In this issue we feature the first attempt we know of by a group in our political sector to relate to the growing U.S. Green movement. The Committee for Socialist Union's document is followed by the "Key Values," the position statement of the major Green grouping in the U.S., the Committees of Correspondence. Through Don Fitz we have the first of a series of updates on the Spanish dockers and their class struggle union. Monroe Prussack comments on the current condition of the Delemonist movement. Next John Zerzan comments on the perfidy of
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marxoids, while I try to answer him. Our leaflet publishing project continues with a four-pager published by the Industrial Union Party. Jon Bekken discusses censorship and anarchist organization. Next is a review of what I think is a major document in our political spectrum and a letter from Wildcat on how to order it.

Along with our usual call for your articles and letters for publication (please single-space and use narrow margins and a dark ribbon) we are appealing (for the first time in this column) for donations. The DB has no organizational support, and we have gradually gone into the hole to the tune of over $130—no small amount to a shoestring operation like the Discussion Bulletin.

Frank Girard for the DB Committee

---

**PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED**

Beginning next month this department will review briefly not only pamphlets and books published by groups in our political sector but also the English language periodicals which in our view can be classified as presenting a revolutionary socialist political viewpoint that rejects both the Leninist and social democratic varieties of statism and reformism. Below is what is intended to be an exhaustive list. If you know of other publications that should be included, please let us know and send a sample if possible. Those marked with an asterisk are considered close enough to be reviewed but infected with the Leninist virus of "dictatorship of the partyism." We intend to reserve a page or two to review periodicals alphabetically in rotation as space permits. The following list will be published in each issue:

- Against Sleep and Nightmare, Anarchist Labor Bulletin
- Angry Workers' Bulletin
- Bulletin of Anarchist Research
- Class Struggle Bulletin
- Collide-O-Scope
- Communist Bulletin*
- Deleoniist Bulletin
- Demolition Derby
- Discussion Bulletin
- Echanges
- Factsheet Five, Fifth Estate
- Here and Now, Ideas & Action
- Industrial Worker
- Internationalism*
- Internationalist Perspective*
- International Review
- Libertarian Labor Review
- New Unionist, Open Road
- The People, Processed World, The Red Menace, Smile
- The Socialist Republic, Socialist Standard
- Solidarity
- The Spanner Subversion
- Syndicalist Bulletin
- Wildcat
- Workers' Democracy
- Workers' Info-Rag
- World Revolution*

Law & Hypocrisy, 1989, 8 -- 8 1/2 by 11 inch pages; no price from Wrekin Syndicalists, College Farm House, Wellington, Telford TF1 1TR, England. We have a few copies for readers who will send an SASE. This is a study of the use by the British political state of censorship, news management, and its legal system to contain what the authors apparently believe would be public outrage if certain state crimes became widely known. It details specific recent cases. I'm not certain that the term hypocrisy really applies to ruling classes, which have no standard of morality except too stay on top. Of course I may be blinded by the fact that I am writing this in the wake of our rulers' decision "to return the government of Panama to the people."

Cont'd on p. 12
The following review offers a brief history of the politics and economics which closely affect the environmental movement. In addition, it goes beyond common analysis and proposes a practical alternative to the prevailing system -- a system which currently can only distract us with superficial schemes of reforms that avoid the real problem. However, this does not intend to isolate activists from a direct role in immediate issues and projects. Instead, it provides a critical understanding which, as an objective tool, can most accurately assist us in focusing our efforts. In this manner, we can more efficiently challenge the otherwise overwhelming forces which now gravely threaten our environment.

But the full utility of this challenge cannot be realized by a single contribution. This is why we ask for your comment on the related matters of tactics as they correspond to a distant, yet necessary alternative to capitalism. Feedback from those who are constantly involved with these matters of environmental protection is essential for insuring grassroots organization and it is a positive beginning on the long road to social change.

Sincerely,

Michael Hinnenkamp, Committee for Socialist Union,
P.O. Box 303 P.O. Box20010, Greeley Sq. Sta.
Camden, NJ 08101 New York, NY 10001

*   *   *

BUILDING A GREEN MOVEMENT

A NEW POLITICS & TEN KEY VALUES

Since the ten key values are set in the form of questions, it would appear that the Green Movement is open to discussion and invites comment from interested individuals. The following critical analysis is offered in a comradely spirit with the objective that the Green Movement get off the ground in the United States with the most viable program possible. The movement fits the needs of the hour, but it doesn't address all of the questions. At the present time, it has the greatest potential to bring together working people* from all walks of life, from the highly paid highly skilled workers to those in the

* for a definition of working class see page 5 second paragraph
 lowest job categories to the unemployed and impoverished. Regardless of one's feeling of personal security, who is not disturbed one way or another by the proliferation of social and environmental problems? If the Green Movement is logically structured and based correctly on the source of the problems, it should become a powerful instrument for social and economic change.

The gist of the Green analysis is that the system we now live under somehow grew in a hodgepodge manner by harnessing all the historic forms of dominance into a political and economic system sustained by military industrial conquest. There is reference to a competitive dynamic, and rightly, to the fact that State Bureaucracies such as the Soviet system are subject to much the same competing forces as capitalism. But in either case, the Green position seems to be that both systems exist because of willful corruption rather than because of the driving forces created by the laws of capitalist economics.

MARKET V.S. NON-MARKET ECONOMIES

For purposes of objective clarity, it is necessary to analyze the driving force behind the domination, the reason for economic growth other than expansion for its own sake. Despite the evil ambitions which may be involved, a deeper analysis will add to our understanding of the real problem at hand.

Communal, ancient slave, and feudal societies attempt to "dominate" nature was a matter of survival, to find ways to ameliorate the devastating effects of storms, drought, freezes, adverse conditions of all kinds. From the period when ownership of private property had become an important factor dividing society into classes and breaking up the old communal equality until as late as the emergence of capitalism as a dominant force in the 16th century, ecological destruction was very minimal. Humanity still lived in basic harmony with the natural world. In all the earlier economic and political systems, the prevailing mode of production was for use rather than sale, regardless of the hierarchy of power or class divisions.

Today, however, even in the undeveloped areas, this is no longer true. In order to feed their starving families, native peoples, living in the remaining forests and grassland areas, are forced to do business selling endangered live animals and pets to avaricious traders. These same simple people, who have lived in balance with nature for thousands of years, are witnessing widespread destruction of the last of the earth's virgin territory because of the dominating economics of agribusiness.

The Green movement must take into account the motivational changes brought on by a market economy which now dominates the world. As the prevailing mode of production and distribution, the capitalist system is the main force not only behind destruction of the environment, but also, its competitiveness
creates unemployment and poverty. It is the predominate reason for international rivalry, the invasion of the third world both politically and economically, the rise of militarism and increasingly awesome production of military weapons as well as the devastating wars of the 20th century. The world economy is driven by production for sale with a view to profit and the wage system. Even the state run unsocialist bureaucracies of the Eastern powers cannot escape the devastating effects of the market system, to which they are still subject, in absolute contradiction to any of Marx's proposals.

