

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Volume 7 No. 7

10 cents

CONTENTS

Total War

The State and The Soviet Union

Report from Britain

Freud, Houdini of the Libido

**A
U
G
U
S
T

1
9
4
5**

Issued by the Revolutionary Workers League for the International
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Leninist League of Great Britain

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

Mail address of publishers

DEMOS PRESS

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Labor Donated

STACKS

TOTAL WAR

The second world war brought into the limelight the concept of "total war". It has been attributed to Hitler and the fascists, but history proves that they have presented nothing new in either theory or practice.

It was Dr. Blau, national-socialist and strategist for the Nazis, who elaborated and expounded the idea of "Total War", of a war on the diplomatic front, the economic front, the psychological front and finally the military front; in fact all phases of social life - to organize the whole nation for war in "peace" and in military conflict.

But Dr. Blau merely borrowed practical and theoretical ideas long ago expounded and proven correct; and later merely borrowed by the German General Staff and Hitler for imperialist ends.

General Ludendorff studied this problem and advocated "total war" long before Hitler became the "darling" of the Prussian Junkers and the big financial interests of Germany. Ludendorff's theory took into account the relations between politics, technology, economics, morals, and warfare. His concept of total war differed from Hitler's only in the theory of politics. Ludendorff wanted to establish a military dictatorship of the old Prussian Junker type, doing away with the 'evils' he confronted under the Kaiser during the first world war; while the fascists and Hitler desired to establish a different type of political dictatorship of the minority over all social institutions. They presented two different roads to total war and the handling of politics, but their content was the same.

Civilized wars, meaning wars under the systems of exploitation, are wars that tend to embrace more and more of the whole nation. But the difference in the past - Chattel Slavery, Feudalism and developing capitalism as compared to the imperialist stage of capitalism - is mainly the result of technological development. The low industrial level and lack of science, transportation, communication, and movement did not enable the "total war" of nations to proceed beyond the primitive stage. But with further economic development and social change, wars of nations took on a more total character. The theory was there from the very beginning; but the economic means to the end were not present.

REDIVISION OF THE EARTH

It was not until after the industrial revolution of capitalism that the beginning of total war became evident. The first war to **DIVIDE THE WORLD** among the exploiters and to lay down a political and social line of demarcation for the future was fought in Europe in the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune that followed. Prior to this war and revolution the economic development was too low to embrace the **GLOBE** as a whole, and wars were fought for control only

of PARTS of the world. 1871 was the beginning of the world wide struggle and the world wars to follow.

Economic development and its technological progress laid the basis for this. By the turn of the century the second series of wars for the REDIVISION of the EARTH took place, on the one hand between rising United States imperialism and declining Spain; and on the other hand between backward Czarist Russia and rising Japanese imperialism. This was followed by the Russian Revolution of 1905. The theory and practice of total war had progressed to the extent that economic development of capitalism moved forward.

The first world war between Germany on the one hand, and the British Empire on the other, resulted in a loss for both and a gain for two other imperialist powers - the United States and Japan. This was a third attempt to divide the earth. Again as in 1871 and 1905 this war was cut short by the social revolution in Russia of 1917 and a series of others that followed. In this first world war, total war was at a much higher level than ever before, even though the term was not used then as it has been in this second world war.

The type of war has undergone a revolutionary change because of the classes involved and because of economic development. The Nazi theory of total war is an extension of the concepts of Clausewitz and Ludendorff. But it leaned upon previous theories of Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Scharnhorst, Moltke, Schlieffen and Gneisenau. It is a blending of these men of theory and men of action together with economic development.

MARX AND ENGELS

But the whole picture of total war would be one-sided and erroneous if we did not consider the contributions to this subject by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. It was Marx' thesis on Feuerbach which stated that, "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways. The point, however, is to change it."

The writings of Marx and Engels on military problems are not bound in one or more volumes, and are scattered; but when one considers that military strategy and tactics cannot be separated from the class principles, political principles one can understand the real significance of Marx and Engels as writers on total war, which was later practiced by Lenin and Trotsky in the Russian Revolution.

One could mention the "Class Struggle in France, 1848", the Paris Commune, the American Civil War, and many other writings on military questions by these revolutionary Marxists, not to speak of writings by Lenin and Trotsky. But the important factor to remember, in the question of total war, is not merely the question of military problems. It is the question of how these military problems are handled as class problems.

Marx and Engels clearly laid down the concepts of a continuous war. In 1850 Marx presented the theoretical concept of the permanent revolution later developed and expounded by Trotsky. In the general concepts of the class struggle and Historical Materialism, the broad outlines of war of political, economic, social and military struggle is put forth constantly.

The exploiters' society fights for the control of the world's resources and the means of production. This is supplemented by an officer corps and military staff that can absorb a large draft army in a very short period. The struggle of the exploiters for the redivision of the earth is a continuous war taking on different forms, open and concealed, social, political, economic, and military. The struggle of classes is continuous and has even more fundamental contradictions. The very foundation of the class struggle and the relationship of imperialist wars and revolutions lays the basis for total war. Exploitation and wars of reaction demand the organization of the total social forces or the alternative of being liquidated. The proletarian revolution likewise, even to a higher degree, demands the total organization of the social, economic, political, and military forces for these ends.

LAND, SEA AND AIR POWER

In the period of the first world war the railroads determined the size of the army and naval strength acted as a barrier to invasion and helped blockade the "enemy". These economic conditions placed restrictions upon the extent of "total war" and revealed the relation of total war to economics.

But at present, in the second world imperialist war to redivide the earth among the victorious exploiters, other economic developments play a leading role. First and foremost is air power. But this does not mean that the airplane replaced the navy and railroad of yesterday; nor does it replace the naval and land forces. It means that the naval, land and air strategy are combined, taking the best of land, sea and air and uniting them into a new and higher unity of former "opposites", with air strategy playing the key role.

This general idea of social, political, economic, and military development, which includes any and all scientific developments, has been presented by the revolutionary Marxists through Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. It includes the concept of total war - total war of the exploiters for their narrow ends - and above all total war of the exploited for their social broad ends.

Read Lenin on the October Revolution. Rostudy the practical questions of this turning point in historical development and you will see total war that makes the fascists and Hitler the amateurs and copy-cats that they are. The mobilization of the nation for total war for liberation against exploitation is the only KIND of total war worth supporting. It involves every man, woman and child. It involves every means at the disposal of the nation to free itself from exploitation of man by man. It involves mass propaganda and agitation; it involves economic, social, political and military war.

KINDS OF TOTAL WAR

The total war of fascism is different in kind from the total war of the struggle for communism; whereas the total war of fascism is different only in degree (not in kind) from the total war of bourgeois-democracy.

