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The publication of issue number 100 of the Discussion Bulletin calls for one of those self-congratulatory articles by the publisher, and I have decided to yield to the call. The last time I did anything similar was the seventh issue, August 1984, which indicates how pleased I was to have lasted one year. Here it is:

TO OUR READERS

With Number 7, the Discussion Bulletin begins its second year. The prospectus that occupied this space in the first issue expressed the hope that the DB would be a forum for what we called "third force" revolutionaries—the non-Leninist, non-social democratic, anti-statist, anti-capitalist, anti-authoritarian socialists, to describe us in terms of what we oppose.

We are a "political" sector consisting of parties, unions, groups, and individuals that appears to be more diverse in our tactics and objectives than we really are. Whether we call ourselves syndicalists, socialist industrial unionists, anarchists, De Leonists, council communists, Marxists, libertarian socialists, or left communists—or a combination from the labels above—we are probably agreed on our vision of the socialist society: The means of production and the services will be socially owned. To the extent that industrial technology and planning require regional and national organization, it will consist of industrial congresses and councils of democratically elected delegates. But whenever possible production will be decentralized, and decisions will be made directly by the producers in the workplace. There will be no state, no coercive power over the individual. And there will be no exchange and thus no wages or money.

The differences among us are probably greatest in the tactics we advocate for reaching our class and for destroying the system. But many of these are imaginary, rooted in the quarrels of our ideological ancestors seventy-five and a hundred years ago.

As we said in this space a year ago, the Discussion Bulletin was designed as an arena for exploding ideological myths and "... exchanging ideas, challenging assumptions, presenting theories, and perhaps resolving differences and beginning the first stages of limited cooperation." We feel the DB has made a good beginning. Six twenty-page issues have been published in thirteen months. These contained 59 articles and letters by 34 writers who represented nearly all elements of the "third force."

The Bulletin continues to be independent of any faction or group. It is published by an involuntary Discussion Bulletin Committee consisting of subscribers who have contributed time in the form of articles and letters or money in excess of the subscription price. They receive with the Bulletin a "Report" which contains a financial accounting, acknowledges contributions, and asks for suggestions.
The Bulletin will continue its flexible publication schedule. We publish a new issue as soon as we have twenty pages of copy to fill it. The content consists of your articles and letters. These must be camera (actually scanner)-ready. We simply paste them up without editing. Please be sure your copy is dark enough and single-spaced with one-inch margins to conserve space.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

Now for the hard part: The Discussion Bulletin exists because of the financial support of its subscribers. The price of a six-issue subscription is $3. Although this issue was mailed to the entire mailing list of 500, future editions will be limited to 250 copies. Only subscribers can be sure of getting every issue, although most non-subscribers will get an occasional copy as we circulate the mailing list with copies not needed for subscriptions.

One more thing: Despite the cheapest printing method available, three dollars does not cover the cost for printing and mailing six issues. The Bulletin always runs a deficit, and we need your contributions.

What prompted the Discussion Bulletin’s publication was the rediscovery of the 17 issues of the Socialist Industrial Union Discussion Bulletin while Ben Perry and I were researching material for our book, The Socialist Labor Party 1876-1991: A Brief History. Published in 1970 and 1971, the Socialist Industrial Union Discussion Bulletin was the organ of the “defrocked DeLeonists,” as Laurens Otter called them: those ex-SLP members who were expelled or in 1968-69. They opened the SIUDB to almost anyone interested in writing for it. It was tremendously interesting in 1983 just as it had been in 1970. Ben and I—by 1984 both much more ecumenically minded than we had been even in 1970—talked about beginning a similar publication, not just for DeLeonists, but for all revolutionaries that fall into the categories listed above.

The first issue was published in June 1983. The SIUDB’s masthead was retained except that I removed the “SIU” in recognition of its no longer being restricted to discussion among DeLeonists. Like the SIUDB articles and letters. The DB was printed directly from the typewritten manuscripts submitted. The first eight issues were printed on my school’s Gestetner by a secretary who was willing to do the work for a small fee. I then collated, stapled, and got it ready to mail. Unfortunately she quit the job in 1984. I then took it to an IWW print shop here. The format was changed by reducing the 8 1/2 by 11 inch pages by 17 percent and printing two pages on fourteen inch paper like the present DB. By 1991 the number of pages had risen from 20 to 32. The cost of printing had also risen, and I had retired so that I had time to print it myself. DB readers and I then bought a used copier and all the work is now done at PO Box 1564.

Recently a longtime subscriber renewed his sub for fifty issues. It’s possible that I will be around to publish number 100, but I suspect that by 2008 technology will have overtaken the DB and the internet will force me to downsize and lay myself off. DB readers, all having noticed how much of the content comes from the internet, will go directly to the source—the websites and the on-line forums (or fora, as those who obey Latin and keep their fish in aquaria would say). On the other hand there may
be enough of us around who love the printed page to keep the DB going in its present form.

This article exhibits rather heavy use of the perpendicular pronoun. The DB couldn't exist without the letters and articles readers send in, not to mention the donations.

(from p. 2) — Frank Girard

DB when it was indeed a sort of DeLeonist forum for those of us who at one time or another had been cast into outer darkness by the SLP. Even at that time, though, we were reaching out to others in what John Crump calls "the thin red line" of non-market socialists.

