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**BULLETIN MATTERS**

Perhaps we should begin with the "readability factor" of the DB. Since the text you see in the DB is exactly that submitted by the authors, the burden of readability actually falls on them. One difficulty for writers is the fact that we reduce the page size from the 8 1/2 by 11 inch standard so that it fits half of a 7 by 8 1/2 page of the DB. We do the reduction here, so authors who submit
2

letters and articles in a small format will have their text shrunk still further. We encourage writers to use a dark ribbon and a 7 to 7 1/2 inch typed line so that we can cram the most words possible into the DB.

Second is the management factor. Actually the DB began at my initiative with the cooperation of number of people once referred to as "defrocked DeLeonists." Since I was taking money from them and other revolutionaries to put out the DB, I felt uncomfortable not accounting for it. Until quite recently persons who had contributed time in the form of money or articles for the DB were regarded as involuntary members of the DB Committee and received a dittoed financial report with each issue. When we expanded to thirty-two pages, we decided to include the financial report under "Bulletin Matters" and to expand the Bulletin Committee to include everyone who reads it. (Note the editorial we in the preceding line)

(Cont'd on p. 10)
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The Non-Violent Death Penalty--A Campaign Slogan for Greens?

While participating in the 1992 Green Gathering in Minneapolis, I was able to propose several items which passed and others that failed. Delegates liked the idea of reducing terms of national officers from 2 years to 1 year so that we could review their performance regularly. They also went for restricting national officers to election for more than 4 of any 6 consecutive years. But when Howie Hawkins proposed that Greens call for a 95% reduction in military spending, I wanted us to advocate the total abolition of the capitalist military. He didn't accept that as a friendly amendment. When someone proposed handgun control, I suggested that we disarm the police. Neither the original suggestion nor my suggestion went anywhere. Since then, I've rethought these issues. Maybe calling for a reduction in armaments and killing by the State is not a good way for Greens to be elected. Maybe we should change our feelings about subjects like the death penalty rather than trying to change the State. What follows is my proposal for a "Non-Violent Death Penalty," an idea which attempts to fuse Green values with the desire of Greens to be elected to office.

Visualize this: A Green running for office is flanked by a pro-death penalty Republican and an anti-death penalty Democrat. Our candidate desperately needs a position which simultaneously reflects a Green outlook and is attractive to voters. The candidate wants to be accountable to everyone in the district and a majority support the death penalty. Now visualize this: The Green candidate unveils a program to dramatically change the feelings of those who are executed. The program is called a "Non-violent Death Penalty." While being sympathetic to those who are executed, it does not reject the belief system of Americans who feel that a death penalty is central to their family values.

One of the four Green pillars is non-violence. If we are ever going to get anywhere with the electorate as it is today, we need to find ways to make this pillar acceptable. We could redefine what we mean by "non-violence." This article outlines a way to rethink concepts of non-violence so that the public will not reject Green candidates.

The point of being Green is getting elected to office. What we do when we get there hardly matters. Candidates often say "We want to bring Green values to government." Greens cannot accomplish anything unless we are elected to office. But once elected, we can solve any problem by passing a law. Election means power for Green ideas.

Proposing a "Non-Violent Death Penalty" may seem like it would change things very little. But it would help Greens become part of the American mainstream and help Greens get elected. And that would win more exposure to Green ideas. Isn't that what we're all about? The Non-Violent Death Penalty is in the best of liberal traditions: since it is not possible to change everything at once, the most realistic improvement we can make is to help the State function less harshly. Let's take a look at exactly how a Non-Violent Death Penalty would work.

What is the Non-Violent Death Penalty?

The key players in the Non-Violent Death Penalty are the three p's: (a) privatization, (b) patriotism, and (c) prayer.

(a) Privatization. While the rest of government has been privatized, death chambers remain property of the State. This has broken the bond between those executed and the rest of society. If the power to execute went to the highest bidder, it would be clear that it could be more profitable by charging admission and making videos. The death penalty would cease being a drain on State finances. Corporations which own the right to execute would make so much money that they would actually return a portion of it to the State. Read my mind: the State will make money with no new taxes. (Isn't that an idea that could win people to vote Green?) As the prisoner feels a surge of pride in knowing that s/he is helping establish the financial health of her/his country, the bond between executed and the rest of society will once again grow and flower.
(b) Patriotism. Whether executions were shown live via satellite or by video, they could be shown at school right after the kids pledge allegiance to the flag. By telling our future generation see first hand what happens to those who commit the crime of not being able to afford a good lawyer, it will let them know what America is all about. Of course, it will simultaneously give the prisoner a sense of importance in being a video hero instead of suffering a hidden and meaningless death.

(c) If Greens believe in politicizing spirituality, can we really oppose prayer in school? If a TV execution was preceded by the pledge of allegiance, what could be a better way to finish it off than with a prayer? (Watching someone gasp the last breath of life would certainly give the little buggers something to pray about.) Besides that, school prayer is another way for Greens to suggest increased State revenues with no new taxes. The way that schools used to have prayers was not cost-effective. It never generated revenue. In contrast, the new generation of TV preachers who dominate our airways every Sunday are geniuses at making money. Rather than harassing and restricting TV preachers, isn’t it time for government to realize that it could increase its revenues by requiring them to pray for the State? We could contract out prayer videos the same way we would contract for executions. Schools would buy video prayers from whichever TV preacher got people to send the most money to the government.

The Non-Violent Death Penalty would become part of a larger process of Green privatization for family values: (1) the state purchases execution services from the most cost effective business; (2) schools buy (non-flammable) flags from whoever has the best prices; and, (3) the government privatizes school prayer by buying videos from TV preachers. Privatizing the death penalty thus affirms the Green value of decentralized economics.

Privatization encompasses the very essence of rendering the death penalty non-violent. It then loops around and under its own being to bond itself to patriotism and prayer, only to reappear in its solitary form. Privatization thus forms the crystalline epicenter of Green Consciousness. Visualize this; a non-violent public execution on a beautiful spring day with a lovely audience drinking organic apple cider and eating whole grain popcorn. If anyone running for office feels uneasy about proposing the Non-Violent Death Penalty, here’s an idea: consult your I Ching. The I Ching would never tell you to do anything wrong.

Now that we’ve seen what the Non-Violent Death Penalty is, let’s examine objections to it. I would like to explore four irrational arguments that many Greens make when they oppose the death penalty:

1. The death penalty is bad because it takes a human life;
2. The death penalty is bad because it is unjust;
3. Those who support the death penalty are personally responsible for killing; and,
4. Elected Greens should carry out the Green Program (which opposes the death penalty) and are accountable to the Green membership for doing so.

Scrutinizing these misconceptions will show how resistance to the death penalty is not consistent with many other Green values and practices. This understanding will help develop a general conceptualization of violence and non-violence from a Green point of view.

Misconception: The death penalty is bad because it takes a human life.

Violence is an act by an individual. The same act by an agent of the State is not violence—it is necessary force. This is a key concept in understanding why the State is not and cannot be violent.

Greens already show an implicit understanding of this when they run for office, propose laws, and support legal enforcement. Without enforcement, what would be the purpose of a law? What does “enforcement” mean other than using “necessary force” to compel obedience?

Every Green office-holder who swears to “uphold the laws of the State” endorses the
State's use of "necessary force" to subdue those who would resist. Just as guns in the hands of the military or police are not violent guns, dragging people to jail is not an act of violence. These are examples of "necessary force."

As Greens become part of the State, they are more and more likely to accept its use of force. Has any Green ever called for disarming the police? Has any Green local ever asked a candidate to do so? Does anyone seriously think that we have any hope of being elected to national office by calling for the abolition of the military?

Being elected involves compromise. One way to achieve a compromise is to redefine the word "violence" so that it does not involve the State. In this way, we can be responsible for State actions and still be non-violent.

At the time of the Gulf War, prominent Greens issued a statement calling for the US to negotiate with Iraq. Not unconditionally leave the Middle East... but negotiate. This means that if negotiations had taken place and failed, Greens would have had little basis for criticizing subsequent US actions. Greens are not against the use of State force per se; Greens only oppose the amount of force applied in particular situations. Of course, challenging the quantity of force used simultaneously affirms the right of the State to use force.

What does this have to do with the death penalty? Remember what the business of the military and the police is. They may do this or that nice thing like hurricane relief or drug education; but, ultimately, they have the sole legitimate right to kill people. What do Greens say about this? Through the Green Program and through participation by elected Greens, they affirm the inalienable right of the State to kill. By what convoluted twist of logic can one claim that executing a few thousand prisoners is bad while the military extermination of millions is a matter of negotiation? Both are merely the exercise of "necessary force."

Misconception: The death penalty is bad because it is unjust.

This argument fails to understand that the death penalty is nothing more than the extension of "necessary force" used by the State in its exercise of military and police power. As long as we accept the State and its use of force, we must accept the unequal and disproportionate use of that force. Does anyone seriously think that small and weak nations will be as likely to use force as those which are rich and powerful? In other words, acceptance of State force as a necessary part of the world order requires accepting that some nations will force their will upon others. This is just the way things are.

We often hear concerns that the death penalty is "unjust" because it is differentially applied according to (a) class and (b) race. But before we can reach a conclusion about the justice or injustice of the death penalty, we should examine whether the larger system of "necessary force" is any different.

(a) Class. Military and police actions of the State are used on disruptive social elements. They are not used against the rich and powerful. Greens would never be elected to office if they were naive enough to challenge this.

During a strike, we may debate whether more or less force should be used to crush a picket line. But has any Green official in any City Council ever suggested that cops march into corporate headquarters and drag its executives off to jail? No Green wishing to be re-elected would ever suggest such a thing.

