

in the form of religion does not yet profess it in the form of the state, for it still takes a religious attitude toward religion, that is, it is not the real fulfillment of the human basis of religion, because it still hinges upon immorality, upon the abstract form of this human grain. The so-called Christian state is the imperfect state and the Christian religion serves to eke out and sanctify its defectiveness. It therefore necessarily makes of religion a means, and so it is a state of hypocrisy. It makes a great difference whether the perfect state counts religion among its underlying factors because of the deficiency which lies in the general nature of the state, or whether the imperfect state declares religion for its basis because of the deficiency which lies in its peculiar make-up as a deficient state. In the latter case religion becomes the bearer of a deficient policy. In the former case the deficiency of even a consummated policy asserts itself in religion. The so-called Christian state requires the Christian religion in order to round itself out as a state. The democratic state, the real state, does not require religion for its political consummation. On the contrary, it is capable of drawing upon religion because in the democratic state the human basis of religion is fulfilled in a secular form. The so-called Christian state on the other hand takes a political attitude toward religion and a religious attitude toward politics. If it reduces the functions of the state to a pretense it equally reduces religion to a pretense.

The Twilight of Leadership

By A. BILAN

History is made by heroes, and the leaders are the dynamic forces of social development. That is the assertion of present-day bourgeois ideologists and scholars. In their eyes the masses are but the instrument that transforms the ideas of the leaders into action. According to their conception the people live peacefully, as satisfied, law-abiding citizens, respecting all laws and orders of their natural leaders until undesirable elements create distrust, dissatisfaction and unrest among the masses. Therefore in order to restore normal conditions these undesirable leaders must be separated from the masses, and all unrest, strikes and revolt will cease.

This is the theoretical foundation of capitalist social philosophy, and on the basis of this philosophy they are justifying

their persecution of radical labor leaders, and their imprisonment to save society from "unwise" action of the masses.

An analysis of this theory in its historical development will show that this belief in the right of the capitalist class to be the leader of the masses by heritage has a distinct economic basis. Under the system of ancient slavery the slaveholder did the thinking for the slave. He was the organizer of production, he marketed the produced goods, in short the slave-owner gave the orders and they were obeyed by the slave, because their existence depended upon his will.

The development of the trades in cities during the middle-ages created a new class independent of a superior class, resting upon their own economic interests. Their interests aroused a new spirit in the masses. The relations of the people to their feudal lords underwent a change, the latter were overwhelmed first in the economic field and then on the field of battle. The leadership of the feudal class was broken and replaced by that of the new class. This process reached its climax in the French Revolution. Down through the history of the ages, new social forces have always been combatted by the old order; the dying class has always had to become the suppressor of new thought in order to safeguard its own existence.

Our capitalist class, whose power rests upon its ownership of the means of production, thinks in the same terms. In the mad competition between individuals they fail to see the social forces that stand behind the modern social system, driving them onward to the end of their leadership.

Economic conditions are forcing them to combine, are destroying their individuality, are depriving them of their leadership. Capitalist development has produced a working class whose interests are driving them, as yet unconsciously, to united action. Individual leaders, foreseeing what the masses as yet only dimly perceive, can for a time assume leadership; but the development itself is inevitable, beyond the power of leaders, be they never so influential, to create or to stop. The work of the leader in this movement of the working-class is limited to hastening or hindering this process; in no wise can they either create or prevent inevitable changes in society. The bourgeois conception of the part that the leader plays in the modern labor movement is therefore completely at variance with historical facts. When economic pressure becomes strong enough to awaken the class interests of the masses, no power on earth can stop the movement of the oncoming tide.