Next, readers will find a selection of articles on what is being called "The Battle of Seattle." The first, by Elizabeth Burke, presents what I would call the standard "left" analysis of events in Seattle. With due respect for her and for sincere leftists, I suspect that "fair trade" is an impossibility, simply because it implies the continuation of the market system, which is inherently unfair. As for writing our congressman, somebody already wrote to them and enclosed a big check. The "press release" condemning the riots expresses an understandable effort by the less violent anarchists to distance themselves and their movement from the blackclad rioters. I have two problems with the press release. I'm less than certain that it represents the thinking of the "anarchist movement as a whole," and I suspect that had the demonstration been conducted as the press release desired, it would have been ignored. Next Loren Goldner weighs in with an analysis that ties the aims of the WTO to the ongoing effort of first world nations to take advantage of the great bargains in the global labor market by cutting back on the costly Keynesian reforms of the thirties and forties designed to buy off the rebellious working class. Examining events in Seattle, he sees its union-led reactionary, anti-foreign aspect as well as the unifying nature of the state's violent reaction to the demonstration. He, like the authors of many "what-next" articles in radical journals, hopes to see the further development of the "genuine whiff of spontaneous awakening" and regards it as a "breakthrough." New Democracy's short article was included for those who believe the forces of righteousness won the "Battle of Seattle." There were several other articles on Seattle that should have been included. Check for them in DB101.

The purpose of the Discussion Bulletin is discussion. This issue has an unusually large number of contributions in that category. First is an exchange between Dave Zink and me on appropriate and effective activity for revolutionary socialists. Adam Buick's letter brings up a fact that DeLeonists would generally prefer not to consider. De Leon was not like Jesus: the same yesterday, today and forever. He changed directions when he thought the situation required it. What he did insist on was the basics of non-market socialism. The letter also provides historical evidence for a fact that the IWW insists on today: that the IWW is non-political, not anti-political. Jon Bekken corrects DB99 regarding the IWW's position on the Zapatistas and also the relationship between the IWW and the Charles H. Kerr Company. Mike Hargis's letter also relates to the departure of De Leon and the DeLeonists. My main disagreement with Mike is the implication that De Leon and DeLeonists advocated state socialism. I would refer him to De Leon's speech on the Preamble to the IWW's Constitution and challenge him to find anything by De Leon or any other SLP spokesperson written after 1905 advocating state capitalism.

I believe that the exchange between Richard Lloyd and the DeLeonist Society of Canada raises more questions than it answers. A question for both Lloyd and the DLSC: Are we to believe that a working class suffering in the midst of a collapsing capitalist system will stand around until election day before taking over the means of production and organizing to satisfy human needs?

As was promised in DB99, this issue continues publication of Non-Market Socialism in the (to p. 8)
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From: revelrytion <revelrytion@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 16, 2000 10:41 AM
Subject: ATTACKS ON WAGE-WORKERS' NEWSPAPER

Dear Friends,

Faridabad Majdoor Samachar is a monthly publication in Hindi language. After publishing 1000 copies in 2 page format for a number of years, we have been able to distribute 5000 copies of the paper each month for more than six years now. The newspaper is free and we distributed it by standing along roadsides during shift-changing hours. We give the newspaper to workers who ask for it and it takes ten days each month to distribute the 5000 copies. Most of the copies are taken by industrial workers working in thousands of factories in Faridabad and adjoining industrial areas of Delhi. Some copies are taken by office workers in Faridabad and Delhi. About 300 copies are posted to different places.

First-hand experiences and ideas of wage-workers at large of different factories, offices, research centres, etc. make-up most of the newspaper. A brief article addresses these experiences and ideas. A column also deals with 'Questions for Alternatives'.

In Faridabad more than half of the four hundred thousand factory workers are categorised as casual workers and contractors' workers. The statutory minimum wages, presently Rs. 1852 [US $ 43 approx.] Per Month, are not paid to almost half of the work force. Even permanent workers are not paid wages for two-three-four-six months. Workers of hundreds of factories that have been closed have not been paid their legal dues even after five-ten-fifteen years of factory closure. Goons of managements beat workers inside factories and unions of all stripes act as departments of managements. Each issue of Faridabad Majdoor Samachar carries articulations of workers of 50 to 60 factories on such issues. Over a period of time, stress on self-activity of wage-workers to confront and transform the present has become a focus of the newspaper.

Management goons attacked us when we were distributing the April '99 issue of the newspaper. We were publicly threatened in May '99. We have again been attacked on 14th Jan now.

We request you to circulate this information amongst wage-workers and also send protest letters to the Prime Minister of India through the Indian embassy in the country you reside in.

Looking forward to responses

With greetings,
Sher Singh

Majdoor Library
Autopin Jhuggi N.I.T. Faridabad 121 001
India
I was one of the 59,000 people who went to Seattle to video tape the Teach-Ins and protests against the World Trade Organization's policies, for my video show "FOR A BETTER WORLD TAKE ACTION" aired on Public Access Television, Channel 17.

I was very encouraged and excited to be among environmentalists, labor unionists, and animal rights activists, from all over the world; Canada, U.S., England, France, Japan, China, India, Africa and many other countries.

Since I belong to the Green Party, it was very encouraging to see so many Greens from all over the world and also other political parties like the Labor Party, etc.

The World Trade Organization is a powerful world government body started in 1995, that manages trade between its 134 member nations. It has its own court system of enforcement powers that can override the authority of national, state and local laws oil over the world. In every single case, it has decided against environmental, public health, labor and agriculture laws in favor of corporate profits and has required countries to eliminate or change their own laws or face economic sanctions.

WTO considers corporate profits more important than anything else in the world, even citizen's freedom of choice. It seeks to undermine laws that require sustainable rainforest wood harvesting and laws that require labeling of genetically engineered foods.

Workers around the world need to have their basic rights protected, whatever country they're in, rich or poor. Some aspects of globalization must be reversed where commodities can be produced locally, they should be produced locally. Things like water and other biological resources - genes, cells, species, people - should not be commodified and traded. The current set of WTO rules is to the advantage of the rich countries, particularly the U.S.

Trade and investment should not be ends in themselves but tools for promoting ideals such as equality, democracy, good jobs, a clean environment and healthy communities. The goal is to shift from an emphasis on exports based on the plunder of resources and the exploitation of workers to sustainable economic activity that roots capitalism locally and nationally!