It is no different with the death penalty. When a low income person murders a spouse, we may debate whether the person should receive death or life imprisonment. But, never, under any circumstances, would polite people apply such a debate to polluters who cause cancers among thousands. For them, we discuss how large the fine should be. Determining which person receives State force has little to do with how much damage that person has inflicted. If Greens running for office want to be taken seriously they will have to accept this.
(b) Race. It is no different here. Since crack and heroin are drugs more frequently used by people of color, it is appropriate to discuss how much force should be used in suppressing them. No Green who intends to win a campaign would ever argue that the State should bust into the corporate headquarters of white men who produce alcohol and tobacco merely because these drugs cause dozens of times more deaths than do street drugs. If you accept *wars* on some drugs but not on others, how can you rationally claim that the death penalty is racist?

Misconception: Those who support the death penalty are personally responsible for killing.

This argument reveals a failure to understand that violence involves an act of *commission*. Violence can never be an act of *omission*. You must actually commit an act of violence yourself before you are guilty of anything. A basic element of common law is that you can never be held responsible for the act of another simply because you omitted actions which could have prevented it.

Many local groups already recognize this principle in their daily practice. For example, what do you do if someone disrupts a meeting? If you pushed the person out yourself, you might be considered violent. So you call the police. It's their job to deal with people like this. They carry the person out and what the police do to the person outside of the meeting hall is between them and the individual. Those calling the police are not responsible for police actions.

Similarly, those who use the death penalty as part of an electoral campaign are not those who actually carry it out. Nor or they necessarily the same people who originally demanded it. If a Green campaigns for a death penalty merely to be elected, the responsibility for killing may be shifted to either the electorate who wants it or the person paid as executioner.

Just as we can render an act by an individual non-violent by having the State do it, so can we avoid personal responsibility for the act by paying someone else to carry it out.

Misconception: Greens should support the Program, which opposes the death penalty.

One of the most common misconceptions of electoral work is the idea that Green candidates have some sort of obligation to implement the Green Program if they are elected. Contrary to what many believe, Greens are elected to office without any binding mandate, without any requirement to implement any aspect of the Green program, and without any need to submit their actions to review once they are in office. This means that elected Greens function pretty much like Democrats—they need a grabbag of proposals that will give them name recognition to help them be reelected. I am not suggesting that we change the Green Program so that it accepts the death penalty. Rather, I am describing a way to circumvent the Program, just as Greens in office can circumvent any other part of the Green Program if doing so would be useful to their political careers.

But going around the Green Program does not mean that Green candidates will not be accountable. The 10 Key Values will keep them accountable. A sort of "accountability magic" unfolds for anyone who chants these 10 phrases: "Ecological Wisdom; Grassroots Democracy; Social Justice; Non-violence; Decentralization; Community-Based Economics; Feminism; Respect for Diversity; Personal and Global Responsibility; Future Focus/Sustainability; Family Values." Rather than getting stuck in the low road of mechanistic accountability to members instructions, Green candidates should take the high road of accountability to her or his interpretation of the 10 Key Values.

Greens run for office in order to bring Green values to government. These values are more important than any particular legislative act. This concept is key: *What we do is insignificant; it is how we feel about what we do that is all-important.* This is the essence of Green Spirituality. We believe in accountability by trust in our elected officials. A Green plan for a Non-Violent Death Penalty will not necessarily aim to lower the frequency of the death penalty or change its class or racial nature. Instead, such a plan would focus on how we feel about the death penalty. It would help those who receive it by integrating them into a holistic unity. The Non-Violent Death Penalty would restore the lost bond between those
being executed and the rest of society.

Beyond violence and non-violence

Greens are being elected to local offices at an increasing rate. We must find ways to make proposals which are welcome by the public. The way in which we linguistically demoralize the death penalty is merely a premonition of what our office holders must do if they want the House of Green to become a mansion in the Community of Electoral Politics.

It's not that we don't care about people being executed. It's just that Greens also need to be elected to office and we have to make a realistic judgement of the most prudent position to take publicly. Some may call this "selling out," but I call it "mediating." One of the most cherished of Green dreams is to become a vehicle of "consensus." Greens yearn to mediate the differences between sides so that together we can reach a common agreement which encapsulates all of our hopes and desires.

For example, imagine that some wished to "hand" Blacks by requiring them to wear computer-controlled bracelets, while others opposed all "banding" whatsoever. Greens might help mediate a consensus which would band some Blacks this year and the rest next year. In this way, we could come to an agreement which avoided one side imposing its view on the other. Similarly, if some wanted to dump all US toxic wastes on Mexico and others wanted to impose unreasonable restraints on commerce, Green mediators might help them cope on an amount of toxic dumping which respected the diversity of both sides.

Finally, if some corporations wanted to destroy the entire ozone layer while critics wanted to suppress their individuality by denying them any right to influence the ozone layer, Green mediators might contribute a timetable for the rational and cool-headed elimination of ozone over a period of years.

For Greens, the ability of the State to kill has always been a negotiable position--there has never been a Green dogma opposing all State killing. Our call for a 75% reduction in military spending is an important example of this principle. It is not important whether we call for a 75% or 85% or 95% reduction. What is critical is that we reject a narrow-minded insistence on total elimination of the military budget, a program which would only stand in the way of Greens being elected. Once we accept a percentage reduction (say 75%), we have a non-absolute which can be negotiated. This would mean that a Green politician could suggest a 75% cut to a Congressional Committee. The Committee might only wish a 55% cut and, after amendments, the final bill might be a 25% cut, a 10% cut or even a 5% increase. A Green who originally proposed a 75% cut could wheel and deal to accept any of these as a minor readjustment. But a Green who was bound to a total elimination of militarism would be tied to a rigid dogma--an approach which is useful only to Leftists with an "us-them" attitude.

The concept of a negotiable 75% reduction could become the basis for a Green World Order: a 75% reduction in biological weapons, a 75% reduction in nuclear plants; residences for 75% of homeless persons; medical care for 75% of the population; treatment for 75% of AIDS patients; education for 75% of all children; toxic dumping on 75% of Indian lands; workplace for 75% of empowered families; oil on 75% of ocean waters. The list is never-ending. The truly Green aspect of all of these proposals is that they are negotiable--once in office, a Green politician would not be hamstrung by a restrictive dogma but would be free to bargain whatever percentage was most advantageous to her or his career.

It is time to abandon the narrow-minded slogan: "Never another battered woman." Instead, Greens should inscribe upon their bumper stickers the negotiable compromise: "For a 75% reduction in woman abuse."

Don Fitz, Gateway Green Alliance, October 2, 1994 file: DNQNONVDP.doc 3354 words
Subversion readers who are interested in knowing why social ecologists disagree with other leftists on the "working class's potential as the only force capable of bringing about a fundamental transformation of society" (as you put it) may consult Murray Bookchin's writings on the subject, many of which are available in the U.K. (from his 1969 essay "Listen, Marxist!" in Post-Scarcity Anarchism to his reply to anarchosyndicalist Graham Purchase, forthcoming this winter from Freedom Press). But your account of Bookchin's ideas in "Bookchin and Green Anarchism" goes on to suggest that he is ultimately a reformist by associating him with reformist tendencies in the Left Green Network (an organization Bookchin co-founded and some of whose members support his views). Your article observes that "the Left Green Network's programme ... contains a number of 'immediate demands,' which consist of a mixture of worn-out policies peddled by traditional left-wing parties and measures which could quite comfortably be adopted by capitalism without bringing about any real change in the system."

It is understandable that, an ocean away, you would not be aware of internal dissensions in the Left Green Network. Be apprised here that (1) the LGN has passed no "program"—what your writer must be referring to is one of several draft programs that have been floating around for some time now; and (2) despite the somewhat diluted assertions of libertarian municipalism in the LGN's Principles, libertarian municipalism is only one of many tendencies in the LGN, which encompasses not only social ecologists but eco-socialists, social democrats, anarchosyndicalists, and anarchists of a postmodernist bent.

Bookchin has consistently fought the very reformist tendencies in the LGN that you now associate with him—indeed, a considerable literature makes the same criticism that you do. In "Critique of the Draft Program of the Left Green Network" (June 1991), for example, Bookchin and I criticized in detail just such reformist tendencies in one of the draft LGN programs and concluded by asserting that "the Left Greens should be uncompromising in their spirit of opposition. . . . We know of no other way to countervail the cooptive powers of capitalism but to oppose to it the most demanding ecological positions in our movement." Subversion readers who wish to see a copy of this critique and our other antireformist writings may write to the Social Ecology Project, P.O. Box 111, Burlington, Vermont 05402 U.S.A.

Finally, far from advocating a "steady building up . . . within capitalism," Bookchin places himself in the great anarchist tradition of the "Commune of communes." His libertarian municipalism seeks to develop a civic communal opposition to the nation-state and the capitalist system by means of the "counterpower" of a new confederal politics (in the Hellenic sense of the word politics) and a municipalized confederal economy. Not to see that this counterpower would emerge as a "dual power" is a mistake that many of our opponents in various Green movements typically make.

Janet Biehl
At the risk of beating you over the head with my constant questions I'll remind you that you failed to answer my inquiry regarding the "precise" meaning of MUNICIPALIST socialism and how it might differ from INDUSTRIAL UNION socialism as espoused by the SLP.

Second, reference is made to DB 55 and your remarks in answer to INTERNATIONALISM. to wit: "For me and for many libertarian socialists consists of our class's walking into their workplaces, kicking out the bosses, and democratically carrying on production for use."