American imperialism, as the leading bourgeois-democratic imperialist power, had greater economic, and therefore political, social and military might at its disposal. Its total war, therefore, could have reached a higher level in degree than that of the fascists, although in actuality this did not occur.

But more important that this relationship of degree in the question of total war is the question of relationship of KIND. The Soviet Union with its more backward economic level than either German or American capitalism revealed in its defense against fascism that its forces were greater for total war.

This was due to its superior economic system. No one questions the restraints that the economic level of development places upon a nation. But the economic system, the superiority of weak capitalism over strong capitalism has been proven time and time again. And this has a key bearing on the question of total war.

No one mechanically separates these social and economic factors from the military tactics and problems. On the contrary, the military tactics and strategy flow from basic class principles. Total war is a product of social development. It is not new. Its "newness" merely means the kept press and their editors and those who mould public opinion have caught up with the social conditions which bring to the fore the theoretical and practical question of total war long ago theoretically presented by Marx and Engels.

MORALS AND TOTAL WAR

One more important distinction must be made in relation to total war. Revolutionary Marxists are not moralists. Moralism has become a hiding place for fakers who try to cure the cancerous growth of capitalism with ointments and surface remedies, are the true social defenders of progressive morals for all mankind regardless of race, color or creed.

Total war, as it has been associated with Hitler and fascism is to be abhorred. It represents a return to barbarism. Total war of fascism and its systematic destruction of the working class and minority races, especially the Jews, represents Capitalism in decay at its worst. And unless we change to social production this will be repeated over and over again. In small backward countries, without German industrial development, this wholesale destruction of human beings is not NEW under capitalism. Industrially developed Germany, taken over by fascism (with the consent of the rulers of United States, England, and France, in 1933, to be used against communism) is only a more widespread barbarous phenomena. It is not a new condition of decay capitalism at all.

The mass killings and the exploitation and suppression by the fascists in Germany as compared to that of lesser capitalist nations reflects the differences in the DEGREE of economic development and capitalist decay. It is not a matter of morals. But when the total war of fascism is compared to total war of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky a different content is brought to the surface, not a difference only in degree. The total war of the exploiters' nation is a total war of minority not only against the majority within the

nation but also against the majority of the exploiter nations whom the victor must vanquish in order to rule Europe and the world for German exploiters. They do not intend to share the world with other exploiters of other nationalities. So the problem is more than class vs class. It also includes in addition to the workers and peasants the minority exploiters of other nations (except for those Quislings who are needed as local agents to hold in check the masses.

Total war of revolutionary Marxism (not Stalinism) represents the war of the majority against the minority. Such war can not be waged under a bureaucratic dictatorship over the majority, such as the Stalinist machine, but only under the democratic rule of the majority over the former exploiting minority. This brings to the fore a new and higher moral basis which is the antithesis of the fascist wholesale destruction and elimination of the countless millions of oppressed and exploited and the minority nationalities.

Science and technological development will make the concept of total war more and more a common topic, but above all total war must be understood in its relationship to the class struggle - the aims of the exploiters and reactionary wars on the one hand versus revolutionary wars for liberation and social revolution on the other. Only within this framework can the problems of total war be analyzed.

5/5/45

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO

THE FIGHTING WORKER

Popular Organ of the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U. S. A.

Affiliated to the INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION

The Fighting Worker contains popular analysis of national and international events; featured articles on economics; and interesting columns of comment

Subscription rates are \$1.00 a year. Single copies 5¢

Bundle orders of 10 or more sent to you postage paid at the rate of 1¢ a copy. SPREAD THE FIGHTING WORKER!

Order from DEMOS PRESS, 708 N. Clark St., Chicago, Ill.

THE STATE THE SOVIET UNION AND DEFENSISM

Political economy is a science which deals with living, dynamic forces. Any attempt, therefore, to interpret the laws of Political Economy in a rigid, mechanical fashion are doomed to failure. In dealing with human and social relationships all things are blends and interrelationships, rather than fixed and unchanging entities. Marx used to point out for instance that his great work, Capital, actually did not give a picture of modern society because no place on earth was there a system exactly like the one he described. All capitalist economies had carryovers of the old feudal, chattel slave, and sometimes primitive communist, eras. In some backward capitalist countries most of the forms were feudal forms, rather than capitalist. The system of society that Marx described in his three volumes of "Das Kapital" is therefore an abstraction of a pure capitalist society which never did and never can exist. Anyone who attempts to deal with Marx's masterpiece in a rigid, mechanistic fashion will thus never understand the living relationships in the real capitalist world.

Unfortunately however too many "theoreticians" in the revolutionary movement are intoxicated by what Stuart Chase called "The Tyranny of Words". They take a Marxian law and repeat it by rote for every given situation without attempting to understand the living interrelationships and blends of all phenomena. Everything to them is either black or white, progressive or reactionary, good or bad. They look upon social phenomena as statics, rather than as changing forces going through an evolution-revolution process based on an actual struggle (and unity) of opposites.

This crude form of thinking is especially noticeable when dealing with the question of the State. Lenin once wrote that "The state is the instrument of the ruling class", and for some "thinkers" that exhausts the subject entirely. All states are always the instrument of the ruling class and do its bidding. Hence if a state is not doing the bidding of the "ruling class" there must be another ruling class in existence. The state in the Soviet Union has arrested, imprisoned, and otherwise harmed millions of Russian workers; ipso facto the Soviet State is not an instrument of the workers (A Workers State), but of another class, "the bureaucracy". Such is the syllogistic argument put up by the mechanical materialists who parade as Marxists.

FORMS OF THE STATE

Let us break down Lenin's theorem - "The State is the instrument of the ruling class" - into its living components. Yes, it is quite true that GENERALLY AND HISTORICALLY the state represents the interests of the oppressors against the oppressed, the interests of the dominant class. But that does not mean, for instance, that :

- a- One section of the state may not take action against another section, as a reflection of the struggle within the capitalists themselves.
- b- All sections of the ruling class are treated equally, or

- c- That the state will not make concessions on occasions to the oppressed, or
- d- That the state will not be used by a major section of the rulers to discipline the whole ruling class for extended periods and receive the wrath of the individual members of the oppressing class.

As a matter of fact all these things are happening constantly. Roosevelt orders his troops to carry Sewell Avery out of the Montgomery Ward plant because he recognizes that the interests of this one potentate of the capitalist class are hurting the GENERAL interests of the whole class...Roosevelt dies and Truman comes in with a whole new set of advisers, cabinet members, etc. That signifies that Truman will pay homage to a slightly different section of the rulers than did Roosevelt.