Global institutions should help protect the environment, fight diseases and defend human rights.

Corporations should pay their fair share of taxes, provide their employees with a decent standard of living, and limit their pollution!

In Seattle during the protests, violence came mostly from the police against the masses of peaceful demonstrators. I was there I saw it with my own eyes. I have it on video. The demonstrations were marred by a handful of vandals who took advantage of the event to smash windows, loot stores, and wreak havoc.

People have fought and died to establish "beneficial rules" for fair labor practices, animal rights...
and to protect the environment. Now, the WTO in their insatiable greed for more profits plans to eliminate the above mentioned "beneficial rules" and return us to world wide use of sweatshops, pollution, and the slaughter of endangered species of wild life.

My vision of the future is for FAIR TRADE not FREE TRADE where rich and poor countries trade with one another, where there is no child labor, prison labor, where workers rights, animal rights, human rights, are protected and where the environment and endangered species are protected! Trade that respects the rights of countries to set their own environmental, labor, public health, and safety standards.

The World Trade Organization is corrupt! It is trading democracy for corporate profit and must be stopped! If you are at all concerned about your future and your children's future, become active, let your congressperson know how you feel!

Elizabeth Burke, Santa Barbara, CA

(from p. 5)

Nineteenth and twentieth Centuries. Unfortunately we have space here for only about half of chapter two. As usual we end with some notes, announcements, and short reviews.

Finances

The first two months of this century have been financially successful for the DB, much more so than for the economy in general. Receipts were twice those of the last two months of the twentieth century while expenditures were only two-thirds as much. Is this a trend?

Contributions: Ivan Aymat $10; Jerry Kaplan $10; Joe Tupper (for the destruction of capitalism) $20; Rado Mijanovich $50; Robert Blau $7; John Craven $7; Frank Kohler $20; Linda Featheringill $7; Paul Burkett $4. Total $135. Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE December 31, 1999 $281.85

RECEIPTS
Contributions $135.00
Subs and Sales 176.00
Total $311.00

DISBURSEMENTS
Postage $105.00
Bank Charges 14.00
Printing 36.29
Postage Due 2.50
PO Box rent 44.00
Total $201.79

BALANCE February 25, 2000 $391.06

Fraternally submitted, Frank Girard
Press Release
for immediate release
February 13, 2000

Anarchists Condemn Anti-WTO Riots

The recent protests against the World Trade Organization, in Seattle and London, may have given the public the false impression that the black-clad, masked rioters who went on a rampage are representative of the anarchist movement as a whole, instead of being an extremist group, whose understanding of anarchism is apparently weak or inconsistent. Most anarchists, today and historically, believe that their objective is the transformation of human society into a form based on individual freedom, equality and cooperation, as opposed to the authoritarian, hierarchical and competitive situation that humanity currently suffers and dies under. The core values of anarchism are opposition to coercive authority, and that all people should have access to the earth and to the products of our cooperative human labor. We feel most governments are mechanisms for maintaining the current disparity in political power and wealth. Revolutionary governments, while seeking to impose some other distribution of power and wealth, use the same coercive mechanism for their own purposes. Anarchists reject government in principle. Beyond this there is a great diversity of opinion, and we also differ on what the best method is to achieve these goals. Some favor organizing labor unions as the core of the new social relations, others favor a mass political movement capable of pushing aside the old social structures, others the organization of voluntary producer cooperatives and communities, which would co-exist within the current society and gradually replace the old structures, and on and on. What we do not propose is the imposition of our point of view on society. Social change must be voluntary and consensual, and any revolutionary activity must have massive popular support. The authoritarian strategy of imposing change on society through the use of violence, with minimal popular support, and at the direction of a small group, is not compatible with anarchism. We laud the peaceful protests against the WTO, which have brought attention to the authoritarian nature of the organization, and to its biases against labor, consumers and the environment. But it is a violation of individual liberty to obstruct or break up meetings, destroy newspapers, silence speakers, damage personal property, riot, block public movement on the streets, and attempt to coerce or intimidate our political opponents. Not only are these tactics ethically wrong, they also foster a never ending cycle of repression and counter repression.

Chris Faatz, 1701 Broadway #211, Vancouver WA 98663 USA
Larry Gambone, Box 174, Montreal QC, H3K 3B9 Canada
Amorey Gethin, 60 Scotland Rd., Cambridge CB4 1QG UK
Greg Hall, 580 W. Clark #C6, Pocatello ID 83204 USA
Dick Martin, Affinity Place, Argenta BC, V0G1B0 Canada
Ron Myers, 7523 N. Valerie Ct., Spokane WA 99208 USA
Lynn Olson, 4607 Clausen Ln., Valparaiso IN 46383 USA
Ed Stamm, PO Box 1402, Lawrence KS 66044-8402 USA
Fred Woodworth, PO Box 3012, Tucson AZ 85702 USA

(endorser are in alphabetical order)
Mass politics in the streets disappeared in the U.S. between 1970 and 1973. In retrospect, it is clear that the years 1964 to 1970 were not a "pre-revolutionary situation", but anyone who lived through those years as an activist can be forgiven for thinking it was. Any number of people in the ruling circles shared the same error of judgement. The black urban uprisings of 1964 to 1968, the working-class wildcat rebellion (often led by black workers) from 1968 to 1973, the breakdown of the U.S. military in Indochina, the "student" and "youth" rebellions, and the appearance of militant feminist, gay and ecology movements were all indicators of a major social earthquake. Thirty years after they ended, the "sixties", for the left and for the right, still hang over American society like smoke after a conflagration.