Evidence of the driving forces behind capitalism is everywhere. It can even be cited from the mouths of the capitalists themselves. The Hughes Alliance, organized to promote the candidacy of Charles Evans Hughes against Wilson in the presidential campaign of 1916, reveals the system and the class that it serves. In their statement, signed by twenty-five leading industrialists and bankers, and two ex-presidents, they said: "Our business is business. We are producers, traders and manufacturers without sufficient home demand to absorb the full yields of fields and the output of factories; year by year it becomes more apparent that the markets of the world must be open to American industries. We cannot extend our trade further than we are able to defend it. The rivalries that begin in commerce, end on the battlefields. The history of war is green with international jealousies. Whatever the excuse, every conflict in modern times had its origin in some question of property rights." Contrary to many peoples' belief, the military industrial complex is not an independent operation. No matter what independent power it seemingly takes on, it is the essential war unit that controls and protects the trade interests of the capitalist class.

CHANGED ECONOMIC CONDITIONS BEHIND "FAILED" DEMOCRACY

Analysis of the capitalist system must avoid the misleading tendency to equate size with the problems of society; big business is bad because it is supposedly uncontrollable, small business is good, i.e. controllable. Yet Value 6 asks how can we restrict the size of large corporations without discouraging superior efficiency or technological innovation? Size, per se, is not the problem. It is the concentrated power of corporations that are run from the top down in a market economy. If they were run from the bottom up in a non-market economy, size wouldn't really matter. This important consideration often is eclipsed by popular, nostalgia-like yearnings for a society made up of small businesses and farms under the control of the community, but without the worst abuses of the old days such as sexism, racism, or human dominance of any kind. But this yearning never touches on the reason for the failure of "democracy", nor the reason for the present inability of the American Constitution and political government to be effective in controlling modern industrial economy. In the early days under the U.S. government, democracy was more widespread because it represented a large segment of
the population, small business owners, independent producers and farmers. Although the political system never really represented the working class, it was relatively easy for a worker to acquire ownership of the land and tools necessary for production and to rise within the social order. Regardless of its inequities, the form of government fitted the needs of the time. With the industrial revolution, vast concentrations of wealth were put in the hands of a tiny top capitalist class. After the Civil War and continuing at an increasing rate up to the present time, the social structure has changed almost completely. Small businesses and farms have all but disappeared; those that remain are for the most part under contract to large corporations, and owe their existence to them. Hence, the majority of the population today, are members of a working class living on a mythology of the past without fully taking into consideration these overwhelming economic changes. They are for all practical purposes disenfranchised, having little control over their economic or social life. Modern political figures are, therefore, agents of the rich and powerful's narrow profit interests, not representatives of the people's well being. The political form that suited the earlier economy is obviously outmoded. What is needed is a government that conforms to the realities of industrialization while serving the interests of all the people.

This is where the idea of "work place democracy", listed in key value #6, can provide an understanding of the fundamental problem with democracy in our present form of society. Currently, it is the private ownership and control of the means of life (which in modern society are the industries) concealed by an obsolete wage system, that clearly illustrates the domination of human by human, and humanity over nature. Yet, when problems from this domination arise, the capitalist oriented political status which has little effective control of the industries or the market, is called upon for direct solutions. The result adds overwhelming bureaucratic chaos and immeasurable waste to the already total disregard for society's needs on the part of the profit seeking "leaders" of industry. Therefore, the basic flaw of capitalism is that the effective control of industry does not come from the democratic organization of workers who are in direct association with our productive processes. Instead, control is left to the whims and compulsiveness of a tiny minority of business men who, driven by their own economic balance sheets, are thoroughly engaged in ridiculous, but deadly games of cut throat competition.

Furthermore, under the wage system, workers receive only a fraction of the values which they produce. We are no longer living in a predominantly agricultural economy where production is based on use. Instead, profitable sale is the major economic driving force and surplus value, resulting from modern industrial processes and technology, creates over-production, the pile-up of inventories, layoffs, needless job competition, cheap wages, shoddy goods, lack of affordable housing, poverty, racism, violence, environmental pollution, etc. The list seems endless and one of capitalism's most revealing contradictions becomes quite clear: the total value of the collective wages and salaries of the world's working people cannot buy back
or use up the total quantity of all the commodities and services which are available in the market. These commodities are then wasted and destroyed -- leaving millions of people without the basic means of subsistence.

SOLUTION: COOPERATION NOT COMPETITION

In order to solve the problem, future society must be based on the democratic control by the working class, of all means of production and services -- with the producers, all of us, receiving the full value of our work. No class will be free to live off the labor of others. Part of each person’s life would be the productive years when he/she contributes either mental or physical labor to the social store. Part would be the non-productive years, when he/she takes freely from the social store. And as the Greens have wisely reasoned, there must be a reordering of priorities, as to what would be considered useful occupations.

Following the same reasoning, and in order to attain our goals, we must have social ownership and control of the means of production and distribution of the entire industrial economy, not just employee ownership of certain corporations that try to compete with capitalist concerns, big or small. Social ownership must be in the hands of the entire people in order to rid ourselves of the market system in its entirety. If the Green Movement avoids dealing with this problem for fear of being labeled communist or in order to build a large mass movement, it will undoubtedly find itself in the same mess that advocates of “social democracy” have in the past. The movement will be subject to the same divisions and splits that have ruined the earlier organizations.

It is evident that an entirely new world-wide economic and social system is needed, one that will eliminate senseless competition and reward constructive cooperation. It is not a matter of putting a so-called socialist political party in office while the capitalists control the economy, as the history of governments under “social democracy” has proven. From a reading of their literature, it would appear that the Greens are well aware of this. But what we must deal with is the question of how to take the power away from the tiny minority who hold society hostage through their enormous economic control. Furthermore, a feasible program is also necessary to reorganize society so that the source of power remains in the hands of society, and humanity once again balances with nature.

DE LEON’S PLAN

We believe the plan formulated in 1905, by Daniel DeLeon, a pioneer of social and political science, covers this question. This program urges the organization of all working people, employed or unemployed, into a nationwide union movement, whose goal would be to set up a cooperative commonwealth in which all industry be held in common by society. The potential power of a united working class is that it is essential to production, distribution, communication, education, defense, etc. Society
could not function even one day without the brains and brawn of the workers. (Working class here defined as all those who work for a wage or salary, are employed, unemployed, retired etc. Those who live by working and not by owning. On the other hand, the modern capitalist class as a whole contributes nothing. It is not necessary to the carrying of the vital needs of society. It hires the managers to run the industries, but their priorities are to increase profit for the benefit of the owners, not for social good.)

The general outline of De Leon's program is twofold, political as well as economic. It calls for the organization of a labor party with one demand in its platform: that all means of production, distribution and social services, the entire industrial economy, be converted to social property. In addition, the labor party would function to educate, agitate, and urge the establishment of the socialist industrial unions.