I am currently reading William Greider's latest book, entitled, "WHO WILL TELL THE PEOPLE" and subtitled 'The Betrayal of American Democracy'. You may remember him as the author of SECRETS OF THE TEMPLE (about the Fed). Greider goes a few lengths beyond the "radical liberal" category in that he is vitriolic in his critique of our political and economic systems, yet remains short of being revolutionary. In any case, on page 194 in a Chapter called "Political Orphans" he makes assertions which, if true, might prevent a legal "take over" of commerce and industry by a successful revolution, to wit:

"...The astonishing irony of American labor's political condition is, that even struggling workers in Eastern Europe, bravely led by Solidarity in Poland, have been able to pursue forms of collective action that are not available to workers in the United States. Americans who cheered the triumph of Solidarity perhaps did not realize that the same tactics are not legal in the United States. If an American union adopted Solidarity's methods--siezing the plant with sit-down strikes or forming an interfactory strike committee to coordinate a general strike across different industries--it would be held in contempt and pinned with huge fines and injunctions. If the tactics persisted, the leaders would doubtless be jailed and perhaps the workers, too..."

I realize that Greider is referring to "trade unions" here, as presently constituted but, he goes on to further clarify the reason these "rights" no longer exist.

"...These rights were either traded away in exchange for federal labor law protection or gradually taken away through court decisions and legislation. (He seems unsure which it is here) Labor has tried periodically to win back some of the protections by political action and launched a new effort in 1991 with a measure to prohibit hiring striker replacements in wage strikes..."

"...The prospects are not good. In 1978, despite the fact that labor provides major funding for Democrats, the Democratic Congress refused to pass labor law reforms that would have removed some of these barriers..."
"...One crucial fact has been obscured by the long decline of labor as a political force. Millions of Americans workers want to join a union but, for all these reasons, and others, they can't. According to regular surveys conducted by the University of Michigan, 30 percent of the workforce consistently expresses a desire to be represented by a union contract protecting their working conditions and wages. When that number is added to the 17 percent of the workforce who are already union members, it provides a rough measure of how much the power relationships of politics have been distorted. Roughly half the working population identifies with labor's interest. Yet labor is confined by law and politics to a position of weakness...".

If this is to be believed, nothing would prevent numerous governors and/or a militant and conservative (not necessarily Republican) President from calling out the troops and enacting a bloody re-enactment of the Paris Commune. Is there reliable information that would support the possibility of a peaceful take-over of industry and commerce in the event of an overwhelmingly majority backed force?

Fraternally
Jerry Maher

(Cont'd from p. 2)

sentence, which I have learned to use without a twinge of conscience even though I make most decisions unilaterally.) It is this "committee" to whom DB's masthead refers as the publisher. We invite all readers to participate in the DB's management by writing to us voicing your comments and criticisms. We'll give them space.

Although we didn't intend this to be the "election" issue, Don Fitz's advice to Green Party candidates heads the table of contents. It would seem to be appropriate for all reformist candidates. They can use the compromise mechanism Fitz suggests as a basis for getting elected while salving their consciences.

Janet Bishl saw the DB's reprint of Subversion's article on Bookchin, libertarian municipalism, and the Left Green Network and responded to it. She sent the DB a copy for publication. Perhaps her letter will answer Jerry Maher's question about libertarian municipalism in the next letter. Most of his letter concerns another matter, though: the legal power of the state to prevent a working class takeover of the industries. I think we will have to assume that ruling classes will always find social revolutions illegal.

The dynamics of the Socialist Labor Party's national office management style are the subject of an article and letter by Ed Wizek and a letter by Ken Kelly, Next Larry Gambone replies to Ed Jahn, Adam Bulick, Jerry Maher, and me on the meaning of revolution, changes in the nature of capitalism, and related matters.

Kamunist Kranti's letter responds to articles by Pashan Chatopadhyay, Jeff Stein, and me. KK takes issue with these writers' understanding of Marx and his "ism." The letter is followed by KK's text on Marxism and the labor movement.

(Cont'd on p. 15)
DEMOCRACY AND THE S.L.P.

Ken Kelley's letter cites his membership experience in the SLP from 1956 to 1972 and writes, "the SLP was really a democratic organization. Nothing that anybody can say now can convince me otherwise". His conclusion was based on his membership right to vote any way he pleased.

If this alone defined the existence of democracy, we could include the former Soviet Union, South Africa, and various labor unions. The essence of democracy is "people-rule". People can't begin to rule or vote intelligently unless they can freely express themselves in speech, writing and association without fear of reprisal.

For example, in the United States we have the Bill of Rights guaranteeing certain freedoms, though much eroded by Capitalist power. You will not find member civil rights guarantees in the SLP Constitution. In fact, when joining the SLP one gives up some of the already limited human rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

When I joined the SLP in the 1940's, it was expected that good party members would only read party literature. Subscribing to or possessing literature of another so-called worker's party or attending their meetings would give you plenty of "flack" usually resulting in expulsion.

Anyone associating with an expelled member, a member of another socialist/communist/union party or exchanging mail critical of the SLP or its officers would also be subject to charges and expulsion. Nor could a member willingly join a union unless his job depended upon it; nor could one take a course in "Capitalist economics" unless a college degree depended upon it; nor could one belong to any political/social (even Unitarian) group or espouse any other causes than the SLP.

Like Ken Kelly, I accepted the "so-called undemocratic provisions in the SLP Constitution," (Kelly) agreed to discipline myself and accept restricted rights in order to join, promote the SIU program and defend the party which advocated it.

The problem with these restrictions on democratic rights is that they are not limited to oneself. We have to enforce them upon each other as worker-members of the SLP. We then become active accomplices to expelling one another for non-working class reasons. In the past we have expelled each other on charges of "conspiracy" or "disruption" or "behavior unbecoming a Party member".

In most cases, what we did was defend the party's special interest to dominate its worker members and keep them in line. With few exceptions, all expelled SLP members fully agreed with the basic SLP Program for political and SIU organization of the working class. This is true for myself and all other expelled members I have known, including a great working class educator, Eric Hess.
As Ed. John wrote, “If a group treats its own members this way, what will it do to the rest of us if it ever gains power?” I regret to admit that it took nearly 40 years of active experience in the SLP before I came to learn what Ed. John discovered upon his first studying the party’s constitution in the ‘60’s.

Like Ken Kelley, I joined the SLP for its Program and viewed its restrictive Constitution as tolerable and necessary. The Program brought worker-members together but it was the devious application of its Constitution by those with executive power that led to a self-destructive course of massive membership expulsions. Constitutional revisions did not change this course.

I sincerely hope workers will adopt the SLP Program, but to attain democratic control, workers must reject the SLP as a party because even its own members cannot control. In fact, these members are so intimidated by their party that none (to my knowledge) have felt free to write the Discussion Bulletin in the past 10 years.

Fraternally, Ed. Wizek

Dear Comrades:

I would like to respond to Kelly’s assertions that those expelled from the SLP are to be lumped with police spies, etc. For example, his conclusion:

“Thus the SLP has the right to expel police spies, agents provocateur, and anyone else who joins just to disrupt it...it keeps its revolutionary integrity by expelling undesirable people and police spies”. Kenneth Kelly #55 DB

I have no argument with Kelly or the SLP on this. But during my 36 years of membership in the SLP, hundreds of members were expelled, but none were proved to be police spies, agents provocateur or persons who joined to disrupt the SLP.

To my knowledge and with few exceptions, expelled members were loyal, hard-working and supportive of the Program for many a year. Then they had a minor disagreement (not over the Program) with those in executive power or with their Section’s members who responded to that power. This is the point from which to examine democracy.

In a Democracy where majority rules, there must be a minority unless the group consists of mindless clones. In the SLP, no minority position is tolerated once a decision has been made. You will find no Constitutional provision protecting member or minority rights.

It is called the organizational principle and all members must agree to it when they join. No matter how correct you may think your position, you must suppress it and go along with the majority position. That is the SLP’s position on democracy no matter how the Constitution reads. You have majority rule, without a minority. But, suppose the suppressed minority position is correct?
For example, in the 1960’s the Constitution and majority opinion prohibited SLP members from participation in demonstrations and peace marches.

Members of the original (1960’s) Section Palo Alto went along with this position, but they did distribute SLP leaflets at demonstrations and they were severely chastised by the SLP Executive Committee for leafleting too close to the staging area. Can you imagine the chilling effect this had on Sections and members throughout the nation? Loyal SLP members felt duty-bound to put under charges other members who might participate in a demonstration.

Members in old Section Palo Alto felt those demonstrations were a great opportunity for the SLP to propagate its Program. They believed the party’s position should be changed to one of active participation in peace marches and demonstrations.

To them it was urgent. Section Palo Alto initiated a referendum vote to change the party’s position. In order for the referendum to take place, two or more other Sections had to second it.

But the SLP Constitution provides for Executive Committee intervention in the Referenda process. This intervention allows executive committee arguments on the matter before it is considered by other Sections for seconds.

This executive intrusion (check the current Constitution) has been so successful in blocking referenda that there has never been a successful Section initiated referendum that any of our old-timers could remember. That’s over 60 years.

The SLP executive committee vehemently defended the party’s non-participation in demonstrations. It also argued (1) that a referendum would create a lot of work for the National Office; (2) that a successful Section initiated referendum could open up a Pandora’s box of frequent referenda; (3) that the Section should be patient and wait a few years to present “demonstration” matters at the national convention.

Today those executive committee arguments may seem like lame excuses, but they were intimidating enough for the rest of us SLP members so there were no seconds from any Section in the country. Of course, old Section Palo Alto was now considered defiant, (“undesirable or worse”) and it was ordered (among other things) to stay away from demonstrations or be expelled from the party.

This entire Section was expelled. Ten years later, the SLP did reverse its position on demonstrations and marches. It did so on the initiative of its National Secretary (the same person delegated to expel old Section Palo Alto in the 1960’s.)