The "oil crisis" and world recession of 1973-75 closed that era, and the revolutionary movement in the U.S. and everywhere else has been retrenching and regrouping ever since. If the ebb has seemed deeper in the U.S. than in Europe, it is only because U.S. capital is the cutting edge of the dismantling of the old Keynesian "social contract", such as it was, a dismantling in which Europe is still at the halfway point. The ebb of open struggle in the U.S., punctuated briefly but hardly reversed by actions against the Gulf War in 1990-91 or by the Los Angeles riots of 1992, expresses a vast "recomposition" of class lines in a world restructuring of capital. Many formerly successful forms of struggle, most notably the wildcat strike, have all but disappeared. The movements of the sixties were internationalist in sentiment, but they rarely transcended the national framework in practice. However much one wants to quibble about the reality of "globalization", it has been clear for a long time, even to avowed reformists, that any meaningful strategy, even in the day-to-day sense, has to be international, or better, "transnational", from the outset to win anything worth talking about. "Think globally, act locally" may sound like a solution, but its practical result usually comes down to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic.

Some American and Chinese workers may have had a more radical consciousness, and perhaps were even more internationalist rhetorically, in the 1920's than today, but today conditions exist in which they are compelled, practically, to make internationalism concrete in a way that was unthinkable in the 1920's. Awareness of the need for a global strategy has been around, and widespread, for a long time, but it has been extremely difficult to make practical. The reformists at places such as the Institute for Policy Studies, supported by a few capitalists, are working hard to develop something like a "global Keynesianism" and a "global welfare state", once they solve the little problem of the "separate body of armed men", the sovereign nation state, which has not exactly disappeared. Meanwhile, the "centrist" Clinton administration has since 1993 pushed through NAFTA, the WTO, the ASEAN agreement, and the dismantling of welfare, a set of attacks on working people in America that would have been opposed in the streets if undertaken by the "right". It has delivered everything the globalists have asked for. American workers have reacted to this situation in contradictory ways. There has been an important protectionist sentiment among American workers for a long time: "Buy American", "Save American Jobs", "Park Your Toyota in Tokyo", support for anti-immigrant legislation, occasional violence against Asians, the vile anti-Mexican propaganda of the Teamsters, the USW's (United Steel Workers) anti-dumping campaign, or the working-class electoral base for Buchanan's "Fortress America" are all
ugly examples of this. Beyond it all ultimately lies the sentiment: lay off someone else, or
don't hire someone else, and save my job, not to mention a fair dose of anti-Asian,
anti-Latino racism. Many workers have been won over to sympathy for their employers,
who are beleaguered by imports, and have swallowed big concessions on that basis. On
the other hand, traditional unions such as the UAW (United Auto Workers) as well as
respectable reformist opposition groups such as Labor Notes have made some serious
attempts to hook up with workers (usually along industry lines) in Mexico, Asia and
Europe, but strictly within a union and often corporatist framework. There have been
some coordinated job actions in auto between the U.S. and Mexico, or the
Bridgestone-Firestone campaign of U.S. and Japanese workers. But all these actions
have been strictly under the control of some faction of union bureaucrats, in or out of
power, and represent the extension of sectoral trade union reformism to a world scale.
There exists an inchoate desire in the U.S., including among some American workers,
(which surfaced during the campaigns against NAFTA or 1995 “fast track” legislation),
for a DIFFERENT KIND OF INTERNATIONALISM than that offered by either the
globalist ruling class or by the timid actions of official unionists who unquestioningly
accept the framework of capitalism.

If, as seems to be the case, the world economy has become a “negative sum
game” for workers, a “race to the bottom”, then a “different kind of internationalism”
would mean creating a situation for a “positive sum game” in which workers can
concretely fight for their own interests on a CLASS FOR ITSELF basis, in a way that
explicitly or, better still, implicitly, recognizes the practical unity of interests of working
people in the U.S. and China, Japan and Bangladesh, Italy and Albania. Since society,
like nature, abhors a vacuum, without this kind of perspective, the protectionists and/or
the anti-protectionist, internationalist reformists will rush in, and contribute to a new
anti-working class reshuffling of the deck, in the capitalist “sum which can never be a
totality”; as Bordiga used to say.

From a revolutionary viewpoint, it is easy to be skeptical about the events in Seattle.
The American participants, both among the trade union contingent and the direct action
groups, were overwhelmingly white, in a country in which 30% of the population is now
constituted by people of color. The slogan “Fair Trade, Not Free Trade” could certainly
be seen as a slightly-concealed variant of protectionism by those (and there were many)
who wished to do so. The dominant nerve of the demonstrators was activated by the
very real prospect of little groups of transnational corporate appointees overruling and
overturning national labor and environmental laws and agreements, but just behind that
animus was, for some, the idea of Chinese bureaucrats having such influence. Steel
workers threw foreign steel into Seattle harbor and others held a “Seattle Tea Party”
against foreign imports, with China the obvious main target. Few questioned as
vociferously the negative impact of WTO entry on CHINESE workers, who obviously
could not be present.

Throughout, the trade union bureaucracy remained firmly in control of the worker
contingents, (determined, and successful, in their plan to have nothing but a peaceful,
disciplined, unthreatening march independent of, if not indifferent to, the “crazies” of the
direct action groups), and few if any workers seriously challenged that control. The
animus of the Sweeney leadership of the AFL-CIO clearly came from the sense of
“betrayal” at the recent US-China agreement on China’s entry into the WTO. The failure
of the Seattle meeting took the Democrats off the hook of having to push hard for China's entry into the WTO in an election year, when both the USW and the Teamsters have clearly gone for the protectionist option. Clinton's kind words for the rights of the demonstrators should be seen in that context, particularly after it became known that powerful forces at the top had pushed for heavy repression when the police lost control on the first day, and that US Army intelligence units disguised as demonstrators had been all over the place with concealed lapel cameras and all the new paraphernalia of the technocratic, "New Paradigm" surveillance state. In the Boston area, where I live, much of the "post-Seattle" organizing has an even more overtly protectionist agenda, with repugnant slogans such as "Not One More American Job to Mexico", and I doubt that this is exceptional.

