behalf of "polycentrism" and "local control", have come into their own.

The entire "New Left", from the Berkeley "Free Speech Movement" to the "dissident intellectuals" in Yugoslavia, whose writings appear alongside Marcuse's in Telos magazine, the CIA's own philosophers' counter-gang, was and is a creation of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and its associated thugs and criminals throughout the world.

In the next issue of Class War (issue no. 6) we shall continue this narration of the development of Social-Fascism from the Social-Democracy to the New Left, how the counter-revolution was deployed through the decade of the sixties, and what new programs, strategies, and tactics the new international revolutionary movement must develop in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy everywhere.

The following material was used as sources of information for this article, is widely referred to in the article, or else is of particular use in further understanding and fighting against the phenomena described herein:

"The Dialectical Imagination, A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950" by Martin Jay, 1973 published by Little, Brown and Company.

"The Tavistock Grin", published as four major articles in the April and May issues of the Campaigner, (both available for \$2.00 from the N.C.L.C. P.O. Box 1972, GPO, New York, N.Y. 10001) This is a must for a basic understanding of any aspect of modern politics in the world today.

"Fascism and Social Revolution, A Study of the Economics and Politics of the Extreme Stages of Capitalism in Decay" by R. Palme Dutt, 1934 published by International Publishers, out of print unfortunately.

"The Left-Wing Intellectuals Between The Wars, 1919-1939" Published as issue no. 2 of the "Journal of Contemporary History" edited by Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse, useful for background on Social Democracy.

"Life Against Death, the Psychoanalytical Meaning of History" by Norman O. Brown, published 1959, a CIA Psywar Primer for the New Left and the Counter-Culture in the 1960's and '70's.

CHINA.....

(This statement is taken from "Whither China?", the 1968 Manifesto of Sheng Wu-Lien, the Ultra-Left Red Guards mass organization in Hunan, which was reprinted in Class War, issue no. 3.)

of the bureaucrats who, before the revolution, had said: "Without us, production would collapse, and the society would fall into a state of hopeless confusion".

As a matter of fact, without the bureaucrats and bureaucratic organs, productivity was greatly liberated. After the Ministry of the Coal Industry fell, production of coal went on as usual. All departments of the provincial Party committees fell, but the various branches of their work went on as usual. Moreover, the working class were greatly liberated in their enthusiasm and initiative for production. The management of industrial plants by the workers themselves after January was impressive. For the first time, the workers had the feeling that 'it is not the state which manages us; but we who manage the state'. For the first time, the workers felt that they were producing for themselves. Their enthusiasm had never been so high, and their sense of responsibility as masters of the house had never been so strong...

...This was the true content of the class changes in the January Revolution. As a matter of fact, in this short period some places realized, though not very thoroughly, the content of the "People's Commune of China". The society found itself in a state of "mass dictatorship" similar to that of the Paris Commune. The January Storm told people that China would go ahead toward a society which had no bureaucrats, and that 90 per cent of the senior cadres had already formed a privileged class...

...The commune of the "Ultra-Left faction" does not conceal its views and intentions. We publicly declare that our objective of establishing the "People's Commune of China" can only be achieved by forcible overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship and the revisionist system of the Revolutionary Committee. Let the new bureaucratic-bourgeoisie tremble before the true socialist revolution that shakes the world! "

SOVIET UNION.....

(This statement is taken from the "Programmatic Proclamation" of the Soviet Revolutionary Communists (Bolsheviks), an underground revolutionary workingclass organization in the Soviet Union today. The statement was published by the Albanians in the latter half of the sixties, and was also reprinted in one of the predecessors to Class War, a publication called Communist, issue no. 4, Nov.-Dec. 1970.)

"The bourgeois class policy of Soviet bureaucracy has been quite clearly manifested in the fact that its first move was the formal removal of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Of course, this has been done under the pretext that allegedly it is no more necessary in the Soviet Union. And this is happening in the conditions when half of mankind is still under the yoke of capitalism, when even inside the Soviet Union, for that matter, one cannot help seeing the consequences of the world class conflicts and the bourgeois influences. Bureaucracy opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Party of the proletariat 'the state of the whole people' and 'the party of the whole people'...But they only say that this state and this party are led by the 'leaders', that is to say the bureaucrats who now represent no more and working class, none except their own selves.

"...To upset the bureaucratic system in the USSR it is indispensable to have an organization of the revolutionaries, it is indispensable to have a bed through which to channel the anger of the people and the popular struggle. But for this we need not make any researches. There stands before us the tested road—the road of the re-creation of the proletarian party. Indeed the CPSU has now been transformed into an entirely formal organization, into a screen providing a democratic appearance to the rule of the bureaucrats. It is clear that the new really proletarian party will be nothing less than the regenerated Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Soviet Union. All those who are prepared to fight against bureaucracy, all those who dearly cherish the great revolutionary victories of our people and the cause of world revolution, must embark resolutely and forever on this road...To overthrow the opportunists, and after having set up a revolutionary government to place bureaucracy between this government and the people as between the hammer and the anvil—this is the task facing the Soviet communists. It is by no means a question of total liquidation of the bureaucrats. Not at all. Only those who would openly resist the victory of democracy should be mercilessly smashed."