Kelly and the SLP want to smear these expelled members by grouping them with police spies and agents provocateurs. I call them SLP freedom fighters who went down in
defeat and lost their membership attempting to make the party more responsive to its membership and working class needs.

Since Kenneth Kelly agrees with the basic principles and program, I urge him to join the SLP and continue that worthwhile struggle for democratic membership control. After he becomes a member, I hope he will insist on his basic US Constitutional right to continue writing to the Discussion Bulletin despite SLP pressures to the contrary.

Just keep in mind that democracy is more than voting. It is tested by your right to protest and disagree with those in executive power. How else can the SLP be brought under membership control and be worthy of working class support.

Fraternally, Ed Wizek

Dear DB,

I wish to reply to letters by Frank Girard, Ben Perry and Ed Jahn in DB 55. In Girard's letter, I disagree with his statement that there is "direct evidence of limitations on SLP members' freedom of speech in Part V" of ORGANIZATIONAL NORMS AND PROCEDURES. In the 1992 edition of this publication, Article IV (not V) Section D. says, "Sections may communicate directly with other Sections on agitational matters, exchange locally produced material, etc. Copies of such material and related correspondence shall be supplied to the National Office." - not the National Secretary. Such communication does not necessarily have to be submitted to the SLP Newsletter. Furthermore, access to the Newsletter is not controlled by the National Secretary, as the "Guidelines for the SLP Newsletter" on page 9 show: "A. Responsibility for the editorial content and production of the newsletter rests with the national office staff" - not the National Secretary. "D. The national office staff (not the National Secretary) shall be given discretion to decide what contributions are suitable for publication." ... "The SLP Newsletter is open to all members. However, it then follows that the Newsletter should not be dominated by a few members." - including the national office staff.

There is an unstated but implied assumption in these letters that the National Secretary of the SLP is a dictator. To show that this is not so, I will quote from the 1991 edition of the SLP Constitution. Article II, Section 1 states, "The affairs of the Party shall be conducted by the National Executive Committee (NEC), the National Office, the local Sections, the National Conventions and the membership." This does not even mention the National Secretary. Article VII, Section 1 (a) says, "The National Secretary shall be elected by the National Convention, the election to be specifically approved a general vote of the whole Party." Section 3 states, "The National Secretary shall not be a member of the NEC but shall attend all its meetings and shall have a voice in all its proceedings; BUT NO VOTE." (my emphasis). Section 4 (a) says, "The National Secretary may be removed from office through the procedure provided in Article XII, Section 2, but any National Secretary who in the judgement of the NEC has proven to be incompetent or disloyal shall be at once suspended by that Committee."

This may come as a surprise to most people, but the National Secretary of the SLP really has very little power. His powers are: Section
é, "The National Secretary shall deliver formal reports to National Conventions." and Section 7, "The National Secretary shall at the earliest possible moment transmit to the Sections the results of a referendum vote." The National Secretary is just that — a secretary! The real power in the SLP is vested in the membership.

Regarding Ben Perry's letter, I agree with him that "The SLP Constitution does not permit the national secretary or NEC to expel individual members of local sections." See Article V, Section 13. Also, all expulsions can be appealed to the NEC or the National Convention. See Article XI, Section 13.

Regarding Ed Jahn's letter, I dispute his statement that "Every S.L.P. member who has not gone along has either been expelled, or put under such pressure as to eventually resign." The reason "I would always go along with the majority viewpoint" is because I believed (and still believe) that the SLP was basically doing the right thing, and I did not want to be disloyal to the organization or the working class. As I stated in my previous letter, I was NEVER threatened with expulsion, I was NEVER put under any pressure to resign — I was NEVER even asked by anybody why I voted that way. There is a difference between disagreeing and being disloyal. People are expelled from the SLP for being disloyal, but not for disagreeing.

I agree with Ed Jahn that readers of the DB should "Write to the S.L.P. Get their Constitution. Read it!" (Their address is: P.O. Box 50218, Palo Alto, CA 94303-0218). I hope Ed Jahn is one of the first to do this. He will find that most of the rest of his letter is based on myths and old wives' tales.

Ken Kelly

(Cont'd from p. 10)

Next, a letter by George Walforf criticizes the Socialist Party of Great Britain's debate methodology, and an article by Laurens Otter comments on the split in the SPGB and provides some questionable history as regards Gronlund, at least, who was a Danish immigrant to the U.S., a member of the SLP/WPNA as early as 1878, and whose later political history included membership in the SLP and Bellamy's Nationalist movement but not the Canadian SP, so far as I know. We end with a set of short reviews.

FINANCES: At the moment the DB's financial condition is good. Thanks to our readers, we are out of the red, and now that the DB's share of the cost of the copier has been paid off, printing costs will decline by about $50. On the negative side, though, we have the P.O. box rent of $35 to look forward to early next year as well as the bulk mailing annual fee, which has now reached $75. In addition, the cost of bulk mailing went up over two cents a piece during the past month.

CONTRIBUTIONS: Monroe Prussaok $10; Rado Hjanovich $40; Anonymous $10; Francis Smith $10; Lila Holmdahl $4; Steve Hoyle $10; Ralph Forsyth $7; Glen Johnson $8; Ben Perry $7; Anonymous $27. Total $149.00. Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE August 21, 1982 [deficit] $4.43

(Cont'd on p. 19)
Dear DB,

I wish to respond to some of the comments and letters in the past two bulletins. First off the points which Frank makes. Looking over the material in ATN which discusses the nature of revolution, I suppose I could have phrased it a little more clearly, maybe this is the root of the problem, so here is one more attempt.

There is more than one meaning to the word "revolution", one being the popular sense of a quick and usually violent overturning and the other a much more long-term affair. (See "revolution" in Raymond Williams's KEY WORDS) The old nineteenth Century dichotomy evolution-revolution does not apply to my usage - nor am I so naive as to not know the difference between the two. But don't take my word for it. Here is what H. H. Draper has to say on the matter; if we decide to define social revolution as a basic transformation in the social system involving its class base, then it is apparent that such a sweeping change cannot be conceived as a mere act or event, but as a process, more or less extended in time. The transformation from capitalism to socialism is envisaged by Marx as such an historical process. Moreover, it is clear that in some cases social systems have changed basically ... in a secular movement which can be described as a social revolution ... even though no one may have been aware that a revolution was going on.

(p. 19, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution, Vol. 2)

And if Draper isn't to your taste try Grandfather Marx himself - in place of the critical outlook the Minority substitutes a dogmatic one: in the place of the materialist an idealist one. Instead of actual conditions pure will becomes the drive wheel of the revolution. Whereas we tell the workers, 'You have 15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and peoples' struggles to go through, not only to change the conditions but in order to change yourselves and make yourselves fit for proletarian rule.' You say on the contrary, 'We must come to power right away or else we might as well go to sleep.' - Address to C. C. of Communist League Sept. 15 1850

Most of what I am trying to say about revolution is contained in those two quotes. I would add (and I have mentioned it several times previously) that the narrow or popular view of a revolution as a quick overturning also has its place in events - at some time the old system is completely over and done with and its remnants are overthrown and buried - perhaps after many years of socialization this will happen to capitalism, but it certainly isn't on the agenda this moment nor in the near future. And that's all I am really saying about revolution.

As for Frank telling me that socialized capital is still capital, I have only repeated this same viewpoint about a dozen times so far and it is essential to the whole concept of socialized capitalism. Furthermore, the most highly socialized forms such as co-ops are only embryonically socialist, as Marx and Engels pointed out.

Now on to Ed Jahn's opinion that it is astrange to believe that workers ever benefit from socialized capital. He might as well say that workers have never benefitted from reforms since the two aspects are so closely interrelated. Also, by making his viewpoint absolute, he puts himself on a shaky ground logically - all you have to do to destroy an absolute statement is find one piece of evidence which contradicts it. If on the other hand he was to discuss the subject in relative terms, ie, socialized capital does not benefit workers a great deal, he would have no argument because I would certainly agree. (For example, it would be very difficult to prove that state capitalism benefits the working class.) To make his absolutist point stick, Ed must prove the following statements which all involve socialized capital. - 1) Workers were better off 100 years ago than today 2) it is better to have a landlord than belong to a housing co-op 3) it is better to have a boss than be a member of a worker-managed co-op 4) it is preferable to work until you drop dead than retire with a pension 5) private medicine is better for workers than medicare. 6) I should put my money in a bank and not a credit union. 7) One should only shop at Safeway and not the wicked socialized capitalist food co-op.

As for my being "ennamored" with Quebec banks - in the first place I was discussing credit unions, not banks, in the second place, reporting on something does not mean that you are in love with it. Nor does showing that something has a positive or beneficial aspect necessarily mean that one is generally in favor of it. Marx and Engels claimed the British were revolutionizing
India without ever supporting colonialism. (in fact being colonialism's harshest critic). But of course, they were fortunate to be alive before the rise of that abomination, "political correctness."

Adam Buick raises the question about the division between ownership and control of pension funds in DB 54. But this division is found elsewhere within capitalism and even was a theme developed by Marx in Capital. (Ninety years before Galbraith) True, ownership without control seems to negate the ownership aspect, but I think that Adam tends to overstate his case. There are for example, millions of non-voting shareholders - or think of bank accounts, for that matter. $5000 in the bank is real wealth even though I have no word in how the bank is run. Nor is the non-transferability of pension funds so unique, one cannot sell ones share in a housing co-op (a way of stopping property speculation) or transfer ownership in an insurance policy.