Nevertheless, despite all the elements of "uneven", parochial or simply reactionary ("Buchananite") consciousness it may have contained, one has to characterize Seattle as a breakthrough. There was, in the patent lack of official preparedness for what happened, an unrepeatable singularity (no international trade summit will ever again take place, anywhere, with so little readiness for heavy repression) an opening to exactly that element of the unknown and unexpected that characterizes a situation momentarily beyond all manipulative control, whether by the state or the unions or the "left", when power lies for a moment "in the streets". In 24 hours, Seattle ripped away the "one note" unanimity of the tolerated "public discussion" of international economic issues of the past 20 years or more. Millions of people who never heard of the WTO learned what it was, and what it does, more thoroughly than through decades of peaceful opposition and think-tank chatter. Even strongly protectionist American workers were thrown together in the streets with activists, including worker activists, from 100 countries, and had to confront the human face of the producers of "foreign imports" in a way that had never previously occurred on such a scale, not to mention in such an open situation (as opposed to tedious international trade union conferences of bureaucratic delegations). Teamsters, bare-breasted Amazon lesbian warriors and tree-huggers were thrown together, and talked, on an unprecedented (for the U.S.) scale. The Seattle events gave a concrete target to opponents of the seemingly abstract forces that have made serious action on the appropriate level so difficult for so long. In accounts I heard from people who had been there, and in material I was able to gather, there was a genuine whiff of the spontaneous awakening, in the heat of confrontation, to the power of capital and the state that has not been seen in the U.S. since the sixties, a genuine demonstration by masses in motion of the truth of the Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach, to wit that classical materialism "does not understand sensuous activity as objective". The great majority of demonstrators in Seattle, particularly in the direct action contingents, had not been born or were children when the sixties ended, and had never experienced their own power in the streets in this way, anywhere. Trite as it may sound to the small numbers of sixties activists who still consider themselves revolutionaries, and who are jaded from having been through it all before, a first clubbing, a first tear-gassing, seeing the police go berserk against people detained in a holding cell, a first concrete experience of what bourgeois "rights" really mean when the state tears them up in a confrontational setting, is an irreversible crossing of a threshold, an irreplaceable experience of collective power and of the role of those who job is to repress it. People who go through this, whatever the consciousness or intentions that brought them to Seattle, can never be the same.
The brief, ephemeral opening of the sense that "nothing will ever be the same" experienced by some in Seattle and in the wake of Seattle will close again quickly (just as the opening, such as it was, of the LA riots, or that of the December 1995 strike wave in France, closed quickly) without a strategy for a real internationalism, an internationalism in which criticisms of slave labor in China or child labor in India are joined to, e.g. a practical critique of the mushroom-like proliferation of sweatshops and prison labor in the U.S. A perspective encompassing the most oppressed layers of the working class and its allies is always a safeguard against the parochialism, including militant parochialism, which sets the stage for a "reformist" reshuffling of the capitalist deck, as occurred in the 1930's and 1940's. Ever since "1973" closed the era of meaningful "wildcat" direct action on the shop floor of one factory, the workers' movement in the U.S. and many other countries has been groping toward a new concrete terrain on which to fight something beside endless losing local battles against plant closings and downsizing, or outright reactionary battles demanding in effect that the layoffs happen "somewhere else". In their greatly heightened global mobility, the capitalists stole a march on the world working class that more than 25 years of losing and defensive struggles has not yet overcome. If Seattle is in fact to be a positive turning point, at which history did in fact finally turn, it can only be on the path to solidifying and greatly expanding this terrain.

Loren Goldner

Forget Seattle: Our ministers do what corporate lobbyists want

From a World Trade Organization special report, by George Monbiot of The Guardian (UK), Dec. 16, 1999

...The master plan is now falling into place. A greatly expanded Europe will form part of a single trading bloc with the U.S., Canada and Mexico, whose market have already been integrated by means of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. NAFTA will grow to engulf all the Americas and the Caribbean. The senate has already passed a bill (the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act) forcing African countries to accept NAFTA terms of trade. Russia and most of Asia are being dragged into line by the International Monetary Fund. Before long, in other words, only a minority of nations will lie outside a legally harmonized neoliberal world order, and they will swiftly find themselves obliged to join in. By the time the world trade agreement is ready to be re-negotiated, it will be irrelevant, for the WTO's job will already have been done. The world will consist of a single deregulated market, controlled by international companies, in which no robust law intended to protect the environment or human rights will be allowed to survive....

--from New Democracy, Jan-Feb, 2000 (PO Box 427, Boston, MA 02130)
Dear Frank,

In the letter you sent me acknowledging receipt of my subscription request, you said that you "have a little trouble believing that a Labor Party will be any solution. It hasn't helped British, Danish, German, or Belgian workers." Can I add Canada to your list?

While it is true that the social-democratic labor parties in these countries haven't smashed capitalism & established anything near that you or I would call a socialist society, they have helped the workers. These countries have (at least) single-payer health care systems, while we in the USA have to put up with a goofy, HMO ("Hand the Money Over!") system in which corporations skim off 20% for profit, without adding anything except complications. Americans work about a month more per year than the Danes and Germans. German workers have a bit more input into corporate decision-making than we do, since corporate boards in Germany must include union representatives. And, at least the term "socialism" isn't a dirty word in Britain, Canada, Denmark, etc. like it is here.

We need social revolution, to replace capitalism with something better. Would a mass, inclusive Labor Party of America (LPA) help bring this about? I think it might, but it depends on people like us. Regarding the LPA, I think we only have 2 basic choices: 1. Abstentionism, which I think would be a sectarian error, or 2. Join it, fight for a class-struggle perspective, and help it grow into a real contender for political power. Maybe we can avoid some of the mistakes that the Canadian New Democratic Party or the British Labor Party have made.