One state takes on a monarchical form, another a military dictatorship, a third a "democracy", etc. Furthermore each monarchy differs from the other and each "democracy" differs from other "democracies". The United States has an entirely different parliamentary form than that of France.

What makes for these differences? The answer is not simple but complex:

- 1- The economic development and level of each country. (For instance a Fascist government in Spain, based on a low level of economy, is radically different than the fascist form in Germany.)
- 2- The specific class struggle within each country.
- 3- The internal struggles amongst the ruling class itself, in that country.
- 4- The relationship of that one national ruling class to the ruling class in other countries.

If you want to understand a single action of the capitalist state you must take into account the interrelationship of all four factors. Let us take a simple example. The Roosevelt government attempted to introduce a bill in the United States which amounted to forced labor, the Wadsworth Bill. Many people could not understand why the bill was put forth at the time that it was, especially since the defeat of Germany was imminent. But the bill was based on the international relationships of the American capitalists with Britain, Japan and other powers on the one hand, and the need of a struggle by American capitalism against the Soviet Union and the growing wave of Revolutions, on the other hand. Furthermore, Roosevelt correctly anticipated resentment at the unemployment and loss of take home pay after the defeat of Germany and he wanted this weapon to smash strikes and keep that resentment within bounds. There are other factors too, but these highlights show that it is impossible to explain a single act of the state on the mechanical thesis "The State is the instrument of the ruling class", but that the living interrelationships must be taken into account. As a matter of fact a large section of the ruling class, - for its own reasons, i.e. in order to protect "laissez faire" which is one of the weapons these sectors have against other monopolists - opposed the Wadsworth bill. But the Wadsworth bill fitted into the needs of the capitalist class AS A WHOLE.

INNER STRUGGLES OF THE CAPITALISTS

The bourgeois state does not represent the wishes and interests of each individual capitalist as such; it represents the interests of its class AS A WHOLE. Sometimes those interests dictate that large sections of the ruling class itself shall be exterminated. In order to exist, American capitalism had to go to war against German capitalism. In doing so it forced innumerable small capitalists

out of the economic picture, as a sacrifice to the greed of the larger monopolists who refused to support their own state unless such concessions were given them.

How does the bourgeois state represent the interests of the ruling class? Its constitution makes private property sacrosanct, - its army, its police force, its courts guard that one basic theorem above everything else - including and especially human rights. The bourgeois state defends the right to make a profit above everything else. But the bourgeois state is definitely not free from the whirltides of economic pressure, from the pressure of the working class, or from the internecine struggles within its own class at home and abroad. Wars for instance between rival sections of the world ruling class force the state to modify its forms. Struggles of the working class for economic and political rights force the state to either turn to the left, toward popular frontism in one of its many forms, or to the right, to military dictatorship in one of its many forms, depending on the specific gravity of the struggle. Furthermore the economic level of the country will color the picture. A "democracy" in the United States will be very different from one in backward Peru. And finally the ability of capitalist leaders to organize the state machine and to control the capitalist internecine struggles will determine the state forms too. The forms under a Roosevelt are different than the forms under a Hoover. This subjective factor must not be discounted.

THE FORMS OF THE STATE WILL VARY THEREFORE DEPENDING ON THE BLEND OF THE FOUR FACTORS DEALT WITH ABOVE, DEPENDING IN OTHER WORDS ON THE TOTALITY OF THESE FOUR FACTORS, WHAT WE REFER TO AS CLASS RELATIONS.

Where the oppressed class is docile, weak, disorganized or beaten the state will appear more openly as the agency of its class. The Latin American dictatorships and the colonial rule of the imperialists are an excellent example. The fascist dictatorships, which come into power on the basis of a defeat of the proletariat, are another example. Where the oppressed class is relatively stronger and better organized the forms of class rule are more hidden dictatorships. A trade union movement of some 15 million in America, for instance, forces the bourgeois state to assume a mask of "impartiality". A large revolutionary wave, such as existed in Germany in 1919 or in Hungary under Karolyi will even make the state attempt to appear as an agency for the oppressed class, the working class.

APPEARANCES AND REALITIES

The stronger and more numerous the oppressed class the more will the state form appear as an "arbiter" between classes. The weaker the oppressed class the more will the state show its open fangs of dictatorship. As the oppressed class grows in strength and power a number of strange "exceptions" to Lenin's Maxim develop. Those "exceptions" (in reality extensions) are of a number of different types. There are instances where the relationships of classes are so evenly balanced that what Trotsky called a "Bonapartist" state comes into existence. For instance the absolute monarchs of the latter days of Feudalism were forced on occasions to employ capitalist ministers. On the surface they appeared to be an instrumentality of the bourgeoisie, and many a feudal lord bemoaned this fact no end. In the terminology of Engels the contending classes were so evenly balanced that the state appeared to rest above classes, but nonetheless its roots remained within the prevailing mode of production. That was proven when the bourgeoisie started the French Revolution - it then had to oppose the Monarchy.

Another type of such "exception" is where the state itself is forced to split into two parts because of its confusion, because of a division of labor, because basically of the pressure of the oppressed class. This occurred, for instance, during the Spanish Civil War. Sections of the bourgeoisie failed to go over to the Fascist state and maintained their old "democratic" state, when the working class defended itself against Fascism and seized the factories, etc.

Another type of such "exception" is where two states of two separate classes exist side by side - dual power. Such phenomena have existed frequently in the past thirty years, the outstanding example of which is the dual power in Russia in 1917, the state of the exploiters under Kerensky, and the state of the oppressed, the Soviets.

SCIENCE AND HUMANITARIANISM

These so-called exceptions take on great significance in periods of accentuated class struggle. It must be emphasized here that we are not dealing with humanitarian questions but scientific estimates. We Marxists will fight tyrants whether they rule over capitalist states or over working class states. We are just as opposed to the tyranny of a Napoleon as we are to the tyranny of a Louis XVI, although one served revolutionary capitalism and the other the reactionary feudalism. Furthermore only mass action by the oppressed can eliminate tyrants. But unfortunately history is not made out of the whole cloth, as Marx pointed out. It is sometimes necessary to move parallel to one set of tyrants against another. We would march with a Napoleon, for instance, against a Louis XVI, while at the same time trying to dislodge Napoleon. Our criteria is dependent on the class nature of the state and the long term historical benefits to be gained by supporting a progressive social order against a reactionary one.