The union movement would not only back up the demand for socialism democratically voiced at the ballot box by making all industry social property, but would form the framework of a nation-wide elective government with workplace constituencies replacing our outmoded and restrictive territorial system of representation. Having achieved its goal, the labor party would disband, its members as workers would make their desires known by voting alongside their fellow workers on the job. In each industry, they would then elect all necessary management as well as representatives to local and national councils of their industry or service, and a central congress made up of all the industries. This all-industrial congress would carry on all necessary general affairs of society as well as plan and coordinate production and distribution throughout the nation. Its decisions would be based on the concept of production to satisfy human needs, not for sale and profit. There would be a continual give and take between the central coordinating bodies and the workers both on and off the job, but the source of power and control would always remain with whole people.

CONFEDERATION OF COMMUNITY GOVERNMENTS NOT THE SOLUTION

By their very structure, community organizations would be unable to manage or control industrial society, or for that matter, keep it democratic. However, this is not to say that they might not perform important functions in a supportive role both before and after the revolution. However, before this role can be assessed, the priorities of the group making up the community must be assessed. What do we mean by community? Community is a catch-all term like the word public. For either word to become meaningful there must be a thread of common interests, purpose and goal that defines the people making up community/public, which is not the case in today's world. Too often communities represent interests only for their own members, exclusive of the concerns of the larger society.

De Leon's program as conceived over 80 years ago, said
nothing about the relationship of the community or community
groups in either leading toward the attainment of socialist
goals, or their role in future society, mainly because the plan
was looked on as a bare outline of the general makeup of future
society. Any structures or additions to it were always
considered to be something that those living in the future would
have to determine. However it should be understood, there was a
different level of cohesiveness between class and community in De
Leon's time. Workers were aware of their working class status.
Today, the average propagandized worker thinks he/she is a member
of the mythical middle class, rather than part of a broad working
class whose income, education and housing may vary widely, but
who still have a commonality of class needs. Therefore,
reference to a worker's government is often understood in a
narrow sense as the dictatorship of a minority, although in
reality, it directly involves the whole of society.

DE LEONISTS AND GREENS NEED TO DIALOGUE

Because of its appeal as a seeming solution to the myriad of
economic and social problems, modern De Leonists need to answer
proposals of community control, as well as deal with the possible
forms of community participation in revolutionary change.
Correctly oriented, the community could play a vital role in
consciousness raising and social pressurizing. For example, the
various groupings of working people, those in the community and
those on the job could develop understanding of one another's
specific problems and perspective, and begin aiding each other in
the day to day battles against the system and the entrenched
powers that uphold it. In the initial stages of organizing
socialist unions, the community groups could be drawn in to
support the union building and bring social pressure, helping
protect working people from retaliation by the owners and
pro-capitalist labor bosses. On the other hand, the growing
socially minded workers could use job pressures to support
grow community groups organized for homelessness, poverty,
unemployment, drug abuse and other problems that capitalism
creates. In the give and take of fighting the system, those
involved would grow politically, and bring other uncommitted
workers into the picture. Together, they could then build a
socialist political movement as has been described. As the
majority demands socialism politically, the Socialist Industrial
Union prepares to take, hold and operate the industries, putting
economic power back on a broad base, similar to the vast period
when the land and all that it produced was held in common by our
tribal ancestors.

With the abolition of private property, (the industries and
resources, not personal belongings such as one's home or car)
class divisions would disappear and communities would share
common interests both internally and nationwide. Community
organizations would thrive if people wished them or thought they
performed a necessary function such as discussing and making
known the coordinated needs of the community as applied to
different industries located in their areas. More than this
cannot be assumed as such decisions belong to the future citizens, not to us.

The foregoing comprises but a brief description of a workers' commonwealth that allows us to keep the magnificent industries built by the sweat and brains of the millions who preceded us, but now converted to social use in conformity with the needs of the environment. It would be a terrible error to destroy industrialization because of the misuse by the capitalist system, when under real socialism it can be reorganized to benefit all life. De Leon's proposal is obviously an entirely new plan; something that has never been attempted as the material basis for it only developed in the last century. We hope with logic and common sense, you too will come to share our basic conclusions, and look forward to your response.

Ten Key Values

1. Ecological Wisdom. How can we operate human societies with the understanding that we are part of nature, not on top of it? How can we live within the ecological and resource limits of the planet, applying our technological knowledge to the challenge of an energy-efficient economy? How can we build a better relationship between cities and countryside? How can we guarantee rights of non-human species? How can we promote sustainable agriculture and respect for self-regulating natural systems? How can we further biocentric wisdom in all spheres of life?

2. Grassroots Democracy. How can we develop systems that allow and encourage us to control the decisions that effect our lives? How can we ensure that representatives will be fully accountable to the people who elected them? How can we develop planning mechanisms that would allow citizens to develop and implement their own preferences for policies and spending priorities? How can we encourage and assist the "mediating institutions" -- family, neighborhood organization, church group, voluntary association, ethnic club -- recover some of the functions now performed by government? How can we relearn the best insights from American traditions of civic vitality, voluntary action, and community responsibility?

3. Personal and Social Responsibility. How can we respond to human suffering in ways that promote dignity? How can we encourage people to commit themselves to lifestyles that promote their own health? How can we have a community-controlled education system that effectively teaches our children academic skills, ecological wisdom, social responsibility, and personal growth? How can we resolve interpersonal and intergroup conflicts without just turning them over to lawyers and judges? How can we take responsibility for reducing the crime rate in our neighborhoods? How can we encourage such values as simplicity and moderation?
4. Nonviolence How can we, as a society, develop effective alternatives to our current patterns of violence at all levels, from the family and the street to nations and the world? How can we eliminate nuclear weapons from the face of the earth without being naive about the intentions of governments? How can we most constructively use non-violent methods to oppose practices and policies with which we disagree and in the process reduce the atmosphere of polarization and selfishness that is itself a source of violence?

5. Decentralization How can we restore power and responsibility to individuals, institutions, communities and regions? How can we encourage the flourishing of regionally-based culture rather than a dominant monoculture? How can we have a decentralized, democratic society with our political, economic, and social institutions locating power on the smallest scale (closest to home) that is efficient and practical? How can we redesign our institutions so that fewer decisions and less regulation over money are granted as one moves from the community toward the national level? How can we reconcile the need for community and regional self-determination with the need for appropriate centralized regulation in certain matters?

6. Community-based Economics How can we redesign our work structures to encourage employee ownership and workplace democracy? How can we develop new economic activities and institutions that will allow us to use our new technologies in ways that are humane, freeing, ecological, and accountable and responsive to communities? How can we establish some form of basic economic security, open to all? How can we move beyond the narrow "job ethic" to new definitions of "work," "jobs," and "income" that reflect the changing economy? How can we restructure our patterns of income distribution to reflect the wealth created by those outside the formal, monetary economy: those who take responsibility for parenting, housekeeping, home gardens, community volunteer work, etc.? How can we restrict the size and concentrated power of corporations without discouraging superior efficiency or technological innovation?

7. Postpatriarchal Values How can we replace the cultural ethics of dominance and control with more cooperative ways of interacting? How can we encourage people to care about persons outside their own group? How can we promote the building of respectful, positive, and responsible relationships across the lines of gender and other divisions? How can we encourage a rich, diverse political culture that respects feelings as well as rationalist approaches? How can we proceed with as much respect for the means as well as the end (the process as much as the products of our efforts)? How can we learn to respect the contemplative, inner part of life as much as the outer activities?