In reality, Adam and I are raising points which reinforce what I am saying about pension funds and not demolishing what they must think is a restatement of Hilterding's erroneous position. (Essentially that socialization = socialism) The fact is, these funds are not controlled by the workers whose deferred income they contain and this, coupled with disastrous mismanagement by some pension fund officials is encouraging a move towards taking control. There does not seem to be any great legal obstacle to this occurring if the pressure is strong enough (unlike say, GM workers demanding that the plants be turned over to them, which would take a revolution in the narrow sense). One recent example of the struggle over the pension funds occurred here in Quebec last February. One billion dollars in profits over and above the amount needed to provide pensions had accrued in the private pension funds. The employers and fund managers wanted to keep this money, the workers said it was theirs. The Supreme Court then ruled that the workers had exclusive right to the surplus. Should the struggle be successful and pension funds end up organized like credit unions (one member, one vote) a vast block of capital would take on the aspects of a co-operative and the socialization of capital would take an enormous step forward, bringing the day closer when capitalist relations are finally abolished.

I also disagree somewhat with Adam's contention that not all wealth is capital. This is true for consumer goods, but necessarily for workers' homes. For example, around about age 60 or so, my wife and I will sell our home and our summer cottage, move to a warmer climate and live on the proceeds - this goal, the home as eventual retirement income, is the goal of virtually all home-owning workers. For the worker the home is his capital - workers sometimes use the equity in their homes as capital for setting up small businesses or for buying a revenue property. There is also the profit incurred upon the sale of the house (Eg. Here in Montreal housing prices went up about ten times in 15 years) Furthermore, when one sells the house at retirement only those without common sense live off the principle, most put their money in annuities, term deposits, bonds or mutual funds.

G.P. Maher's dismissal of workers concern over taxes illustrates the limits of an approach based only upon a general theory of capitalism. True enough, far more wealth is created by workers in the form of surplus value (SV) than the amount extorted from them in taxes. But as Marx shows, the former is economic and indirect, a phenomenon of capitalist society alone, while taxes are direct, political and are similar to the tribute based systems of pre-capitalist societies. As he stated, every peasant in an Asiatic Despotism know he was robbed by the state.

125 years of agitation about SV has made many workers aware of its existence, but generally this situation is grudgingly accepted as the rules of the game. Perhaps people also feel that an unequal exchange is better than no exchange at all, or an unequal exchange is not the same as out and out robbery. One example of the latter should suffice - if I make a business deal with you and you get $500 out of it and I make only $100, I might very well get annoyed, but if you came into my house and stole $200 out of my wallet I would be pissed off to the point of violence.

Workers are also aware that most of the SV goes into reinvestment, R and D etc. and only a small amount actually goes to the high living associated with the stereotypical plutocrat. Marx also pointed out that all societies need to hold the surplus created by the producers for reinvestment, supporting the retired and unemployable and so forth. (In polemics with the crude communists who claimed workers should receive all of the product they produced.)
Furthermore, he stated that a certain amount of the SV extracted was a legitimate wage for capitalists who actually performed in a managerial or productive capacity. The real question then, is not the existence of a surplus, but the fact that this surplus under capitalism takes the form of value. To begin the abolition of the value relation means that workers would call into question the ownership and control of the means of production, something which may be beginning now in the US and Canada because of the lousy job the corporate managers have been doing in investing our SV. Put another way, workers don't mind the unequal exchange if a more or less sound economy is the result, but when the boss screws up either out of short-sightedness, stupidity or greed, then they get angry.

There is another possible reason why workers are more concerned about taxes than SV and that is the fact that taxes are harder to avoid than exploitation. If one really hates creating SV one has the following choices:
1. Go on welfare
2. Start a small business
3. Save and invest your dough and become a petty rentier
4. Get a government (or non-SV producing) job. Admittedly these aren't realistic choices for most of us workers, but people do attempt these alternatives and at least 20% of the population lives by these means. And if you hate paying taxes? If you don't pay them they either come and take your property or put you in jail - even welfare is no escape for you still pay sales tax and a host of hidden taxes. There is no way out, it is the nearest thing to totalitarianism in our society.

Finally, while SV has always been part and parcel of capitalism, workers paying income tax has not. Fifty or sixty years ago few workers paid income tax and when I first started working back in 1962 my deductions were so small I barely noticed them - quite honestly I never gave a damn about the issue until about ten years ago. It was during the '70's and '80's that income tax really began hitting working people - to the point where I give one day out of every week to the bureaucrats (on only $300 a week!) As I said in DB 54, here is a way to build a movement in opposition to the state if there was one, yet sadly the issue will most likely remain in the hands of right-wing demagogues because the left doesn't have the wit to organize along these lines.

I also have a few comments upon the review of Piszko Jacobs book in Daad en Gedachte. First off, I am very curious to see what Jeff Stein, Jon Bekken, Laurens Ottar and Ed Stamm have to say - hopefully they will respond. Secondly, I have heard it all before, the anarchist movement died in 1890 and then was reborn as anarcho-syndicalism, it also died in 1939 and was reborn again in the '60's. What's new? The death of anarchism? Really, give me a break! Thirdly, the charge that anarchism is without influence simply isn't true. Anarchism has had an influence in the women's movement, in education, in the liberation of sexuality, in the formation of mutual aid societies and other co-operative and alternative ventures, and even in town planning. In France it had a certain effect upon popular culture. Many of the best ideas of the labor movement originated with the syndicalists. In a sense anarchism has even influenced the post-war generation, helping to give rise to what Raymond Williams called a "Structure of Feeling" among those of us who came to adulthood in the 1960's. (I remember back in the New Left's pre-Stalinist days we all read Paul Goodman, considered ourselves to be anarcho-pacifists and talked about "student syndicalism!") For a movement which has usually remained a tiny minority of the population, anarchism has had an influence upon society vastly out of proportion to its numbers.

Consider the difference in influence between anarchism and the socialist sects - anarchism has been vastly more influential (of course, this wouldn't take much since the sects impact upon the populace is virtually nil) This brings up the last point, the tired old cliche about anarchist utopianism. Yes, there are utopian anarchists - just like there are utopian liberals, utopian conservatives, utopian socialists, utopian socialists, utopian socialists and utopian fascists. But it is not the utopians in the clouds dreaming about the perfect society or the nail-biting waiting for the Millenium which has made anarchism influential. Rather, it is the practical, "revolution in daily life" which has attracted so many of us. If you don't like the way things are you take direct action to change it, neither asking the state to kindly come to your aid, nor living in misery until The
Revolution comes (which of course it never does) Don't care for the education system? Get together with some friends and form your own school. Don't dig landlords? Start a housing co-op. Don't want to go off to war? Well, refuse to go! These seemingly microcosmic changes eventually reverberate through society helping to further the social revolution to a far greater degree than 500 years of preaching or a super-tanker load of tracts could ever do. Anyway, it is this practicality which has attracted me to anarchism and explains why someone who can quote Marx until everyone within five counties is bored to tears should consider this group his home and not some socialist sect.

Anarchically yours,

Larry Gambone

(Cont'd from p. 15)

<table>
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<th>RECEIPTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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(Cont'd from p. 32)

from all points of view, including that of the right wing of the Green movement, the Green Politics Network, which considers itself the antithesis of the Left Green Network. 48 pages, $3 from Regeneration/WD Press, PO Box 24115, St. Louis, MO 63130.

THE ABOLITION OF WORK. Bob Black's classic begins with the sentence, "Nobod...
Increasing social discontent against the existing state of affairs and the absence of vibrant emancipatory alternatives demand serious reflection. Flippant attitudes in this situation are an added pain. More so when ignorance is confidently flaunted and the nonsense is not challenged. An example is the exchange between International Communist Current’s (ICC) Internationalism and Frank Girard. Internationalism repeats ICC nonsense when they say, “Luxemburg’s analysis of the accumulation of capital stressed the importance of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry as markets for the realization of surplus value in the period of ascendant capitalist development.” This high sounding statement is pure bullshit and Frank Girard’s silence is disturbing. In the period of ascendant capitalist development” is a contribution of these self-proclaimed luxemburgists that goes against the whole grain of Rosa Luxemburg’s analysis of in The Accumulation of Capital. That the petty bourgeoisie is a market for the realization of surplus value is another gem from Internationalism. And to expect these “raisers of important theoretical questions” to have even an inkling of the difference between simple reproduction and enlarged reproduction is asking too much.

II With regard to Paresh Chattopadhyay’s analyses, we share with DB readers our correspondence with Paresh:

A. The stage theory and its corollary, revolution country-wise seems implicit in Paresh’s analysis. In our opinion this needs serious reconsideration. A radical transformation in the social relations of production CANNOT be done in ONE country, however “advanced” it be. Take the example of the USA in the 1890s and pose the problem. In our opinion, the revolution against the capitalist system is a process. It is through a series of defeats, through a series of historical processes transforming circumstances and human beings that communism can be achieved. In this regard the objective limits of capitalism need to be kept in mind. This is one of those “forgotten” basics as well as a contentious issue whose implications are very important for revolutionary practice.

B. We consider a RETURN to Marx a very positive step today but in our opinion a FIXATION with Marx that seems to be there in Paresh’s analyses will not take us far. A Marxist critique of Marx’s analyses, especially of the dominant thread in them is essential. Specifically we would like to mention here some aspects of it --

a) Marx’s analysis in Capital II wherein he poses enlarged reproduction in a closed capitalist system. This can neither explain how the dynamics of capital moulds the world in its own image nor pose the question of objective limits of capital as such.

b) in Capital III, Marx’s analysis brilliantly explains the demise of individual ownership in capitalism by his analysis of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. But this analysis cannot explain the objective limits of capital as a social relation— wage-labour based commodity production.

c) The dominant thread in Marx’s analyses, especially in Capital I, II, III is a fixation with private property (in individual ownership form) and his analyses are based on its dynamics. Of course
Marx also talks of "collective capitalist" etc.; but that is secondary in his analytical schema of capitalism. This inadequacy instead of being overcome was amplified by the Second International and diverse leninist currents. Council communist and other Marxist tendencies have done the same thing. Abolition of private property as the abolition of capitalism has been the main justification for acceptance of terrorist state-capitalist states and tendencies.

d) Marx's analyses often mix-up two distinct forms of commodity production--simple commodity production and capitalist commodity production. Their distinct dynamics and inter-relationship has been jumbled up leading to utter confusion regarding the birth of capitalism, its accumulation process and its objective limits.