The bosses have the Demopublican party. So far, we on the Left have only managed to build an alphabet soup array of relatively tiny, powerless parties with little, if any, progressive impact. We can continue with this, or we can start working together around a common platform and program. I think that the LPA's platform & program are vastly better from a working-class point of view compared to those of the 2 major parties.

As for me, I'm going to see what good I can do in the left wing of the LPA.

Yours for the revolution,

Dave Zink

Dave Zink

Dear David,

Thanks for your letter. It was gratifying to read your statement, "We need social revolution to replace capitalism with something better." Obviously you agree in this respect with non-market socialists and the Discussion Bulletin. How then to understand your support of the Labor Party of America, especially after your recital of the sins and betrayals of the Canadian New Democratic Party, the British Labor Party, and every other social democratic government in the world?

Social democratic and labor party political formations have existed since before 1900. Do you know of a single case where revolutionaries acting as the leftwing of such parties have
influenced them to help bring about a revolution? In fact, wouldn't you agree that labor parties have pretty much the same objective as the more enlightened elements in the capitalist class: to make capitalism endurable for workers who might otherwise rebel?

As to the two choices you see—supporting the LPA and abstaining—I wonder if you have considered the advantages of the latter. For one thing, by not voting, our class sends a powerful message to the capitalist class: that fewer and fewer of us working class people are falling for what capitalism chooses to call democracy. I think that alone would suggest to the liberal and radical wing of capitalism that it's time to raise up another Franklin D. Roosevelt. Perhaps they will panic and decide that the situation calls for a (gasp!!) Labor Party. In which case you will find Sweeney, Hoffa, Yokich and our rulers' other labor lieutenants at the next LPA convention pledging their support.

As for avoiding the mistakes of other social reform parties, you are expecting too much of them. They exist for the purpose of making such mistakes. Even when they seem to be doing something good, they are often sowing confusion, as in the cartoon in the Labor Party Press (reproduced here if all goes well). Can you think of a more wrongheaded idea than to suggest as Huck does, that workers pay the cost of the political system through income taxes? This is the thinking that causes the "middle class"—actually working class—to support politicians that favor tax cuts that cut social spending, like the Balanced Budget Amendment that is closing hospitals and nursing homes.

I saw your letter on the Internet WSM Forum in which you advocated the IWW slogan "Education, Organization, Emancipation. Please tell me how the LPA's strategy of begging for crumbs from the masters' table does anything to organize workers for their emancipation?

Yours for the revolution,

Frank Girard
Dear DB

The De Leonist Society of Canada have got it wrong. The difference between the SLP tradition and the SPGB tradition is not that the SLP advocates working-class political and economic action to end capitalism while the SPGB advocates only political action. While the SPGB does not endorse the SLP blueprint for "socialist industrial unions", it has always recognised that workers should/will organise economically, to take over and administer production, as well as politically, to take over political power. The difference has been one of emphasis.

The SLP tradition sees industrial action as primary with political action playing a supporting role while for the SPGB the emphasis has been the other way round: political action is primary and is needed to prepare the way for the workers to take over and administer production, which, ironically, was also De Leon's original position—consider the following passage from *Two Pages of Roman History*, which dates from 1902:

> Obviously, independent, class-conscious political action is the head of Labour's lance. Useful as any other weapon may be, that weapon is the determining factor. Entrenched in the public powers, the Capitalist Class command the field. None but the political weapon can dislodge the usurpers and enthrone the Working Class: that is to say, emancipate the workers and rear the Socialist Republic (from the section "Breaking off the Head of Labour's Lance", near the end of the first talk).

Interestingly, the De Leonist Society of Canada's revision of the SLP tradition, in not trying to form socialist unions now and in recognising the need for general (geographical) as well as industrial representative institutions in socialism, has brought it nearer to the SPGB tradition. The next step would be to abandon labour-time vouchers and the flawed idea that socialism could be established in North America alone . . .

Yours for World Socialism

Adam Buick, Brussels

PS. Regarding the argument between the DLS of Canada and Frank Girard over whether or not the IWW became an anti-political, anarchist organisation when it dropped the political clause from its preamble, in his *We Shall Be All* (page 140), Melvyn Dubofsky wrote:

> Neither directly nor inferentially, Ben Williams remarked, did the amended preamble compel Wobblies to avoid the ballot box. That remained an individual decision, best kept out of internal union affairs for tactical reasons.

Dubofsky gives the source the *Industrial Union Bulletin* of February 20, 1909. Perhaps, someone could check the accuracy of this. If confirmed, that would make the IWW non-political rather than anti-political, a radical union that rejected control by any particular political or anti-political party or group.
Fellow Workers,
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I want to raise two minor corrections to DB 99, both regarding references to the IWW.

First, the IWW has taken no official position on the Zapatistas. Some members have gone down to Chiapas to build schools and other facilities, many more have joined protests against the military repression of the movement. But that hardly constitutes signing onto the Zapatista program or embracing Subcommandante Marcos' leadership. I should also note that the letter FW Ballard cites from our Anarchist-Syndicalist Review was written in response to comments in ASR 25 that were sharply critical of the Zapatistas. It seems clear to me that the Zapatistas are a complex and contradictory movement, rooted (in part) in fociest vanguardism but forced into a much less ambitious strategy by the struggle to survive. Reliable, detailed information is hard to come by -- both enthusiasts and critics tend to write in very general terms, and most are unable to speak directly with the indigenous people who form the backbone of the movement. (In the U.S., Zapatista 'supporters' also seem to impose their own politics onto the movement, making clarity even more difficult.) My own suspicion is that we are dealing with reformists with guns, trying to escape a desperate situation but lacking the vision and the means.