The Great French Revolution of 1789 offers a fertile field for examining this thesis. Of the various factions in the Revolution the proletariat had more to gain by supporting the Heberts, Marats and Baboeufs against the Robespierres, Lafayettes, Dantons and Napoleons. But the proletariat was duty bound to support the WHOLE bourgeois state against the feudal reaction of central Europe.

Similar examples can be adduced in the trade union movement. The State of Texas requires union organizers to get a permit before they can organize. If that august state were to arrest an out and out Union racketeer because he dared organize without such a permit we would defend him against the capitalist state in this instance, even though in his own Union we would fight him with every weapon available.

The Soviet Union today comes under the category of one of the "exceptions" enumerated above. Inside and outside the Soviet Union the relationship of class forces are balanced to the point where the Soviet state appears to rest above classes; to many people it appears to be an instrument of a new class, the Soviet bureaucracy. As a matter of fact when we say the Soviet Union is a WARPED Workers State, we are merely stating that the relationship of classes in Russia (affected by the world relationship of classes as well) is so tenuous and so evenly balanced, the working class has lost so much strength and power that other classes are challenging its power and are radically altering the forms of state power. Bourgeois ELEMENTS are ensconced in responsible positions and are making headway, while the working class is steadily losing ground, even in its property relations.

- which are being diluted and warped. The analogy with the absolute Monarchs of feudalism is not too far fetched: there too the state was so weakened by enemy pressure that it had to take the enemy class, the bourgeoisie, into its fold. And there too, in an emergency the state defended the prevailing mode of production, just as the Soviet State REINTRODUCED transition economy into the Soviet Union as it marched westward back from Stalingrad.

The issue relative to the Soviet Union is greatly clouded by appeals to humanitarianism - and above all by MECHANICAL thinking as to what the "DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION" means. There are 15 million slaves in Siberia, runs one argument. How can you support the Soviet state? How can you be for DEFENSISM when Stalin and his regime commit such crimes against the Russian and the world working class?

DEFENSISM AND DEFEATISM

But our critics do not understand that the terms "support" and "defensism" are not rigid terms either. Our defense of the Soviet Union today and our defense of it in 1918-20 are radically different. In 1918-20 we wished for and worked for the victory not only of the Soviet State but of the Soviet government under Lenin as well. In the present instance while we want and work for a victory of the Soviet State we state unequivocally that we are for and must work for a defeat of the Soviet government under Stalin - and we must do so with arms at hand. Such a policy of defensism has one thing in common with a policy of defeatism in the capitalist countries, that in both instances we are for the defeat of the regime in power. Furthermore the weapons to be used in both instances are the same: INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTION, workers councils, militia, strikes, etc. Independent working class action is the sine qua non of both defensism and defeatism.

There is one difference, however; in capitalist countries during the war we are for a defeat of the State as well; we are for the defeat of our own imperialists even if it means the temporary victory of the "enemy" power. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, we are for victory of the State against the capitalist powers.

Defensism does not mean support of Stalinism. It does not mean whitewashing his crimes - whether they run into thousands or millions. It does not mean blind defense of the economic victories of transition economy without pointing to social and political defeats. Such stupidity is for the mechanical thinkers. Defensism does not mean no strikes, no guns against the Stalinists, or anything of the sort. What it does mean is that between the Warped Workers State and the capitalist states we DO take sides. But we do not tell workers to die for dear old Stalin, anymore than we tell them to die for dear old Churchill or Roosevelt. Nor do we tell them to remain good soldiers inside the Red Army and leave their officers intact. As a matter of fact we are in favor of arresting all the Stalinist officers in the Red Army, just as we are in the capitalist armies. But there is one difference: in the capitalist armies we are for liquidating the front, in the Red Army we are for continuing the front so as to deliver a blow to world capitalism as a whole. For us the war does not end with the victory of the Soviet Union, or the defeat of Germany, of Japan, etc. All these are merely parts in the jig-saw puzzle of the world proletarian

revolution. Every defeat administered against any imperialist power now by the Red Army will make final victory against world imperialism that much easier. That is the nub of the whole problem.

The cynical will of course reply that all this is academic. What difference do the terms make, they will say. You are using armed force against Stalinism; why then cling to the "outworn" terminology Workers State. The "outworn" terminology however is just as important for the SCIENCE of Marxism and for understanding international class relations as terminology in all sciences. Furthermore it has a material base. He who can not understand the dialectical process of birth, growth and decay, who is confused by the revolutionary state of a phenomena and declares the process over while it is taking place, will not be able to understand any other phenomena either. It is no accident that the mechanical materialists who claim that the Soviet Union is not a Workers State are amongst capitalism's major supporters. The Soviet Union for us represents a great potential material aid to the world revolution. Its present leadership is a detriment to that revolution. But its material base CAN be a great help later, in the extension of October if Stalinism and its line (which flows from the theory of Socialism in One Country) is overthrown by the proletariat. We Revolutionary Marxists know that the very appearance of strength in the Stalinist regime merely hides its basic weakness. We know that the opportunity for political revolution will come. We refuse to hand this enormous citadel covering one sixth of the globe and embracing 175 million people to the imperialists in advance. We are for fighting to maintain and restore it as a citadel of world revolution.

By using the mechanical thinking of the Schachtmans, the Ruth Fischers, the Burnhams and their ilk we would merely be aiding world capitalism stabilize itself and win a bloodless victory against the world proletariat.

READ

SUBSCRIBE

SPREAD THE
INTERNATIONAL NEWS

REPORT FROM BRITAIN

We are swimming against the tide. The bug of "Labour to Power" is biting every one. No one is free from it. After five years of political blackout, the impending General Election is a release. As the day of polling draws nearer the discussions and arguments are increasing - more meetings are being held. All the wares of the various political parties are being put on show in the public places! The mass of the workers and wide sections of the middle class are conscious that "war-time prosperity" is at an end and that redundancy is posing the question "where the hell am I going to find a job." The food situation seems to be rather worse than it was before. In the forces the main question being asked is: "How the hell can I get out quickly, before all the jobs are gone and before I am sent off to the Far East..." The prospect of a long war with Japan raises no enthusiasm whatsoever, in fact so far as the majority of the workers in uniform are concerned they are taking the view that this is not their war - but America's. So far as the continent is concerned, everyone seems conscious that it is only a matter of time before decisive revolutionary upheavals take place - at the moment there is indifference to what is likely to happen - workers generally are more concerned about the internal British situation - what is going to happen here. It is therefore obvious in the face of these facts that the working class as a whole wants the Labour Party to get a decisive victory (parliamentary) at the General Election, although the advanced sections of the working class cynically say that it makes no difference "who gets in." But this does not immediately lead to the next question "If the Labour Party does not deliver the goods - what's the alternative?" At the moment one gets the impression that the general attitude is "Well the Labour Party has a bad record, 1924, General Strike 1926, 1929-31., but maybe if they get a decisive majority this time, something will be done. There is little real faith in Labour leaders such as Morrison and Bevin, but more faith in the manipulators of "left phrases" Aneurin Bevan, Stafford Cripps, Emmanuel Shinwell, Harold Laski.