In our opinion, Marx's analyses are dated. For any conscious revolutionary practice to exist and develop today, one has to explain the social reality unfolding today.

Marx is profound and one can make him more profound today, but in our opinion this will side-step the issues crying to be taken up. Similarly, the ruthless criticism of Lenin's writings is very necessary, but anti-Lenin stances will again avoid the problem.

III. Jeff Stein's letter in DB55 sharply brings out the meaninglessness of quotation debates to help our understanding of individual biographies, history and society. We would like to assert that there is a relationship between a certain strand in Marx's analyses and state-capitalism. But the problem is not just of federalism and centralism but much deeper. All theories of social revolution that we know of have within them an implicit notion of a territorial/stages understanding of social transformation today. Whether one takes self-sufficient self-regulating villages as models for emancipation or municipalities, whether one takes self-sufficient self-regulating nation states or continents, they are rooted in territorial/stages conceptions. How so much workers self-management be, these arenas are bound o lead to the formation of STANDING ARMIES with adjectives Red, Republican, People's etc. and necessary terroristic auxiliaries. In our opinion, what is underlying these is an obliterating of understanding of the dynamics of material production and reproduction of social life today and the direction in which emancipatory potentialities lie. The challenges for emancipatory politics and both in thought and practice demand a critical and rigorous demystification of mythologies, shared implicit assumptions and reverential canons and prophets.

A March 1982 Kamunist Kranti text takes up some of the fundamental problems facing the Marxist communist movement--DB has a copy.

With greetings, Sher Singh -- for Kamunist Kranti

Address: MAJDOOR LIBRARY, AUTOFIN JHUGGI, FARIDABAD-121001, INDIA
Capitalism, an exploitative and oppressive system, also created a potential for human emancipation. Many movements against capitalist exploitation and oppression arose but they could not provide a revolutionary alternative to capitalism because of their lack of a framework for the comprehension of the social process. Marxist communist movement also arose in opposition to capitalism. It was the expression of a major leap in human consciousness because it helps understand the practice of different social movements within a rigorous historical materialist worldview and posits the concrete possibility of the realisation of a humane society. Thus it is a movement for the revolutionary abrogation of capitalism. Capitalism is still the existing social reality. Discontent against it is violently expressing itself throughout the world though latent violence is no less deep and wide. But today the marxist communist movement is not providing a revolutionary channel for the expression of mounting social discontent. Also, no other viable revolutionary channels have appeared. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the problems facing the marxist communist movement.

Fundamental problems facing the marxist communist movement today

It would be inadequate and simplistic to draw a one-to-one relationship between material production of social life and other aspects of human life. Different aspects of social life have dynamics of their own. Even then, material production and reproduction of social life constitutes the axis of the social process in scarcity based social formations because it is the primary human activity in them. An understanding of the material production of social life is therefore required for the examination of the complexities necessary for the comprehension of different aspects of human life and the inter-relations between them. Any struggle for change is aided or hindered by the extent of this understanding.

The capitalist system is the arena of material production of social life today. Therefore, the essence and dynamics of capital constitute the axis of human life. The roots of the fundamental problems facing the marxist communist movement must be looked for in the extent of the comprehension of the essence and dynamics of capital.

I. The essence of capital

Capitalism, like other social formations, is a historical and a social relation. The social relation that defines capitalism is one of wage-labour based commodity production. The marxist communist movement took private property as the essence of capitalism basing itself on the analyses of Marx which were deeply imprinted by private property/individual ownership, the dominant form of mid-nineteenth century capitalism.
Therefore, it posed itself in opposition to a particular form of capital's representatives, the capitalists. The dynamics of capital, however, brought to the fore new representatives of capital. As early as 1860s joint stock companies with their directors appeared. And in the present, limited firm/corporation/'public' sector's increasing role in the domain of material production throughout the world has redelineated the capitalist class.

In this situation, the marxist communist movement took the abolition of one form of capital as the abolition of capital as such. Therefore the marxist communist movement got identified with some forms of state-capitalism.

With private property in the means of production side-lined, capitalists no longer constitute the capitalist class. With the domination of faceless capital, the social relation has come to the fore. This has also made a new definition of the capitalist class necessary. The representatives of capital constitute the capitalist class. A tentative definition for us would be - the representatives of capital are persons who play an active role in the propagation of capital and are better off because of this role.

This inadequacy in understanding the essence of capital has had other serious consequences as well. Some of the the issues that need consideration in this context are:

1. Motive in capitalism. "Greedy capitalists after bigger profits", is a fallacy in a scenario in which individual capitalist no longer has a dominating role in the capitalist system. Enterprises by and large are no longer the private property of individuals. And furthermore, today the profitability or otherwise of an enterprise is not dependent on those responsible for running it, its management. A system geared to profit can no longer be used to characterise capitalism - subsidies, deficits, etc. have become routine. Today the character of capitalism appears misanthropic because its blind laws have brought about a situation where capital has become a barrier to capital. Factions of capital (organised as nation states) are forced to take steps which are detrimental to their own interests. Militarisation, which is a forced necessity in intra-capital struggles for the conditions of capital accumulation, consumes increasing amounts of surplus-value and thus hinders accumulation itself. Subsidies, another forced necessity, both for containing social discontent and supporting certain branches of production, also are a consumption of surplus-value. The forced maintenance of increasing idle capacity not only wastes potential surplus-value but also depreciates existing capital.

A social relation was born, today it struggles to survive.

2. The definition of the revolutionary process as a one-go operation. If the abolition of private property is considered sufficient for the abolition of capitalism, then the revolution does appear to be a tumultuous triumphant moment - only a disposable number of class enemies would have to be dealt with. Desperate measures to stop the return of capitalists are then a willing return to the infrastructure of a capitalist nation - the formation of standing army, the police, bureaucracy, etc.
The task to be performed is the abolition of a social relation. The suppression of person does not take one far in this. Rather, it is counter-productive.

3. Another very different kind of implication is that the decrease in the weightage of inheritance and private property has increased the mobility of the representatives of capital. En bloc retrenchments of managers and supervisors is fast becoming normal. Also, the emergence of representatives of capital from amongst the working class is no longer exceptional. It is quite possible for an individual to be a part of the capitalist class and the working class at different points in time. An important repercussion of this is that the reality of capital as a social relation is heightened. Add to this the rapidity with which crafts like the medical profession are being transformed into another capitalist industry. Doctors, teachers, engineers are effectively becoming contingents of the working class. The intellectual reservoir for revolutionary movement is widening.

4. That private property or individual ownership is not the dominant form of capital anymore has a bearing on the forms of struggles appropriate in present times. Longdrawn strikes that were amongst the most effective weapons of the wage-workers in factory-based struggles are no longer such - the stakes of the managements are unlike the stakes owners had in private enterprises. Rather, isolated longdrawn stikes today are increasingly counter-productive. Furthermore, stopping production through long lockouts is a tool increasingly being used by managements against workers. An important and positive implication of this is that even day to day struggles need to become revolutionary to be effective. The creation of new forms of struggles and corresponding forms of organisations that keep in mind present reality and are effective in the present situation, both in terms of everyday resistance and longterm revolutionary movement, is an urgent issue. Incidentally, in India, as in Europe earlier, we find big industry workers reluctant to struggle in old forms of resistance which are largely seen as paths to certain defeat. But this reluctance of workers is often characterised as reformism/ economism/ aristocracy of labour's attitude by revolutionaries who insist on using the offload of the past in a present where these have repeatedly proved themselves to be redundant. Such perspectives lead many an activist to concentrate on small-scale/semi-proletarian/peasant-artisan arenas where desperation is seemingly revolutionary. In fact, in a desperate person revolutionry rhetoric, not unlike religious and other obscurantist rhetoric, often finds echoes. Here, in the context of the comparatively well-paid workers, the necessity of new kinds of struggles is even more apparent.

II. After having broadly defined the essence of capital and some of the implications which arise from an inadequate understanding of it, we now need to define the life of capital.

A. The dynamics of capital revolve around the accumulation of capital. The accumulation of capital involves the production of surplus-value and conversion of a portion of the surplus-value
into new capital. Transformation of non-commodity economies into commodity economies AND displacement of simple commodity production by capitalist commodity production becomes a forced necessity as capital cannot accumulate in a closed capitalist system. Capital necessarily, in that it is capital, increasingly moulds the world in its own image.

However, except for Rosa Luxemburg, the Marxist Communist movement has seen the accumulation of capital as viable in a closed capitalist system. Capital would, therefore, not mould the world in its own image. This inability of the movement to understand the dynamics of capital makes it impossible for it to understand how capital has spread over the globe. It provides ground for conspiracy theories to replace materialist interpretation of the social process. Lenin’s imperialism these paved the way here. Imperialism (whether cultural or conservative) is now a catch-all concept to account for various problems (whether national or revolutionary).