8. Respect for Diversity How can we honor cultural, ethnic, racial, sexual, religious, and spiritual diversity within the context of individu-
ual responsibility to all beings? While honoring diversity, how can we reclaim our country’s finest shared ideals: the dignity of the individual, democratic participation, and liberty and justice for all?

9. Global Responsibility How can we be of genuine assistance to grassroots groups in the Third World? What can we learn from such groups? How can we help other countries make the transition to self-sufficiency in food and other basic necessities? How can we cut our military budget while maintaining an adequate defense? How can we promote these ten green values in the reshaping of global order? How can we reshape world order without creating just another enormous nation-state?

10. Future Focus. How can we induce people and institutions to think in terms of the long-range future, and not just in terms of their short-range selfish interest? How can we encourage people to develop their own visions of the future and move more effectively toward them? How can we judge whether new technologies are socially useful -- and use those judgments to shape our society? How can we induce our government and other institutions to practice fiscal responsibility? How can we make the quality of life, rather than open-ended economic growth, the focus of future thinking?

The Ten Key Values from the Committees of Correspondence (COC), a national Green federation, is a good representation of the ideals of the U.S. Green movement. COC Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 30208, Kansas City MO 64112

Cont’d from p. 2

Socialist Reconstruction of Society (A Review) by Alan Sanderson, 1989; 29 pages; $0.75 from The De Leonist Society of the U.S., P.O. Box 22055, San Francisco, CA 94122 or The D.L.S. of Canada, P.O. Box 944, Station E, Toronto, Ontario M4Y 2N6 Canada.

This is a companion pamphlet to The Burning Question of Trade Unionism (A Review), which we reviewed in DB 34. Like the latter it is a gloss, this time on De Leon’s speech on the preamble of the IWW constitution. At the same time that it updates De Leon’s 1985 speech as a union program for our times, it uses his words to condemn the current policies of what it calls the “revisionist” Socialist Labor Party. De Leonists will be interested in a longer review, which I hope to publish in a subsequent issue.

World Without Wages and The Futility of Reformism by Samuel Leight; no date, 228 and 229 pages respectively; $0.95 each plus $1.50 postage from WWF Publishers, P.O. Box 42224, Tucson, AZ 85733. A full-length review of these books remains half written, folded in my copy of one of Cont’d on p. 24
Dear Comrade Don Fitz:

At this time, we have a very tense situation in our port, since 50 comrades have been given sanctions of 20 days without work and 2 foremen have been dismissed for refusing to work with non-registered personnel. [1] In other ports of the country such as Bilbao, Algeciras, Las Palmas, Valencia and almost all others, there are serious problems.

For example, in Algeciras, the enterprises Sea-Land and MAER have planned how to reroute their work to the Italian port of Livorno in order to pressure port workers to agree to what the businesses want, which is that the people do not come into the port, [2] and to employ non-port workers (i.e., non-registered dockers) in the container terminals.

On the other hand, I have been in Hamburg, Germany on September 21-25 at an international congress about high technology in the ports and its results on port workers. The view that we have taken to the international meeting is that all countries are experiencing an attack from the large transport multinationals and the governments, and it consists of a progressive deterioration in working conditions, loss of work positions, reductions in the hiring hall lists, etc. Examples are England, Italy, Spain, France, since at this time these governments have made decrees or laws altering statutes of longshore labor. All the countries and ports assumed responsibility for writing a letter to deliver to the I.L.O. in Brussels. [3] The letter will set standards concerning job security for longshore work in ports all over the world.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that, at this time in Italy, only Genoa is experiencing a conflict due to the savage port restructuring by the government.

Tomorrow morning, Saturday, October 14, there will be a general assembly in our port in order to decide what actions for workers to take in the face of this serious problem.

Solidarity greeting,
Francisco Ramos Vargas
Federacion Estatal de Estibadores Portuarios
Tenerife, Canary Islands, Spain (To St. Louis October 16, 1989)

Translated by Don Fitz with suggestions from Louise Donnell.

1. In an interview that I had with Francisco in early September, 1989 he explained that capataces are members of the union. While discussing this, we realized that the Spanish word capataz does not literally translate to "foreman" in the case of Coordinadora, because the longshoremen's union has successfully transformed their role to one of coordinating labor rather than overseeing it for the interests of the shipowners. Spanish dock struggles since 1977 have generally focussed on longshoremen's goal of presserving the hiring hall, which guarantees the rotation and sharing of work.

2. It is not clear which people the companies are trying to bar from port entry or why.

3. To my knowledge, the International Labor Office is only remaining bureau of
Dear readers,

This letter is to briefly comment on two fine articles in J.A. 38. The article by Harry Jambone on two mensevous—Axelrod and Martov—is beyond reproach except for the mention of Leninism at the conclusion. He referred to Leninism as dying out currently which is misleading. A couple years ago Worbeshev wrote a book in which he stated that he is following the policies that Lenin initiated to encourage capitalism as a temporary expedient. It is with horror that we recall how Stalin ended Lenin's New Economic Policy in 1932 with death and repression. The ruling class of the Soviet Union currently will be forced to decide whether to let capitalism get out of their control or to nip it in the bud. Back then the leaders of Russia had no choice because world capitalism was stagnating in a depression and Nazi Germany became a military threat. The centralized feudal elite in Russia capably mobilized its manpower and industry to resist "capitalist encirclement" as it looked to them. Today the trade competition among capitalist countries is so hectic that a new entry like the Soviet union would be at a disadvantage and so decide to quit the rat race and revert to iron rule which got results before.

The second article which I wish to comment on is the copy of a recent S.P. leaflet. "Capitalism can't last forever." My long support for the S.P. gave me the experience of trying to teach ideas that are in that leaflet to people I knew or just met. Although I was convinced that I spoke the truth and that capitalism was in a crisis, I couldn't make a strong impression upon people. The genius of Daniel Defoe who scientifically showed how humanism can emaculate itself from capitalism seemed to have been wasted.

Presently I am more discouraged by the S.P.'s approach than by the hostility and indifference of the average person. It assumes the evaluation of current events to the S.P. has all the answers and does not closely study why people disagree with current Marxism. Since the economy of the world recovered from depression with world war 1, the S.P. has been predicting another disaster of depression, war or inflation. An outsider the members are not convinced of their cause because their support is not over-enthusiastic but forecasts of gloom and doom serve to hold the organization together as the only choice for decent people. Instead of regimenting people into revolutionary activities, the S.P. should examine more optimistic ideas about capitalism that outsiders hold so that they should have an opportunity to choose socialism willingly rather than as an alternative to doom. Yet not the S.P. any longer be guided by Leninist tactics that only correct ideas should be heard and follow Jefferson and Marx who both believed that truth and good sense will prevail over error and we will understand better when we hear all sides that are of interest.

Sincerely yours,

Monroe Crassack
To the DB network:

Under "Publications Received" (DB 38), regarding a paper called Decadent Capitalism, "It deals with an aspect of marxian theory that seems to go without saying: that capitalism, having accomplished its social revolutionary purpose of raising and concentrating global productive forces, has ceased to be a progressive system..." (emphasis mine)

Goes without saying?!? Here once again is the essence of marxoid dogma, all the more astounding at this late date, that industrialism's class domination was earlier a positive thing, become nasty and "decadent" only since around World War I.