What is not understood is the way in which the Labour Party acts as a "cover" for British Imperialism. The Conservative Party is having difficulty in putting over its line---indeed they have to resort to a "National Front" and their first election posters on the hoardings show the heavy jowl of Churchill peering down with the words "Let him finish the job..." a paraphrase of Morrison's early wartime slogan "give us the tools and we will finish the job" and the words "Vote National" not, you will note "Vote Conservative."

Speculation is rife as to who will get a working parliamentary majority - at the moment it is anyone's guess. But here are the possibilities:

(a) There is a definite leftward swing. The prospect of a definite working parliamentary majority for the Labour Party is offset by the fact the "General Election" is taking place at a time chosen by the ruling class, when Churchill's prestige as a "war leader" is high. The Labour Party Leadership did not want to break the Coalition Government at this stage. It appears that the Labour Party leaders in the cabinet were anxious and prepared to remain in a "national government" until the war with Japan was finished. However, pressure of the rank and file percolated through at the Labour Party conference for a break-up of the coalition - and this was facilitated by Churchill's ultimatum to these leaders (a) either remain in the Government until the Japanese question is settled, or (b) get out. The get out order was necessitated by the

urgency of using Churchill's war record and the social patriotism worked up during the war for the election, before the "peace" broke out in the form of unemployment, strikes, housing shortage, etc. The first possibility therefore is that the Labour Party will secure a working majority and will be able to form a Government in alliance with the Liberals, on a mild programme of "public control" of the mining industry, public utilities, electricity, gas etc. a social security programme ala Beveridge, a housing programme, and a continuation of the war with Japan.

(b) A "National" Government, utilising "odds and sods," with the real control in the hands of the Conservative Party. The "odds and sods" referred to are so-called non-Conservative Party elements, high civil servants, industrialists (without party labels), and opportunist "independents." The remnants of the "National Liberals" and MacDonald "National Labour," also being used to prop up the old facade.

(c) As to the position of the Communist Party (Stalinists), Independent Labour Party (reformist), Common Wealth (reformist) they are not coming out very well. At the moment the Labour Party has rejected the tender embraces of these "fellow Travellers". They may snatch a seat here and there, but their position is not decisive. If the Labour Party secures a slender majority, they may be permitted a "kiss" now and again, and will be duly rewarded.

This is of course a very tentative picture of the situation, events may modify the above analysis - but not very much. Whether or not a "National" Government is returned, or a "Labour" Government makes no fundamental difference to the working class, if anything, taking a long term view of the situation - it is in the interests of the capitalist class to put the 'Labour Party' in power as it will facilitate the heading off of the demands of the working class. In one sense a Labour Government will make the workers "pull their punches" for the Labour Party in Gt. Britain is unique, it is the mass party of the working class and organizationally rests upon the trade union movement and the workers as a whole are "loyal" to their party, as they conceive it.

What, however, is decisive is the development of international events and the internal situation. The capitalist class cannot solve the social crises with which it is faced.

Of major importance are the increasing number of strikes taking place in industry and transport. There is an upward curve, particularly in engineering, where as a result of the tapering off of wartime production, redundancy is making itself felt. At the moment this unemployment is transitional. The displaced workers are being transferred at lower rates of pay to the building industry and consumer commodity production (severely reduced as a war time measure). The discontent at the moment is being headed off and in this connection the C.P.G.B. (Stalinists) is playing a reactionary role. "Peaceful" demonstrations of strikers are being shepherded by the "Stalinist" shop stewards on deputations to their Members of Parliament, Government Officials, etc., where they are persuaded with "oily" phrases that things will be different soon. The workers are being assured by the Labour Party and the "Stalinists" that a Labour Government will solve these problems, the Soviet Union will require machinery for her over-run industries, the continent will require commodities, etc. etc., etc.,. For a temporary period capitalism may be able to prevent mass unemployment by the meeting of the demand for houses to replace those destroyed by the war, in the "blitz" for consumer commodity goods, modified war production for the Far East and to hold down the revolution in Europe, supplying the Soviet Union with machinery, etc. But the

ability of the working class to purchase houses, and particularly consumer goods will be reduced as "war savings" are eaten into and the reduced wages have to pay for consumer goods being sold at "inflated" prices. The onslaught of the ruling class against workers wages and conditions has started. The first phenomenon is the reduction in overtime, which is a reduction in actual wages. The second, is the withdrawal of special "wartime" production bonuses. The third, is short time working.

The political perspectives in the industrial field are very rich indeed. The trade union bureaucracy is banning strikes but no one takes very much notice of this. British workers when they decide to strike---strike. The time is ripe for the development of a trade union left opposition. The advanced workers have not forgotten the experiences of the minority movement. They have gained considerable experience in the struggle during the European war. Trade Union membership has reached a high level-it will decrease in certain industries, with transfer of labour, for a time. After excessive hours of work, the question of a shorter working week is coming to the fore. All these and many other questions are receiving our close attention. We are clear as to what must be done, we lack at the moment the means to do it.

Under the leadership of the R.W.A we need an industrial paper which will co-ordinate the struggle, and bring into activity wide sections of the militant workers, developing strong factory, mine, shipyard, and depot committees, coordinated on a local, regional and national basis. Then the transformation of these units into active political elements capable of challenging the state power of the capitalist class.

ONLY PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

CAN DEFEAT FASCISM!

SIGMUND FREUD

HOUDINI OF THE LIBIDO, OR SCIENTIST?

(The following article was presented as a discussion article in answer to the article: Psychology and Capitalism, appearing in the November 1944 number of the International News. As such it does not necessarily represent the position of the International Contact Commission.)

In order to correctly estimate Freud, it is necessary to examine into, not only his stated positions, but also the company he keeps. That is to say, the type of mind to which he appeals and the class to which these belong, for the most part.

Obviously Freud is not a Marxist. But just as obviously, he enjoys a large portion of his support among those calling themselves Marxist. William F. Warde, an outstanding theoretician among the Trotzkyists, tells us that "No psychologist dares to ignore the conclusions of Freud." Many of the "unsuspecting" youth in the movement tote Freud's popular works under the arm and modestly admit that they are Freudians. But those who help us most to understand the caliber of Freudianism, from this point of view, are the petty bourgeois intellectuals who spend their time jitter-buging first toward the revolutionary movement and then away from it. These gentry, quite noticeably remain steadfast Freudians regardless of all else. Usually, their knowledge of Freudianism is embodied in the one monotonous query, "You haven't any inhibitions, have you?" Freud supplies them, as he does many others of various trades, with their social stock in trade.