In fact, imperialism is a function of capitalism. As capitalist commodity production requires simple commodity production for its growth. It is merely another fact that now simple commodity producers are mostly a subset of weak factions of capital (otherwise termed as third world, developing countries, etcetera). To reduce imperialism to a moral question takes away from its existing material basis. From posing a revolutionary alternative to capitalism to becoming a tool in the intra-capital scrambles speaks volumes about the present perspectives of Marxist outlook. In this context, it needs to be considered that global capital is constituted by factions of capital which are essentially organised on country-basis. There is a capitalist basis for nation/nationalism. But by forcing the movement of capital across boundaries the accumulation of capital has undermined national boundaries in the past and today brings national framework increasingly into question. Weak, and therefore worried interests of capital are increasingly adopting nationalism as a rallying cry. This has at times made concepts of national capital — foreign capital powerful in intra-capital contentions. When social reality is forcefully pushing globalisation to the fore, isolationist aspirations expressing themselves as anti-imperialism, anti-multinational corporation, anti-foreign capital etcetera need to be understood for what they are in order to pose a revolutionary alternative to capitalist oppressions and exploitations.

B. Another interpretation of the dynamics of capital bases itself on attempts to maintain and raise the rate of profit. This was valid in the period of the domination of private property in capitalism. As joint-stock companies and big capitalist enterprises like railways were explicitly left out in the determination of average rate of profit, it is obvious that the rate of profit as envisaged was meant for private property based capital’s dynamics only. This theory has little relevance today where private property plays a peripheral role in a system dominated by faceless capital. What has helped create another problem for the Marxist Communist movement today is that the rate of profit continues to be seen as the pivot of capital’s life. Attempts to trace the life cycle of capital (boom slump war new
cycle) as being governed by the insufficiency of profit/attempt
to raise the rate of profit disallows facts like jumps in the
organic composition of capital that accompany war. Furthermore,
thorizations such as 'exploitation of superprofits from third
world to raise the falling rate of profit' enhance anti-
imperialist choruses.

C. The accumulation of capital, the life of capital is tied to
the availability of non-capitalist commodity production (simple
commodity production). The accumulation of capital at the same
time involves displacement of simple commodity production by
capitalist commodity production. It is this process that has led
not only capital but the world in its own image, but also
to a situation where available amount of simple commodity
production becomes insufficient for the accumulation needs of
capital. This situation was reached by the end of the nineteenth
century. Capital became a barrier to capital. The epochal crisis
of capital has set in. Capital, thus, faces objective limits to
its life.

For Marx, the tendency of the rate of profit to fall posed
objective limits to capitalism. But the tendency of the rate of
profit to fall poses objective limits to only to individual
capitalists. It poses objective limits to the domination of
private property in capitalism. This is inadequate with regard to
objective limits to capital as such. With faceless capital as the
increasing reality, holding on to Marx’s analyses on this score
is more in terms of faith than a materialist analyses of social
reality.

But the question of objective limits of capitalism has largely
been bypassed by the marxist communist movement after Marx. And
this so when the arrival of the epochal crisis of capitalism has
exacerbated all-round discontent/struggles. To the periodic
 crises of capitalism, which are a product of the anarchy in
capitalist production, the setting-in of the epochal crisis of
the system gives a new, qualitatively different setting. And the
accumulation of capital increasingly deepens the epochal crisis
of the system.

The question of objective limits is of crucial importance and
inadequacy/blindness on this score has engendered problems
spawning many aspects of the marxist communist movement.

D. The objective limits of capitalism provide the objective
basis for the constitution of a new social system. Communism
becomes possible and the task that faces humanity is the
subjective realization of this objective possibility. The process
by which the subjective forces can be constituted is what
essentially matters for us. The focus of the marxist communist
movement fundamentally is how human beings are to develop the
consciousness to act together to constitute a humane society.
That the epochal crisis of capitalism will incessantly deepen
will either capitalism is replaced by communism or humanity
destroys itself needs to be grasped well. The deepening crisis
of the capitalist system increases social discontent as a corollary.
The periodic crises of capitalism in this situation are bound to
give rise to upheavels of increasing dimensions. This is the
setting for the growth of the consciousness, the forging of the
subjective tools for the realization of an objective possibility.
One thing is obvious: in place of the stages theory, revolution needs to be seen to be a process. It is a series of defeats through which victory can be achieved. With the incessantly deepening crisis of the system, bigger upheavals to come must act as guarantees against desperation and desperate measures. It is an urgent task, but to accord it signal desperation is to allow all means—the red army of "socialist" Russia helped create one of the most repressive nation states of all. The ethics of a movement are important as they have a bearing on the quality of the achievement. With the greater probability of opportunities in the future, we need to realize that means aiding degeneratation can have no place in the revolutionary movement. Pragmatism to save present gains has had to be dearly paid for by humanity.

E. The objective limits question needs to be dwelt a little in the context of a notion of the inevitability of communism. That the accumulation of capital leads to objective limits of capital only means that an either/or situation increasingly develops. Either a revolutionary abrogation of capitalism or the self-destruction of humanity. There is no inevitable communism. The epochal crisis of capitalism does not pre-ordain the birth of a humane society. And this must be sufficient to highlight the importance of organised activity by communists. Learning from past experiences and transmitting those experiences, learning from ongoing experiences and linking them up together to make the revolutionary alternative viable is an urgent task that needs to be performed for the emergence of a consciousness willing to constitute a humane society.

The focus of this paper has been to point out the paramount importance of understanding the essence and dynamics of capital. After Marx's critique of political economy, but for Rosa Luxemburg, this field has hardly been examined. Some questions not adequately tackled by Marx and others which have arisen with changes in social reality demand an incisive and contemporary critique of political economy. An unworried reticence in this field has played havoc with the materialist interpretation of the social process for revolutionary practice. Not addressing problems staring in the face is a peculiar problem, a fundamental problem of the marxist communist movement for quite some time now. A critical approach, the hallmark of any revolutionary movement has all but disappeared and transformed the marxist communist movement into a faction ridden sect. Materialist interpretation of the social process demands a critical approach fundamentally because social reality is inherently dynamic. Only a critical and evolving relationship with it will lead the marxist communist movement to its aim. After having attempted to highlight the necessity for a critique of political economy, we will finally touch here some other issues which need clarification.

III. In the revolutionary abrogation of capitalism, the role of the working class is seen to be pivotal by the marxist communist movement because of its place in material production. Even then, changes, major changes in the composition of the working class have hardly been considered by the marxist communist movement.
same has been the case with changes in working conditions and production processes. What is more, because of its fixation with workers employed at a given time, the marxist communist movement has often appeared as a protagonist of outmoded production processes. Blindness to the working class dynamic will not allow any movement to pose a revolutionary alternative to capitalism. The overlapping of physical and mental labour increasingly visible is a very positive development. We welcome this. We welcome the transformation of sweatshops into airconditioned factories. We welcome computers and robots. We welcome the transformation of scientists-engineers-doctors into industrial-technical workers. The intellectual reservoir of the working class is incessantly increasing. Add to this the possibility of abundance of material means of life for all, a possibility that is increasingly making itself visible. Communism can be seen to be looming on the horizon!

IV. Before we end, it will be relevant to dwell here a little on the meaning of abundance. That the marxist communist movement has often become identified with asceticism in unfortunate. Abundance of material means of life for all is the starting point of the realm of human freedom because production of material means of life no longer remain the primary activity of human beings. That the leap in productive forces in capitalism has made a utopia of long standing into a concrete possibility is the underlying basis of the marxist communist movement. This needs to be brought to the fore again. The present capacity, the waste due to capitalism, the possibilities, all these need to be highlighted to aid the struggle for the communist dream which has become a distinct possibility.

KAMUNIST KRANTI MARCH '92
MAJDOOR LIBRARY, AUTOPIN JHUGGI, N.I.T. FARIDABAD - 121001 INDIA

Dear Editor, The letter in DB54, from Adam Buick of the Socialist Party based in Clapham, reveals the technique of argument routinely used by this party. Their theory asserts an antagonism of interests between the working class, enslaved and exploited, and the capitalist master class. On which side of this division do the pension fund managers stand?

Are they capitalists? Adam says they may become capitalists in future, so they are not so now, and on his party's definition that makes them workers. The size of their salary does not alter this, and neither does their opportunity of becoming capitalists; many workers have done so. These workers, Adam tells us, pay themselves 'enormous' salaries, and that means they have control of these funds which they do not own. He shows that these workers control this substantial part of capitalism.

But he then says the pension funds 'are not controlled by workers' (emphasis added), and his party also says the capitalists, not the workers, control this society.

This is one instance, though an unusually clear one, of their method. On big issues they assert both sides, jumping from one to the other in order to win the argument. Here Adam has been forced by the trend of discussion to let both sides appear in the one letter; he shows that the pension fund managers are workers (on his party's definition) but says they are not.

George Walford, IDEOLOGICAL COMMENTARY, 15 Calabria Rd.London N5 1JB
Some anarchists may have noted that nowadays there are not merely two Workers' Revolutionary Parties, two Communist Parties of Great Britain, (despite the fact that the largest such is now the Democratic Left,) innumerable S.D.P.s; but also two S.P.G.B.s. Since we have a long history of battling with one S.P.G.B., the reaction "so what?" to this last is to be expected; but it's worth a little interest.

The majority S.P.G.B. has long professed to be more influenced by William Morris than Karl Marx, has long insisted that it does not interpret Clause Six of its statement, (which says that socialists must take control of government,) literally, since forming a government would be in their view a denial of Clause Five, (which quotes Marx that the working class must emancipate itself,) their party having for a long time insisted that: (a) there can be no transitional period in which a revolutionary government exercises power; (b) the existence of a government is evidence of the existence of class divisions.