Baudrillard's Mirror of Production is a contemporary demonstration (1972) that marxism, with its veneration of the factory system, the ever-attenuated division of labor, de-individuation, etc., provides a mirror image of the deformed values of bourgeois production. More recently and closer to home, for a growing number of publications like Demolition Derby, Fifth Estate, Anarchy, No Picnic and Live Wild Or Die, it "goes without saying" that productionism is not and never was anything but fundamentally inimical to freedom, ecology and authenticity.

I find it especially insulting that so-called anarchists are also to be found in the ranks of the would-be factory commisars (sorry, make that organizers) that seem to comprise the bulk of your contributors. (It will not do, by the way, to label non-marxist mags "non-class struggle." The fact of universal struggle between social classes is self-evident to many non-"scientific socialists." )

Again, to find capitalism OK at one period and malignant at another is as superficial as it is opportunistic.

John Zerzan
410 Adams
Eugene OR 97402

Dear Comrades,

In reply to Comrade Zerzan: I don’t know of any "marxoids," including Marx, who "found capitalism OK" at any time in its bloody history. Someplace Marx speaks of capitalism stepping onto history's stage dripping blood from every pore. The factory system it developed has been pure hell from the beginning. I used the word progressive to convey the idea of technological advancement. Its exploitative nature made it possible for the ruling class to squeeze the wealth out of the workers that was used to create new productive forces, increasing and improving them to the point where society can produce goods and services in excess of needs. It was progressive in that sense.

I realize that this explanation is not going to impress Comrade Zerzan. He speaks for what seems to be a growing element in our common political sector that is reacting to capitalist industry's destruction of the environment by demanding the end of industrial production, a return, in fact, to pre-industrial—even pre-agricultural—society.

Given the speed with which the profit system is destroying planet Earth, one finds it hard not to sympathize with this "primitivist" tendency among anarchists. The problem, though, is that its advocates content themselves with simply calling for deindustrialization and have never to my knowledge considered the implications in terms of social dislocation, nor have they constructed a scenario and time table for such a move.

Frank Girard
NO ONE seems to be immune to the effects of the accumulating crises of our time. It is probably no exaggeration to state that a deep current of anxiety has cut through every layer of the population, from the very young to the very old, from the very poor to the very rich.

THE CONCERN of the rich, who are the ruling class of this country, is focused mainly on the problem of staving off whatever may threaten their ownership of the means of production and distribution and the privileges of wealth that go with that ownership. The concern of the overwhelming majority is the chronic insecurity which haunts our daily lives and the prospect ofautomation as nation-states jockey for advantage in the nuclear chess game.

ALTHOUGH, at this writing, nearly one out of every ten members of the working class is unemployed, there is more in store for us. In an article significantly headed "How Industry Leaders View the Critical Issues," the New York Times of October 11, 1981, quotes E. Bradley Jones, the president of Republic Steel, as saying, "Automation experts believe that robots could displace as much as 65 to 75 percent of today's factory work force." The "real issue" for Jones and most of the other capitalists quoted in the article, is not the thousands of human beings slated for the scrap heap but the competitive position of American capitalism in the economic free-for-all of the world's markets.

Regardless of what breathing spell an allaying system may come up with, it becomes increasingly evident that no matter which politicians rule the roost, capitalism cannot be stabilized. Even the possible destruction of whatever civil liberties we still enjoy by the forceful or subtle imposition of authoritarian controls will not bring the stability our rulers long for. This would simply prolong the evils which oppress us, accelerate the drift toward global war, and surely reduce the possibility of bringing in a new social order in a peaceful and orderly manner.

Economic Competition and War

RELENTLESS competition is one of the facts of economic life. It rages between individual business men and even more among corporate giants. It rages among capitalist nations and between them and the totalitarian bureaucracies. This competition, keenly enhanced by automation, in spite of temporary improvements in the employment situation (for some) as a result of military and space-race expenditures, the threat of displacement by improved tools will become increasingly severe.

THE PRESENT system operates in a vicious circle. The very increase in productivity brought on by the endless competitive battle, stirs capitalists and nations into ever more frantic pursuit of shrinking markets, source of raw material, exclusive spheres for capital investment, and areas of strategic military importance. The international conflicts which begin commercially and industrially have usually ended up with the antagonists shooting it out.

AS A UNITED STATES NAVY document put it bluntly: "Realistically, all wars have been fought for economic reasons. To make it politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked." Although in recent years these outbreaks have been confined to the "sideshows"—such as Vietnam, the Near East and Africa—who can doubt that international violence, nuclear powered, is not in the cards for all of us?

IN ADDITION to the purely economic factors, the military industrial complex, through its control of the entire misdirectional process, conditions us from birth into the acceptance of an uncritical nationalism. This irrational fever, carefully cultivated in its people by the rulers of each nation, effectively serves to conceal their own crude financial drives. It serves them well when willing sacrifices are needed for the altar of war.

Which Way to Freedom?

IN SPITE of general agreement among radicals that capitalism bears the ultimate responsibility for the increasing threat to life, liberty and security, there are fundamental differences of opinion as to which course of action is most likely to produce another, and better society.

*See Congressional Record, April 15, 1947, p. 3496*
order. In addition, there is a growing mass of uncommitted people who become increasingly cynical over the present system's widening credibility gap.

MOST OF THESE people seem to be torn between two worlds—men dying, the other (they believe) powerless to be born. If they hate capitalism and its unfulfilled pretensions, they are equally fearful of the regressive totalitarian controls associated with those countries where capitalism has been done away with. Is it any wonder that many hesitate at the prospect of jumping from the frying pan into the fire?

THE INDUSTRIAL UNION PARTY does not claim to have all the answers. But we believe that we do have a clear view of the basic problem and that we have a workable plan which would provide mankind a solid base from which to move forward into a better society.

THE PROGRAM for realizing the specific socialist goal we envision basically is the American Marxist, Daniel DeLeon. Before offering it for consideration to the reader, it may be helpful to refer to a paper by G. William Domhoff, author of Who Rules America? Dr. Domhoff's paper is called "How to Commit Revolution." For the present purpose, only three major points will be referred to. Without these, Domhoff implies, any attempt to replace corporate capitalism with a new society might well prove disastrous. He states his order of priorities as follows:

FIRST, you need a comprehensive overall analysis of the present day system.

SECOND, you need relatively detailed blueprints for a post-industrial (read post-capitalist) American . . . and.

FINALLY, you need a plan of attack—a program for taking power.

THE WORDS are Domhoff's. With these three elementary injunctions, he has reminded the radical movement that it needs serious navigational principles if it is not to be wrecked on the reef of opportunism and reaction. The IUP's interpretation of the three priorities follows:

POINT ONE: "COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS"

THE OPENING paragraphs of this statement have already dealt briefly with some of the facts needed to understand the deadly dynamics of the present system. In the process of a continuing and comprehensive analysis, additional conclusions would emerge.