It is probably true that no psychologist ignores Freud's findings. But this is not to say that all psychologists accept Freud's dogmas as an expression of scientific truth. There are those who avoid ignoring Freud because they are definitely opposed to his unscientific work. Not even the real Marxists ignore Freud. The Marxist reaction to Freudianism must be the same as its reaction to religion, i.e., it is "The opiate of the people." Freudianism is, in last analysis, simply more of the same.

Freudianism amounts ultimately to little more than the paraphernalia of the art of sex appeal. Freud uses it, and admits it. The merchandisers with M.D. after their names find it a valuable accessory to their bag of tricks. The U.S. Government uses it in politics and in the sale of war bonds. All fraternal loges use it. The army uses it. All up to date salesmen use it. And the church uses it overtime. Sex appeal, i.e., the world's most popular "Conditioned reflex" in the period of capitalist society's decay, is best understood through the study of Sigmund Freud.

MAGIC:

It has been said that Freud, at the outset, got down to "cold scientific" methods in his work in psycho-analysis. Well we believe that Freud, himself refutes this every time he opens his mouth. He is the author of the statement

that in their best moments, even the psyche-analysts doubt if their methods could be called scientific.

"Words and magic," says he, "were in the beginning, one and the same thing, and even today words retain much of their magic power. Words call forth emotions and are universally the means by which we influence our fellow-beings." We do not propose to deny that that is precisely the Freudian method. Magic! But magic, we had always thought, was the rage in the days before science overthrew it and usurped the field of reasoned research. We had thought,--hoped,-- that the days of the alchemists, the astrologers, and medicine men were gone forever, that these had flourished before science really became "cold."

In fact, the above statement from Freud implies the fading away of the warmth (to the soul) of magic, before the chill breezes of science. Words still retain some of their former magic, provided they represent those material things most closely underlying human emotions, and Freud, in this sense, chose his words well. Words, magical or not, represent physical manifestations!

But Freud claims to abjure the physical, just as did his forerunners, the Idealists. "In one thing," says G. Stanley Hall, "Freud agrees with the introspectionists, viz., in deliberately neglecting the 'physiological factor' and building on purely psychological foundations." What meaning then, have his "words"???

Marxism today, is entirely supported by science in its insistence that all phenomena, mental as well as everything else, is explainable only by the methods of Materialism. It follows then, that mental phenomena are not only reactions to material forces outside ourselves, but are themselves material forces.

When Freud assumes to cut loose from the "physiological factor", he frankly rends assunder the stream of causality even to the extent of resurrecting pure spiritualism. This is all his "Purely psychological foundations" amounts to. Let any of his defenders attempt lucid explanation of the meaning of "Purely psychological foundations!" Science knows only the real materialistic foundations, regardless of the field of investigation.

It is not only that Freud claims to be able to neglect the physiological factor, he attempts to do this, notwithstanding that he fails miserably as do all his play-mates in the idealistic world. Freud is simply the Twentieth Century's outstanding magician and entertainer. To call him scientific is to heap fuel on the fires of despair.

Freud works out from the points-of-departure of two distinct postulates. One: "The unconscious mind," and two, that all human activities are implemented eventually out of the sex urge,--the "Libido." Neither of these postulates lends itself to materialistic scientific proof in the light of our present knowledge in the field of mind activity. The first,-- the "Unconscious mind", is, as we shall show, entirely unscientific as employed by Freud, and the second,--the theory that the sex urge lies behind,--as a cause,--of all our human reactions cannot appeal to simple reason, to say nothing of "cold" scientific examination.

"THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND".

"The mental processes are essentially unconscious," says Freud. And he adds for good measure of confusion, ".and.. those which are conscious are merely isolated acts and parts of the whole psychic entity." We try to visualize the unconscious professor lecturing for an hour and a half to an unconscious audience in attempt to demonstrate to it that the mental processes are essentially unconscious.

Here, Freud unscientifically begins with "The mental processes", and ends with them. Mental processes are, if we understand the causal nature of our world, simply reactions to outside stimuli composed of all the multitude of material manifestations of a very material world. It is simple arithmetic that consciousness is the felt reaction or reactions to these stimuli, the degree of feeling, or consciousness, being directly proportionate to the force of the physical stimulation originating from without the mind and nervous system.

The findings of Professor Ivan P. Pavlov, (Russian physicist-experimentor with mind reactions observed by means of his "Conditioned reflexes,") show that in any case where one part of the mosaic of brain cortices is sufficiently stimulated by an impingement of excitation from the outside world, the other parts are rendered inactive, i.e., "inhibited," that is, put to sleep. By the materialistic and scientific methods of Pavlov it becomes clear that "The unconscious mind" is simply that part of the mind which is inhibited temporarily in order that a stimulated part may function with due concentration for the time. It thus turns out that "Consciousness" is an entirely relative matter, as is also Unconsciousness. Full unconsciousness constitutes utter sleep. And the portions of the brain, (or the "mind") that are active at any given time are the active representations of consciousness. It is entirely inconceivable that life's most sensitive organ, the brain, can function while at the same time it lies in an unconscious, i.e., an unfeeling state. No other physical process of the living organism is possible, void of feeling, except in a case of unjured nerves by wound or drugs. Much less, then, is it possible to conceive of the mind moving, i.e., functioning, without feeling, i.e., consciousness. The anesthesiologist contrives almost absolute inhibition of the mind by physical means, in order to employ UNCONSCIOUSNESS that the patient may not feel.

But Freud presents us with an imaginary mind that thinks, feels, plots and schemes in unconsciousness,--that is, he TRIES to. But if anyone will take the trouble to read him, while at the same time repelling his hypnotic spell induced by shady implications of one sort and another, he will discover that the Freudian "Un-conscious mind" is very much awake, considering its reported desires, ambitions, preferences, etc.

Freud fails to recognize our justified questioning, in the light of scientific interest, as to what difference he finds between the "Unconscious" mind, and the conscious mind. He sets up consciousness and unconsciousness as two polar opposites, but forgets the one to make a shibboleth of the other. This is an example of his "scientific" approach. Consciousness and unconsciousness are opposites in the relative sense of the term. They are opposites that demonstrate the dialectical nature of the material world in that they inter-penetrate one another, so that the one is always becoming the other. To set the unconscious mind up as an independent entity, as the sole source of its own activity, (he deliberately "neglects the physiological factor,") Freud exposes himself as unscientific

and unmarxian in another sense, i.e., as a died-in-the-wool Formalist, which in turn is just nother evidence of his bourgeois training. Freud fails to explain how it comes about, with him, that consciousness and unconsciousness function identically.