In the announcement of the Charles Kerr catalog, it is stated that "the present management has close political ties with the IWW," and something that was indeed true 15 years ago. Today, however, Kerr's managers have long since ceased to hold IWW membership even if they rely on unauthorized reprints of IWW publications from the 1910s and 1920s to finance their operations. The folks who run Kerr left the IWW after their attempts to purge anarcho-syndicalists from the union failed. Indeed, it would be not as accurate to say they have "close political ties" to Earth First! though in truth they pulled back after the eco-fascists they admired were forced out by EFl activists who tired of their racism, anti-working-class bigotry, and homophobia. (Kerr is actually run by surrealists, as should be clear from even a cursory reading of their catalog -- not to mention the books of bad poetry they stuff into orders.)

For the OBU,

Jon Bekken

(from p. 32)

examples, all of them too long for the DB but, because of their interest and the work involved in producing them, worthy of being brought to readers' attention.

Real Union of Social Science (RUSS): Statement of Principles. Published by ex-members of the SLP in Minnesota, its purpose is "to inform workers about the facts pertaining to the labor movement in every manner possible." (from RUSS, PO Box 20673, Bloomington, MN 55431) Looking Forward to Socialism is part of a resolution by Ross Schelin to the 39th National Convention of the SLP in 1989 calling for literature that describes the nature of a socialist society. The resolution was rejected, hence its publication by the author. For a copy write to Ross Schelin, 9 S. 67th Ave. W., Duluth, MN 55807. I believe the Proposed Socialist Constitution for the United States of America by Barbara Jolly is a detailed plan for the operation of a state capitalist, not a socialist, society. Constitutions designed to guarantee the rights of the wage slaves also guarantee the continued domination of the wage slaves' masters. For information write to Barbara Jolly, PO Box 158, Midway, TX 75852.

The Bad Days Will End (for council communism/libertarian socialism) "is a bulletin (to p. 23)
For the Discussion Bulletin

Fellow Workers,

I was bemused by the debate between Frank and the DeLeonist Society of Canada over whether or not the IWW became an "anarchist" organization when it removed the so-called political clause from its Preamble.

It appears that both Frank and the DSC agree that if, indeed, the IWW had become an "anarchist" organization by its refusal of political action (as defined by DeLeon) that that would be a bad thing. I don't see it that way. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that I joined the IWW back in 1972 was precisely because most historians characterized the IWW as "anarchist" or "anarcho-syndicalist".

But Frank is right: technically speaking, the IWW is not an anarchist organization. It is a "revolutionary industrial union" that seeks to organize the working class to take over the means of production and distribution and manage them in the interests of the working class. There are some Wobblies who still see a role for the State in this situation. As an anarcho-wobbly, I disagree. I don't think that there is any role for the State. Indeed, I feel that if the State is not suppressed it will inevitably seek to take control of the economy from the workers' organizations. One only has to look at what happened in the Russian and Spanish Revolutions to know that this is the result of allowing the State to continue to exist in a revolutionary society.

Be that as it may, I feel that the DSC, like their mentor, use the charge of "anarchism" in exactly the same way as the authorities used it during the trial of the Haymarket anarchists or Sacco and Vanzetti, merely as a scare word to prejudice the jury. DeLeon an his followers, like the DSC, are simply anti-anarchist bigots who don't know anything about the theory or practice of anarchism, but prefer to equate anarchism with violence and chaos, in exactly the manner as the bourgeoisie.

The IWW got rid of DeLeon because they feared that he was trying to turn the IWW into a tail of the SLP. And if you look at the fate of the Detroit IWW/Workers International Industrial Union, a wholly owned subsidiary of the SLP, you can see that they were right. When the WIIU failed to bring masses of workers into the orbit of the SLP, the SLP withdrew its support, and the WIIU dissolved. Meanwhile the non-political, "anarchist", IWW went on to write one of the greatest chapters in the history of the labor movement in the world.

One final point. The DSC complains that the process by which DeLeon was defeated was unfair. They allege that the Trautmann-St. John faction packed the convention with the "bummery". But they admit themselves that before the convention the DeLeonists made sure that their supporters paid up their back dues so that they could send delegates to the convention. It seems to me that the DSC's lament is simply a case of sour grapes. They're pissed-off because the so-called "anarchists" out organized the socialists.

If the 20th has taught us anything it is that State Socialism, whether Leninist, Stalinist or DeLeonist, is a disaster from the point of view of the working class. May the 21st Century be the anarchist century.

In solidarity and struggle,
Mike Hargis
Dear Discussion Bulletin,

I read with interest the De Leonist Society of Canada's reply to the General Secretary of the Socialist Party of Great Britain and to the letter from C. Skelton (Discussion Bulletin no 98).

The De Leonist Society of Canada states that the capture of political power is not sufficient for Socialism to be established. They go on to state that the difference between themselves and the SPGB is that the DLSC advocate: *Both political and industrial working-class unification.*

And then they criticise the SPGB for limiting its concern "to the political field".

This deserves an answer.

Let us first consider exactly what is the economic power the capitalist class enjoy. The employers monopolise the means of production and distribution and only activate production if a profit is to be made. From this position of power they are able to force workers onto the labour market to sell their labour power for either a wage or a salary. Once labour power is bought it is then exploited and the commodities produced by workers are subsequently sold on the market to realise a profit.

One important factor, which should not be left out of the equation, is that the capitalist class are no longer within the productive process any more. This factor has an important bearing on the different perspectives of capitalism by the SPGB and DCSC respectively. The working class, which includes salaried managers, now runs capitalism from top to bottom although not in their own interests.

So why does the capitalist class enjoy economic power? The answer is because the machinery of government protects their ability to own and control the means of production and direct it towards profitable activity. The machinery of government is controlled through Parliament, or its equivalent, by the ballot and at present it is a majority of non-Socialist workers who vote capitalist politicians back into power.

Political power and economic power should not be seen as simultaneous activities necessitating a dualist Socialist response. The employers' economic power is dependent upon their political power, which the working class currently legitimise at elections.