The minority S.P.G.B. has been formed resurrecting the insistence, (more or less unknown in S.P.G.B. literature since the mid-Fifties,) that the party's aim is to take over government, (and with it control of the armed forces, police, law courts & other instruments of state control.) It still denies any intention of creating a transitional regime. It denounces the majority, who it claims, falsely, pretended adherence to the party statement, (no doubt Clause Six is meant,) in order to acquire the party's assets.

Obviously both parties are putting their own interpretations on these two clauses, which cannot if read absolutely literally be reconciled.

The minority has in the current issue of its paper ("Socialist Studies") come up with two supplementary theories:
Since in recent years the majority S.P.G.B. has woken up to the dangers of environmental destruction, it has seen that capitalist (private or state) accumulation is generally achieved at the expense of ecological destruction; the minority has obviously felt itself compelled to deny that capitalism as a system (as distinct from the odd uncontrolled individual capitalist) does anything so vile. They brand the Green interests of their former comrades as unmarxist. Obviously they have not read Marx's Grundrisse; still less Engels' essay on the subject, & the marginal comments on this which Marx wrote. & Dumas published a year or so before she died, criticizing Engels for failing to go far enough.

Likewise as some members of the majority S.P.G.B argue that the rich constantly accumulate an higher percentage of total property, (as Adam Buick takes a mid-position accepting that some statisticians deny this, when talking of the top 20%,) but pointing out that it is obviously true when talking of the ultra-rich, say the top 0.02%,) they launch an all-out accusation of dishonesty. Their arguments are regrettably limited to the wealthy Western world, failing to note the extent to which the Third World has provided a sub-proletariat for the West. They also depend on "de iure" ownership, neglecting the extent to which the wealth of the 80% is lodged in building societies, pension funds, insurance, banks, etc., where it is controlled by very small managerial-capitalist elites, who have the use, & frequently, enjoyment (not merely in the Maxwell sense) of this wealth, so that if not "de iure" at least "de facto" the elite owns the property of the many.

But though these points, & others, may well in due time become the central issues in debate between the two parties, they are at the moment only side-issues. The main point is that two diametrically opposed interpretations are put on two
clauses; neither of which in strict logic can be justified from the plain meaning of the words. How has this happened? Let me briefly look at the party history.

The S.P.O.B. was formed in 1904 under the influence of the then Socialist Party of Canada. There, Laurence Gronlund, a right-wing reformer, decided that the way to get capitalists to accept a Fabian pattern of reformism would be to create a mass workers’ party on a revolutionary programme, frighten the capitalists into seeking Fabian allies. Naturally the party he created for this limited purpose immediately broke with its founder. It was in its early days allied with the American Socialist Labour Party, which was then coming under Daniel De Leon’s influence. This latter believed in forming two parallel working class organizations, a socialist party & an industrial union federation, on lines very similar to syndicalism. In his strategy the party was to be elected, would immediately dissolve government & itself, & the union would then embark on a social general strike. The point of telling the boss class just when the strike was to be was that he assumed that the police, army, courts & state forces generally would accept that the revolution had law on its side, & therefore would not act against it.

De Leon was an University Professor, with doctorships of Law & of classics, it is amazing how stupid clever people can be. Though part of his trouble seems to have been that he appears to have had a personal dislike of anarchists, whether he ever actually read anything by Kropotkin or Malatesta or doubts, he continually attacked them for views they never expressed. Anyway, though he constantly insisted that a socialist state was a contradiction in terms, & that therefore socialists should never form a government, & though—despite the inefficiency—his revolutionary strategy was a variant of syndicalism; he waged constant polemics against syndicalists.

In Britain the SPOB was basically formed by dissident De Leonists. Con Lehane the first secretary had worked with James Connolly in Ireland. He had been a provincial organizer, when the bosses’ thugs got a bit too heavy, Con thought it safer to come to England; he didn’t last long in the SPOB, went to the British IVW, then joined the IRA, eventually becoming a Chief na Fobhlaichte member of the Irish Parliament; like his leader Sean McBride he scabbed on Noel Browne when the latter tried to implement that party’s moderately reformist health proposals, & then engaged in McCarthyite witch-hunts against all leftists in Ireland. Anderson the main founding speaker had been a somewhat male-chauvinist ELF party-organizer, who had decamped with the funds. The party was pulled together, (but at the expense of several splits,) by a comrade called Fitzgerald; it now lives to think of him as its founder, ignoring his predecessors.

But the price of that refounding was a theoretical contradiction. Fitzgerald took the statement that “the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself,” not as the meaningless profession that Marx himself & every other marxist party makes it, but as a flat statement (very like that of De Leon’s) that there could be no such thing as a transitional socialist regime. But De Leon was attacked, (only a minority of the working class was unionised, & so De Leonism was not a class organization,) & they needed an alternative strategy. They got round it by leaving the matter unstated. It was possible to say we’ll form a socialist government to work a transition, but it won’t be a transitional government; or it was possible to say when we are elected the workers will spontaneously make a revolution, so that though we’ll be a nominal government, nominally in charge of the coercive mechanism of the state, we’ve no illusions that we can actually use them for socialist purposes.

Consequently the party has been through contradictory phases. Until WW, despite the fact that many party members worked in or with the IVW, the SPOB, was al-
most exclusively as "impossibilist" electoral party; then after the war there was
an approximation to "left Communism" (the KAPD then, groups like Workers' Voice &
World Revolution now; ) In the late Thirties & during the war, the SPOB's involve-
ment in the pacifist movement led it to argue that mass individual resistance
would prepare the ground & that socialist elections would be the rubber stamp
which would legitimize revolution. There was a reaction against this just after
the war, which led to Tony Turner being hounded out of the party; & briefly the
word "impossibilist" was revived, but revived by people who basically believed in
some form of transitional socialist state, & they couldn't admit such a belief.
This created a theoretical vacuum; & eventually the anti-state position was
reasserted.

Obviously, for a outsider, the answer is that both the SPOBs should agree to
change the clauses of their principles:

the minority would say that the emancip-
aration is the task of the working class itself. "but nevertheless it will delegate
this to parliamentary elite of SPOB members;"

the majority would say that the working class
must organize consciously & politically for the conquest "& abolition" of the
powers of government, "since plainly these, intrinsically ruling class powers can
never be used to make a classless society."

An equal accommodation on the same would also, to an outsider, appear simple.
Plainly, in fact, nothing of the sort will happen. Laurens Otter

SHORT REVIEWS

SOLIDARITY FOREVER: THE 1933 IWW LABOR CALENDAR. Once again the IWW
Hungarian Literature Fund has published a fine calendar for radicals,
revolutionaries, and labor history buffs. The large photos in this
edition include murals from the Duluth, Minnesota IWW hall and UAW
Local 174 hall in Detroit as well as a couple pictures from labor
struggles in Eastern Europe and contemporary U.S. As usual it marks
important dates in labor history including the birthdates of people
considered heroes by the compilers of the calendar. Bill Haywood's
birth is marked for February 5 (The Encyclopedia of the American Left
gives it as February 4), but another founder of the IWW, Daniel De
Leon is missing. Kropotkin and Bakunin are noted as well as Marx, and
John L. Lewis is present but not Jimmy Hoffa. It's a fine calendar in
all respects. Large size (11 by 17 inches opened) on slick paper
complete with a big red IWW button circled by ABOLISH THE WAGES SYSTEM
and information on the IWW, it is a thing of beauty and a joy forever.
$7.50 per copy, $4.50 per copy for five or more sent to a single
address. Order From IWW/HLF, PO Box 204, Oak Park, IL 60303.

IRELAND: NATIONALISM AND IMPERIALISM: The Myths Exploded. As one
might expect in a pamphlet on Ireland from the British periodical
Subversion, neither the IRA nor its leftist supporters in Britain get
much sympathy. Rather, the pamphlet advances the sound revolutionary
socialist idea that national liberation struggles are not likely to
liberate the working class of the oppressed country. In fact, as
Subversion puts it here, "The outcome of past 'national liberation
struggles' shows that the working class always ends up being oppressed
just as much by its so-called 'liberators' as it was by its old
imperialist masters." In other sections, the authors discuss "The
Myth of National Self-Determination," "The Irish 'Free' State," and

ANARCHIST STUDIES. According to its prospectus "Anarchist Studies is a new international journal concerned with all aspects of contemporary anarchist research and theory. It has grown out of the earlier Bulletin of Anarchist Research which has been published by the Anarchist Research Group since 1985. Anarchist Studies will primarily focus upon contemporary developments in anarchism and will provide a forum for original academic papers, as well as reviews of books and other cultural forms. While we intend the tone to be serious and scholarly, we would also welcome occasional polemics, fantasies and projects of a less formal nature. From time to time, special issues on specific themes will be published. All papers will be referred by experts in relevant fields. We also intend to provide reference material, such as short notices of relevant articles or periodicals throughout the world. Anarchist Studies will be aimed at a wide intellectual readership." Full instructions for authors are available from Andrew Johnson, The White Horse Press, 10 High St., Knapwell, Cambridge CB3 8NR England. The subscription price is in the stratosphere: a two-issue sub £12 (£24 US) from The White Horse Press, 1 Strond, Isle of Harris, Scotland PA83 3UD.

REGENERATION 4: GREEN ELECTORAL POLITICS--THE 1992 DEBATES. Regeneration, which bills itself as "A Magazine of Left Green Social Thought," has devoted its fourth issue to the debate on the subject "movement vs political party" which now seems to be in the process of tearing apart the Greens in the U.S. Authors of the twenty-six articles and reviews include names familiar to DB readers: Janet Siehl, Murray Bookchin, Don Fitz, Joanne Forna, Howard Hawkins, Ed Jahn, Bob Long, Laura Winton, and yours truly. They cover the subject (Cont'd on p. 19)