(a) A state of permanent crisis, both economic and social, is endemic to the present system that is, the problems exist in the very bloodstream of an obsolete social order which has bought time for itself by the dangerous expansion of credit and the even more deadly process of preparing for war, waging war, and the profitable reconstruction which follows.

(b) Further analysis would lead to the conclusion that capitalism can only prolong its existence at the expense of the people as a whole.

(c) Any reform measures which may yet be wrung from the system will be granted by them as social bribes designed mainly to "turn off" those elements of the population whose loyalties to capitalism are disintegrating.

YOU SEE, MY KIND OF LOYALTY WAS LOYALTY TO ONE'S COUNTRY, NOT TO ITS INSTITUTIONS OR ITS OFFICE HOLDERS. THE COUNTRY IS THE REAL THING, THE SUBSTANTIAL THING. THE ETERNAL THING IT IS THE THING TO WATCH OVER, AND CARE FOR, AND BE LOYAL TO INSTITUTIONS ARE EXTRANEOUS, THEY ARE MERELY CLOTHING, AND CLOTHING CAN WEAR OUT, BECOME RAGGED, CEASE TO BE COMFORTABLE, CEASE TO PROTECT THE BODY FROM WINTER, DISEASE, AND DEATH.

TO BE LOYAL TO RAGS, TO SHOUT FOR RAGS, TO WORSHIP RAGS, TO DIE FOR RAGS—THAT IS A LOYALTY OF UNREASON. . . I WAS FROM CONNECTICUT WHOSE CONSTITUTION DECLARES THAT ALL POLITICAL POWERS ARE INHERENT IN THE PEOPLE, AND ALL FREE GOVERNMENTS ARE FOUNDED ON THEIR AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTED FOR THEIR BENEFIT. AND THAT THEY HAVE AT ALL TIMES AN UNDENIABLE AND INDEFEASIBLE RIGHT TO ALTER THEIR FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN SUCH A MANNER AS THEY MAY THINK EXPEDIENT."

UNDER THAT GOSPEL, THE CITIZEN WHO THINKS HE SEES THAT THE COMMONWEALTH'S POLITICAL CLOTHES ARE WORN OUT AND YET HOLDS HIS PEACE AND DOES NOT AGITATE FOR A NEW SUIT, IS DISLOYAL; HE IS A TRAITOR. THAT HE MAY BE THE ONLY ONE WHO THINKS HE SEES THIS DECAY DOES NOT EXCUSE HIM. IT IS HIS DUTY TO AGITATE ANYWAY, AND IT IS THE DUTY OF THE OTHERS TO VOTE HIM DOWN IF THEY DO NOT SEE THE MATTER AS HE DOES.

(Mark Twain in "A Connecticut Yankee")

(d) The final conviction which would be derived from the required analysis is the utter impossibility of securing permanent peace, security, or human dignity as long as the present system is permitted to remain.

POINT TWO: "DETAILED BLUEPRINTS"

IT IS AT THIS point that the IUP, regretfully parts company with the other movements which call themselves "socialist" or "radical." Any blueprints lurking in the portfolios of the "old left" usually reflect either the bureaucracy and tyranny of "sovietism" or the fraudulent political style "socialism" which at various times in certain European countries elected "Labour" or "Social Democratic" parties to office. The historical record proves that the role of such parties when elected is that of pulling capitalism's chestnuts out of the economic and social fires which threaten it.

IF AMERICA'S "new left" elements possess any blueprints, they are unfortunately influenced by the present regimes in Cuba or China. We believe that Maoist or Castroist programs offer no lessons (except negative ones) to the people of the United States who must effect their own revolutionary change under highly different conditions. The delicately balanced system of production and distribution in our own country cannot be captured by violence. Here it is especially true that "if the hive be disturbed by rash and stupid hands, instead of honey it will yield us bees." The logical path to the new cooperative society must lie in a form or organization which springs from specific American conditions.
The DeLeonist Program

WHAT DOES the LUP offer as the program? In line with the requirements of the modern technological age, DeLeonism proposes that geographical representation be abolished and replaced with representatives elected from the various economic and social units which comprise the working mechanism of an industrial society. Politicians from geographic areas are worse than useless in the matter of producing and distributing goods. A truly democratic society would vote for its own supervisors, managers and representatives in a national congress which would reflect the major "industry" units of the nation.

WITH THE AID of the modern computer, the relatively simple duties of the national administration would be to plan the production and distribution of the goods and services essential to the full life of modern man. With the minimum of work and the maximum of leisure in which to enjoy the products of that work, socialism would leave the individual free to develop his own creative possibilities without the crippling effect of meaningless drudgery and haunting insecurity. As Engels observed many years ago, "Socialism replaces the government over men with an administration of things."

The "Money Game" vs Human Values

SOCIALISM, then, is not merely the rearrangement of the economic system as some think. It is also the natural rearrangement of human relationships. The present system of boss and worker is, in effect, a system of slavery. The vast majority of us sell ourselves, and are bought, on a labor market. Under these conditions, economic considerations must always be prior to human values, and always in danger of the corrupting influence of the "money game."

THE REDRESS of social grievances cannot be accomplished within the present system. The establishment of a meaningful life for man as man, indeed of man as a human being, depends on how the majority organizes to make the land and the productive tools the common property of society. The technical and human resources necessary to create an affluent society for all, not just the privileged few, are simply waiting to be claimed.

POINT THREE: "THE PLAN OF ATTACK"

IF THE READER thinks that the above is a hopeless dream, then we are surely condemned to the chamber of horrors from which the present system still has its store for us. If, as stated, the material foundation for the new society is already in existence, then its long overdue birth depends upon the appearance of the proper motivation. This motivation must be on a large enough scale to incorporate a "plan of attack" which cannot be "vetted" by the ruling class, no matter how desperate to preserve its selfish privileges. The plan of attack is implicit in the goal - the socialist and industrial administration of the future society.

THERE ARE THOSE doom-sayers who believe that the workers as a whole have sold out to capitalism and to the union bureaucrats who support it. Yet it should seem evident that the achievement of socialism is an impossibility without the combined efforts of those who produce and distribute the nation's goods and services. It would be stupid to deny that most of our fellow workers are, at the moment, sticking with the corporate structure which exploits them so shamefully. It would be folly to believe that this loyalty is forever and ever.

RECENT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS have given evidence (of a sort) that millions of people can be moved by social conditions which disturb them. However, no matter who is elected to the driver's seat, capitalism will continue to prove that it cannot fulfill its endless and monotonous promises of a better tomorrow. Economic and social disintegration will grind on, and with it the process of mass disillusionment. The mission of the rebel is to leave no stone unturned in the effort to direct the disenchanted toward the fulfillable promise of the socialist society.

WHO MUST be reached? - the technicians, the engineers, scientists, teachers and student, the producers and distributors of goods, all of the blue and white collar workers who comprise the 95% who must sell their labor power to those who own the nation's resources. They must be reached effectively with the "plan of attack." This calls for the necessity of organizing what may be called Socialist Industrial Unions. This type of organization is equipped by its very structure to take over, hold, and continue to operate the means of production and distribution and to declare them, by political decision, to be the common property of all.