"THE LIBIDO."

In the spring time, someone has said, a young man's fancy turns to love, or words to that effect. However this may be, it is an observable fact that in face of the class rule implements of despair, the abused human being turns to a thousand escapes from the mind-blighting drudgery of slave labor, starvation and general want. Let us stick a pin there, keeping sex in mind while we examine Freud's theory as to the instinctive forces which motivate the living organism from within. We said forces, but Freud knows only the one force, Sex. And like his unconscious mind, this institution of the mind is represented as the all powerful, all pervading "psychic entity," otherwise called the "Libido".

Explaining contemporary human reactions in the "sex life," Freud has this to say: "We (psycho-analysts) believe that civilisation has been built up, under the pressure of the struggle for existence, by sacrifices in gratification of the primitive impulses, and that it is to a great extent forever being re-created, as each individual, successively joining the community, repeats the sacrifice of his instinctive pleasures for the common good. The sexual are among the most important of the instinctive forces thus utilised. They are in this way sublimated, that is to say, their energy is turned aside from its sexual goal and diverted towards other ends, no longer sexual and socially more valuable."

Ignoring the poor construction in the text of this quotation as being likely a fault in translation, we will try to treat with the most obviously intended meaning expressed.

The Freudians believe that the human race, during the process of constructing the institutions of civilisation, physical and ideological, built at the cost of sacrifice of this desire for sex pleasure, in order that men might enjoy things "socially more valuable."

First, the insinuation here is carried that the time allotted to the building of the physical and ideological institutions of civilisation, as we know them, could have been spent in the all-consuming "pleasure" of a universal and endless sex orgy. The evidence does not substantiate any such implication. But if so monumental an institution as civilisation has been built at the sacrifice of sex pleasure, then our expressed conclusion becomes entirely reasonable.

Second; by what criterions does Freud support his conviction as to this sacrifice; By what evidence does he attempt to prove that the typical exercise of the sex instinct is, or has been, sub-normal? If we compare human indulgence to the certainly normal function of the sexual instincts among all the lower animals, it would be only with a blush that we might stand by the Freudian claim. Taking the increase of population for it, we come off no better.

But we also have it from Freud himself that this so-called sacrifice was made by man himself, indicating, does it not, that according to man's desires, these

other activities, i.e., the building of the institutions of civilisation, rated higher, as "pleasures," than sex. Otherwise, what induced man to sacrifice his sex pleasures? It is quite clear that, if any sacrifice was made here, it was because men preferred the pleasures,--or the relief from pain,--and the two are synonymous,--flowing from the institutions of civilization to which he so arduously turned his attention. The fact begins to become apparent that this great sex pleasure upon which Freud hangs his charlatan's hat is of only secondary importance except in those minds which have recently, (speaking historically) become hopelessly warped by the debased and debauched cultures of the ruling classes beginning about the time of the greatest glory of the Roman Empire, and at perhaps their lowest point today, in the midst of capitalist decay.

Freud speaks of "Instinctive forces," rating the sexual "...among the most important of the instinctive forces." Once again he becomes the formal logician setting up the "instinctive forces" as absolute categories, but ignoring the obvious fact that the fundamental characteristic of the living organism is its ability (and tendency) to re-act. This truth affectively pulls the plug from his barrel of tricks. For, if the forces in endless continuity which induce the sex reaction, (and others), find their implementation, not within the mind, alone, but in the relationship between the mind and the outside world, then environmental conditions play the major role determining the magnitude of the sex urge,--or the power, at any given time, of the Freudian Libido.

When Freud so carefully explains to us that the "energy" of the sexual instinct "...is turned aside from its sexual goal and diverted towards other ends, no longer sexual and socially more valuable," he inadvertently explains that the forces of which he speaks are not necessarily sexual, but are, by the physical laws of nature, available for the great variety of physical reactions common to man. Freud's conclusion that man "sacrificed" his sex pleasure for "other ends" which were "socially more valuable", is nothing more than a Freudian back-handed slap at Puritanism. Even during his own day, Puritanism flourished and demanded this "sacrifice". But did it get the demanded result? But for the general social reaction to the autocratic bulls of puritanism, Freudianism would have suffered for want of attention. And today, but for the bored petty bourgeois intellectuals, it would die where it stands in the swamps of idealism and mystic chicanery.

Freud's "Sexual forces", according to his own expressions, turn out to be not the categorical forces of sex as such, but physical forces generated by the absorption of other forces (i.e., food) and obviously available for the immediate task in hand, whatever that may happen to be. Which is to say that the physical forces expended by men in the pursuit of food, for example, never were sexual forces. It is true, doubtless, that a large proportion of the physical forces of the idle rich, who never have even to think about laboring to produce their own sustenance, goes off in the shape of "Sexual forces," but again we see that all depends, in last analysis, on the relationship between the organism and its peculiar environmental circumstances. And in the minds of these cultured polygamists, any physical energy expended in other forms than "sexual force," might easily be considered a "sacrifice." This comes dangerously near to being the Freudian conclusion when we recall that Freud feels that the whole human labor of building the institutions of civilisation constituted a sacrifice of Sex Pleasure! But the plutocracy of any class society stand off as cultural monstro-

sities as to the normal mass, and especially so as to those who are the producers. It is precisely among the idle rich that all the disgusting perversions of sex originate. It is precisely among the cheap imitators of the idle rich -- a larger group--the petty bourgeoisie, that the mentioned perversions realize their intellectual hosts. How easy, then, it is for Freud to market his unscientific theory of sacrifice of sex pleasure by mankind as a first cause.

"..society," says Freud, (read bourgeois society) "dislikes this sensitive place in its development being touched upon; that the power of the sexual instinct should be recognized, and the significance of the individual's sexual life revealed, is very far from its interests." We have noticed that the plush-lined, soft-lighted, wine-soaked salons and rumpus rooms of the plutes are invariably protected by double doors, double locked, and are efficiently blacked out to the normal people of society. "Far from its interests," indeed is it that the "significance of the individual's, (or the class') sexual life (be) revealed."

The ruling class produces the morals, the ethics, the philosophies, the religions, the mores, and the vices of the society over which it rules'.