WITHOUT THIS ECONOMIC POWER, no peaceful revolutionary change is possible. In actual possession of the working mechanism of society, the overwhelming majority would be in the strategic position of being able to enforce the political decision rendered at the polls. The very instrument of power, the economic and social lever necessary to pry the means of life from the possessive flat of capitalism, remains an administrative framework of the new society. Dr. Dombrow's second and third priorities turn out to be in the same instant, both the means and the goal. Class rule, symbolized by the political state, goes into history's rubbish heap along with THE SYSTEM which it was designed to protect.

CONCLUSION

AT PRESENT, the radical movement is split. Each group pursues its own goal, guided by its own vision, each reasonably certain that its way is the correct one. If there is a common denominator, it is the mutual hope for the establishment of a truly good society. Hope, of course, is not enough. Those who opt for a civilized solution will do everything in their power to bring it about by peaceful means. The resort to violence will bring in its wake the rule of the storm trooper-American style. DeLeon once observed that "When a social revolution is pending but, for whatever reason, is not accomplished, reaction is the alternative." It is to be hoped that the statement, already so prophetic in much of the world, is not equally prophetic in our own country.

...IT IS OBVIOUSLY ESSENTIAL, IF CAPITALISM IS TO SURVIVE, TO HOLD THE LOYALTY OF THE MASSES TO THE EXISTING ECONOMIC SYSTEM. AND IT IS OBVIOUSLY IMPOSSIBLE TO HOLD THAT LOYALTY IF THE EXISTING ECONOMIC SYSTEM FAILS TO FEED, HOUSE, AND CLOTHE ALL THE PEOPLE, TO PROVIDE THEM DECENT MEDICAL CARE OR ADEQUATE EDUCATION. SO THE DICTATE OF TRUE CONSERVATISM WOULD BE TO BRIBE THE MASSES INTO LOYALTY, IF YOU LIKE, BY ASSURING THEM THE BASIC DECENCIES OF LIVING...

THERE ARE THOSE who think it wise to concentrate on immediate issues. Black people and other economically submerged portions of the population will certainly not be resigned to suffering while they wait for socialism. Like workers on strike, all those who are being victimized by deprivation, economic and cultural, will struggle to wring from the present every concession they can get.

THERE IS HOWEVER, the larger vision. As Donohoff states in his essay, "... make no mistake about it—before most people get involved in revolutionary activity, they take a mental look way down the road. Maybe not all the way down the road, but a long way down. They want to know what they are getting into, and what the chances are, and whether there is really anything positive in sight that is worth the gamble."

DELEONISM, we believe, facilitates that "mental look way down the road." It presents a reasonably clear picture of the administrative requirements of a modern cooperative society. It offers a "plan of attack" which could bring the new social order into being in a relatively peaceful and orderly manner. If the gap between the present decaying system and the new society is to be bridged successfully, then the goal and the plan for getting there must never be lost sight of.

THE I.U.P. urges that the above statement be considered carefully. It is, of necessity, brief. We welcome the opportunity to discuss it with those who may see difficulties. Only through a serious exchange of views will it be possible to forge the degree of unity necessary to bring on infinitely better society into existence. The process is essential if the useful members of this society are to mobilize themselves into one mighty lever of human emancipation.

NO MOVEMENT FOR THE DISPOSSESSION OF THE VESTED INTERESTS IN AMERICA CAN HOPE FOR EVEN A TEMPORARY SUCCESS UNLESS IT IS UNDERTAKEN BY AN ORGANIZATION WHICH IS COMPETENT TO TAKE OVER THE COUNTRY'S PRODUCTIVE INDUSTRY AS A WHOLE, AND TO ADMINISTER IT FROM THE START ON A MORE EFFICIENT PLAN THAN THAT NOW PURSUED BY THE VESTED INTERESTS.

(VEBLEN: "The Engineers and the Price System")
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Fellow Workers,

I am sympathetic both to FW Girard’s plight in “censoring” Bob Black, and—as one who has myself been “censored” for submitting documented statements of fact concerning the political actions (ranging from theft from to slander of the IWW) of WSA members—to Black’s frustration. If the DBA is closed to certain forms of argument (and, given my experience with Black, I do not doubt that his letter was rife with personal abuse of the most infantile sort), this editorial policy should be made explicit. I note in passing Black’s reference to myself and others he characterizes (on little evidence) as anarcho-syndicalists. As for myself, I have no apologies for refusing to seriously engage Bob Black’s arguments for the Abolition of Work. The forthcoming issue of Libertarian Labor Review contains a letter by Black summarizing his position in his typically confused way. In the interests of greater clarity, we have appended a summary of Black’s arguments as written up in his essay on the subject. As we note, to present Black’s argument is to refute it.

Of greater interest is FW Kolhoff’s letter. It is difficult to take Kolhoff seriously, however, when he evidences such total ignorance of the organizations he sets out to criticize. SRAF, despite its many failures, not only published a discussion bulletin (which he unfairly judges by its current state—SRAF Bulletin originally carried serious, if often confused, political discussion); it also hosted several Anarchist conferences and issued some good (also some poor), if horrendously-printed, pamphlets. SRAF also had many problems, exacerbated when midwestern Anarcho-communists decided to form a new federation, the ACF. The ACF was organized on a federal structure, based upon affiliated groups in political agreement with the ACF’s Basis of Affiliation—what Kolhoff terms “a limited (and limiting) definition of what an anarchist communist actually was.” The statement was adopted precisely to limit ACF membership to groups that shared a common analysis of what it meant to be an anarcho-communist, and a commitment to joint work to pursue their mutual goals. In this, it was not only “limiting,” but intentionally so! [I would gladly provide copies of this statement, and of an article discussing the formation of the ACF, for $1.]

In violation of anarchist and federalist principles, some groups affiliated to the ACF despite disagreeing with its Basis of Affiliation, in hopes of boring from within the organization to transform it into a Marxist sect. (They subsequently admitted as much, in a statement published after splitting the federation.) The ACF majority quite properly resisted this effort to subvert the organization, and after a long campaign of disruption, the LWG and a handful of others withdrew. Unfortunately, the political battle against these
infiltra(itors) had consumed the organization, and it soon collapsed. But the ACF accomplished important work both before and for several months following the split. The ACF initiated the first English-language North American anarchist paper in several years targeted to a working-class readership; it reprinted several important anarchist pamphlets; several local newsletters and organizing projects were begun by ACF affiliates; etc. None of this would have been possible without basic political agreement, and a commitment on the part of most ACF affiliates to working together in a federalist structure.

Kolhoff now seeks the joint projects the ACF made possible, but without political agreement or a federalist structure to ensure accountability. This sort of muddled thinking plays right into the hands of the advocates of street-fighting quasi-insurrectional tendencies who dominate the Love & Rage newspaper project Kolhoff has so tirelessly advocated. Their advocacy of rioting in the streets, “national liberation” and similar nonsense can only set back an anarchist movement being tapped to the tune of hundreds of dollars a month for its support.

Jon Bekken
Box 2824, Champaign IL 61825

REVIEW

Open Letter to Comrade Lenin by Herman Gorter, [1920: A Reply to “Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder”] 8 1/2 by 11, 41 pp. published by Wildcat, September 1989. For ordering information see the letter following this review.

We begin by quoting the first three paragraphs of Wildcat’s introduction, which will give readers some idea of the importance of this pamphlet to our political sector:

“The current period is one in which communism is supposed to be bankrupt. The recent events in China and the open acceptance of market economics and political democracy by most of Eastern Europe are used by the western media to convince us that the epoch of communism, which they say began with the Russian revolution of October 1917, is coming to an end.

“Yet, shortly after that event critics had already begun to doubt the communist credentials of the new rulers of Russia. From 1921 especially, tendencies emerged which saw the social systems of Russia, and later the rest of Eastern Europe, China, etc., as another form of capitalism. Herman Gorter belonged to one such tendency, the German Communist Left. For all its errors, his Open Letter is a communist pamphlet. And its target is unequivocally capitalist.

“This is the full text of one of the landmark texts of the communist Left: Herman Gorter’s Open Letter to Comrade Lenin. Dirt-cheap copies of Lenin’s notorious diatribe against the Communist Left, “Left-Wing”
Communism, an Infantile Disorder, have been churned out by the ton by the state presses of Moscow and Peking, whereas Gorter's methodical destruction of Lenin's arguments has languished in near-total obscurity, at least to the English speaking world, for nearly seventy years. Its reappearance is long overdue. The *Open Letter* was published in French by Spartacus, Paris, in 1978."

It was first published in English in *Workers' Dreadnought* between March and June 1921 and reprinted in the U.S. beginning early in May 1921 in the *Industrial Union News*, a weekly at that time, published by the [DeLeonist] Workers International Industrial Union (WIIU), until 1915 known as the Detroit IWW.

This document was viewed as very important by that element of the revolutionary socialist movement that had held anti-reformist, anti-statist positions prior to 1917. The Russian revolution had placed the Bolsheviks and Lenin in a position to assume leadership of the revolutionary movement worldwide.

In 1920, the Bolsheviks institutionalized their prestige by forming the Third International, which enabled the Russian Communist Party and Lenin to assume direct control of the revolutionary movement throughout the world. This was done through the 21 Points of Affiliation, which spelled out the tactics that must be adopted by any party that wished to become a part of the only successful socialist revolutionary movement in history. Lenin's "Left-Wing" Communism was prompted by the reaction to these tactics by anti-reformist revolutionaries in the German, Dutch, and Italian Left as well as the SLP, both British and U.S., the SPGB, the IWW, and other groups including the British left communists headed by Sylvia Pankhurst, who first published this in *Workers' Dreadnought*.

At odds with the revolutionary objectives of these groups was the Bolsheviks' need to deal with capitalist nations of the West. To have a "working class card" to play in industrialized countries, they needed mass parties that could influence governments. Such parties could be built only by adopting reformist tactics that would have the widest appeal. The opportunism of this policy was disguised by the use of revolutionary Marxist rhetoric that is the hallmark of Leninist groups of all denominations to this day.

Although he does not inquire into Lenin's motives for using opportunist tactics, Gorter's *Open Letter* is a hardhitting attack on the pamphlet and it premises. He begins by pointing out the differences between Russia and the more industrialized West that call for different tactics, especially the absence of a large peasant proletariat in the West that could back up urban workers, as in Russia. In the West, he points out, the workers must go it alone.

And it is just here that the matter of trades unionism comes up, for if the workers are to make a revolution, they must be organized. The organization at hand, the old line trades unions cannot be a revolutionary weapon. They have a record of betrayal of the working class that goes back to their origins. Here he is on the subject, page 13:
The workers in Western Europe need WEAPONS for the revolution. The only weapons in for revolution in Western Europe are Industrial Organizations. [emphasis in the original] And these united into ONE big whole.

Apparently not understanding that Lenin preferred Communist Party influence in capitalist trades unions to a revolutionary industrial union movement, Gorter goes on at length, trying to convince Lenin of the advantages of the industrial union movement for workers in Germany, and Britain and of the Shop Stewards and Shop Committees in the latter.

In a section devoted to criticism of Lenin's and the Third International's insistence on the tactic of parliamentarism, Gorter points out the futility of expecting revolutionary action from parliamentary representatives of the workers and the anti-revolutionary nature of a tactic that delegates workers' revolutionary fervor to parliamentary representatives. Again he points out, as did the SLP and IWW, that the strength of our class is in the factories--at the point of production; that parliaments are the arena of our masters; and that--as Marx points out--the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class, not of its representatives in parliament.

Gorter's Open Letter never received the publicity it deserved in English speaking countries. But it was unlikely to have made much difference. The Russian revolution had doomed the growing revolutionary industrial union movement. The prestige enjoyed by its leaders isolated or destroyed its non-statist rivals.

Except for that part of Wildcat's introduction that disparages Gorter's industrial unionist ideas, we strongly recommend this pamphlet as necessary reading for anyone who wishes to understand the history of the non-market socialist movement. See below for ordering information.

---

Dear Comrades,

We are writing to inform you of the publication of Herman Gorter's OPEN LETTER TO COMRADE LENIN. This is the first time it has been published in English since the 1920's. It contains the complete text of Gorter's famous reply to Lenin's manual of counter-revolution "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, and a new introduction by Wildcat.

The price for individual copies is £2.50 including postage in the UK, or $5.00 for US customers. Please send cash or blank postal orders or money orders, or UK stamps.

We are depending on BULK ORDERS to recoup some of the cost of producing the pamphlet. It has been by far the most expensive thing we have done, so we hope that any person or group who can sell five or more will buy a bundle. The price in the UK is £2 each for 5 copies, or £1.50 each for ten or more, including postage. In the US the price is $4 each for 5 or more copies, $3 each for 10 or more, prices in other countries are equivalent to
the US rate.

It is particularly important that groups outside the UK take on the distribution of this historically important document in their own backyards, so we would like to receive bulk orders from the USA etc. soon.

Please reply as follows: BM CAT
LONDON
WC1N 3XX.

Fraternally,
WILDCAT
UK

Cont'd from p. 12

these. Both are compilations of radio talks given by the author and present the views the World Socialist Party, the U.S. version of the SPGB, on a variety of topics. Well written and interesting, it deserves that longer review which I hope to complete and publish in an upcoming issue.

Socialist Party leaflets from the Socialist Party of Pennsylvania, 2200 South Street, Philadelphia, PA 19146. This assortment of leaflets on such issues as nuclear power, abortion, gay liberation, and racism includes one, intended as a pitch for the SP, which spells out the differences between the Socialist Party USA and non-market, anti-statist socialists. After the obligatory condemnation of capitalism, the leaflet proceeds to describe, not the SP's vision of a socialist society, but rather its program for a kinder, gentler capitalism with, I suppose, a thousand points of light. It includes the belief that "the use of profitability as the overriding criterion for the production and distribution usually leads to decisions which harm public welfare." The SP also favors a capitalism that defends civil liberties and minority rights and opposes "all forms of minority rule."