Sigmund Freud never knew the proletariat. He is a product, direct, of the upper crust in the "Society" he presumes to analyze. Otherwise, he would find a graphic distinction between the "sexual life" of the perfumed degenerates of the Aristocracy, and that of the proletariat. It is common knowledge that the vices of the over-lords, of industry, of the State, and of the church are imposed upon the workers principally by means of the whip of hunger. It is lush, drunken idleness that turns the normal physical forces of the "individual" into channels of "sex pleasure". And in the case of the only people Freud knows--the bourgeoisie--the process has been directly the opposite of what he tells us. Instead of sex "pleasure" having been sacrificed to the building of civilization (in the better sense of the word) the building of civilization has been sacrificed to sex "pleasure". Otherwise, Freud's "society" would not so "..dislike this sensitive place in its development being touched upon."

"Sexual forces" are environmental, and are cultivated, today, by the abnormal few in precisely the manner of the Pavlovian "Conditioned reflexes." "Wine, women, and song" is the cry of the "Tired businessman" in contemporary society. And he lavishly supports with his dough a thousand institutions of every conceivable sort for the desired conditioning, not the least of which is the church! And one of which, in an important degree, is Freudianism. But idleness is the first essential, the soil in which these weeds of the intellect grow.

"THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND" AT WORK

In his attempt to demonstrate by examples the functioning of the "Unconscious Mind" Freud employs "errors", especially "slips of the tongue."

His statement that "I can imagine what it is that alarms you. My interpretation includes the assumption that tendencies of which a speaker knows nothing can express themselves through him and that I can deduce them from various indications" puts the author on record here as dealing with the "Unconscious mind". And let us bear in mind that he bluntly tells us that "The mental processes are

essentially unconscious". (The emphasis is mine. A.C.B.)

We will take but a single example given by Freud of the "Slip of the tongue" employed to show and prove that men think with "the unconscious mind." It is the case of the president of Parliament who in his opening speech declared the session of Parliament closed. Space will permit of an examination of only a small portion of the huge accumulation of such evidence given. Says Freud, "In certain cases the sense belonging to the slip itself appears obvious and unmistakable. When the President in his opening speech closes the session of Parliament, a knowledge of the circumstances under which the slip was made inclines us to see a meaning in it. He expects no good result from the session and would be glad to be able to disperse forthwith; there is no difficulty in discovering the meaning or interpreting the sense of this slip."

First let it be noted that Freud, himself, gives us the criterions of consciousness in order to convince us that the "unconscious mind" performs exactly as we know the conscious mind to act. The speaker "..expects.." regarding the meeting. Moreover, he expects "no good.." and he would be "..glad.." to be able to disperse forthwith--which, incidentally, he did. Let not that be forgotten. Thus the 'Unconscious mind', according to the only criterion given, functions in the identical manner that the conscious mind does.

Freud does not say that the speaker "..expects.." etc., and would be "glad", etc. unconsciously, this would be too raw. But these mental reactions are necessarily a part of the process presented as the workings of the "unconscious mind." When Freud shows purpose, choice etc., in the actions of a mind, he cannot at the same time show unconsciousness. His proposition makes the theory of a thinking, feeling unconscious mind a simple dogma no different from the theological soul.

Let us look a little closer into his proposition: The president opened the session and straightaway declared it closed. Two acts, the one following the other in close continuity. The one--according to Freud was a conscious act, the other unconscious. But the evidence requisite to prove the distinction pertains entirely to the second act, that of closing the session, and instead of proving distinction proves identity'.! What's wrong? Simply this, that as we have contended, Freud is a formal logician and has no conception of the relativity of consciousness. The act of closing the session is, for him, either conscious or unconscious. Looking at the proposition from the point of view of the dialectician, we begin to find reason in it. Then, it becomes inescapable of conclusion that the act of closing the session shows a degree of relative consciousness, but doubtless no more than this in the act of opening it. For the act of closing the session before any business had been transacted exposes only a vague consciousness of having opened it. Doubtless both acts had become a matter of routine to the President to the end that he had come to be far more conscious of other things while performing these simple acts. Freud attempts to turn semi-consciousness--a positive--into absolute unconsciousness--a negative. A living organism opened the session but a dead man closed it. Yea or nay!

The president of a political organization is usually conscious of many things as Freud shows. But that he is conscious of a great variety of things in a great variety of degrees Freud does not know. Thus, let the president's consciousness of having closed the session be ever so little, it is none the

less consciousness. As a matter of course having no equipment by which to discover and measure the degrees of consciousness of a variety of things in the president's mind at the time in question; and, as he informs us, decided to "Deliberately neglect the physiological factor," he has no way of telling us about the physical causes of the partial inhibition of consciousness in the president's mind of the two acts of opening and closing the session of parliament. No pun intended, but possibly the president was thinking of the "sex pleasure" he was "sacrificing" in attending the session of parliament at all. This is one phase of the Freudian argument on other pages. Incidentally, how does Freud contrive to "Neglect the physiological factor" while at the same time making sex the basis of his entire philosophy? We don't have any faith in the theory of immaculate conceptions, except, possibly in the lecture halls of the Freudians.

Any reaction of the living organism to excitations from without which are carried to the brain through the receptor organs, - eyes, ears, taste glands, etc - is consciousness. Unconsciousness simply denotes the absence of sensation for one reason or another of such excitation. Also, excitation of a specific character carried beyond a given point induces inhibition, i.e., sleep, i. e. unconsciousness, while this same excitation carried up to the same point induces consciousness. Thus, consciousness becomes a relative matter subject to the laws of the dialectic in all ways. A given quantity of a given excitation produces consciousness, but a greater quantity turns consciousness into its opposite, unconsciousness. Quantity becomes quality.

The President reacted to the members of parliament gathered before him for the session when he opened, and also when he closed the session. How conscious he was of his acts is a matter of opinion. That he was simply unconscious when he closed the session, or that some part of his brain thus functioned while it was blanked out, i.e., inhibited, i.e., asleep, is contrary to all scientific knowledge of the functional mind. Certainly Sigmund Freud knows no means by which he might demonstrate or prove such a contention.

The Freudian's consciousness of sex is relatively excessive, and perpetual. According to Pavlov's experiments this condition would tend to inhibit all other conscious reactions in proportional degree. Thus, we come to understand how it is that a Freudian concludes that the institutions of civilization were built by man at the sacrifice of his sex pleasure. And inasmuch as sex consciousness is almost entirely emotion, might we not conclude that, for the Freudians, "The mental processes are essentially unconscious, and that those which are conscious are merely isolated acts and parts of the whole psychic entity", meaning here by "Mental processes"- REASON? A.C.B.