The DLSC's letter goes on to assert;

> *Without political organisation, the labour movement cannot triumph; without economic organisation, the day of its political triumph would be the day of its defeat.*

Let us unpick this assertion. It has always been the position of the SPGB that a Socialist majority would not only be organising for the conquest of political power but would also be organising and planning, in trade unions and elsewhere, for the smooth transformation from production for profit to production for social use.
The problem for the DLSC is that they cannot drop the old De Leonist dogma that having no direct role in production and having lost the battle of ideas, in the lead-up to the Socialist revolution the capitalists could "Still order the shut down of some sectors of production and distribution that are vital to the life of the nation." Production and distribution is not like this any more. The Socialist Industrial Union idea of a capitalist class disrupting production is pure romanticism for the past. The power they give employers was as inapplicable in De Leon's own day as it is in our own.

Do the DLSC seriously believe the capitalists would have the capacity and wherewithal to shut down anything? They would not know where to begin. Who would listen to the employers? Certainly not the Socialist majority, who will be present in all areas of production and distribution. How would they do it? Such political childishness beggars belief.

And why does the DLSC suppose that, in organising democratically for a society based upon common ownership and democratic control of production and distribution by all of society, a Socialist majority would disregard forms and processes of industry necessary to meet human need? But it would be a folly to try to end the class system without taking the necessary steps to ensure that the employing class cannot use the forces of the state to defend their interests. That is why, as Marx and Engels argued, "Every class struggle is apolitical struggle".

The disagreement between the Socialist Party of Great Britain and the De Leonists over the political means to pursue a Socialist objective has been going on intermittently for nearly a century. However it is not some arcane theological dispute. The SPGB wants to focus the working class's attention on where political power is situated in order to remove the economic power of the employers to exploit and pursue commodity production for profit. In this respect the De Leonists have been an impediment on workers for the clear understanding of capitalism necessary for establishing Socialism.

Yours sincerely

Richard Lloyd
32 Derwent Rd., Harpenden, Hertfordshire, England AL5 3NU
Dear DB:

Taking up cudgels on behalf of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, Richard Lloyd responds to our reply to C. May and Chariman Skelton (DB98) by asserting that "The disagreement between the Socialist Party of Great Britain and the De Leonists over the political means to pursue a Socialist objective has been going on intermittently (intermittently) for nearly a century." The assertion is defective, failing as it does to observe that the disagreement has not merely been over political means but also over economic means. This composite disagreement continues to show itself in a great number of ways, not least by the SPGB's rejection of De Leon's dictum:

"Without political organization, the labor movement cannot triumph; without economic organization, the day of its political triumph would be the day of its defeat."

The economic organization rejected by the SPGB is of course the class-conscious, integrally-organized Socialist Industrial Union advocated by De Leonists—a nationwide, self-organized union of the workers prepared upon a socialist political victory to take, hold, and administer industry and the services in the social interest—prepared, in short, to accomplish an immediate transition to socialist production and distribution and thus win the day for Socialism against an expected recalcitrant capitalist class. Accordingly, having constantly stressed the need for working-class preparation for contingencies that may arise during a revolutionary crisis—as for example a capitalist class attempt to annul a socialist political victory by promoting industrial chaos—we are all the more puzzled by Lloyd's cavalier dismissal of the matter, thus: "The Socialist Industrial Union idea of a capitalist class disrupting production is pure romanticism for the past."

But now a seeming contradiction looms up to further boggle the mind. Having dismissed Socialist Industrial Unionism as "romanticism," must Lloyd not also dismiss as "romanticism" the trade unionism which he introduces into the socialist revolutionary orbit as follows?

"It has always been the position of the SPGB that a Socialist majority would not only be organizing for the conquest of political power but would also be organizing and planning, in trade unions and elsewhere, for the smooth transformation from production for profit to production for social use." (Our emphasis.)

Was Lloyd's intimation of possible revolutionary economic organization just a slip of the tongue? In any case it cannot sit well with the position of the SPGB as stated in that party's publication, *Trade Unions.* For example:

"Some of the early unions had the declared aim of abolishing capitalism but this was short-lived, and after the middle of the nineteenth century they settled down to wage-bargaining.... They had accepted that it was their function to work within capitalism, not to try to overthrow
it. If some unions still have 'socialism' as their object, it is only nationalisation (State capitalism) that they have in mind." (P. 16)

"Unlike the industrial struggle of the unions, the task of creating Socialism is a political struggle, for it involves the conquest of political power by the working class." (P. 34)

"The role of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and our Companion Parties in other countries, is to spread the idea of Socialism...When socialists are in a majority, the Socialist Parties will be used as the instrument for democratic change." (P. 34)

Nor, it should be added, does the SPGB's Declaration of Principles itself contemplate socialist industrial organization, saying merely that "the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government..."

When therefore the dust raised by the aforesaid contradiction has settled to the ground, there remains no doubt whatever that the SPGB and Companion Parties restrict their program of working-class revolutionary organization to the political field! We think this is most regrettable. Regrettable because the socialist cause is thereby deprived of a potential economic power (a socialist industrial union) capable of enforcing the fiat of the political ballot. Regrettable because Socialism is thereby deprived of the one logical instrument (a nationally integrated industrial instrument) for administering the industrial policies set by Parliament. Regrettable because, deprived of an "industrial arm it would seem that a socialist political government could become no more than an inept industrial administrator vulnerable to capitalist reaction.

Incidentally, it would seem germane to the issue to comment on Lloyd's observation: "One important factor, which should not be left out of the equation, is that the capitalist class are no longer within the productive process any more." This is not strictly true because evidence has it that great numbers of miniscule entrepreneurs continue to dot the landscape. Nevertheless the most important question here is the question of control. Lloyd and the SPGB propose that a socialist political party, unaided by a socialist economic organization, could alone replace capitalist control of production with socialist control. They still appear to miss the crucial point that under Capitalism the chain of command is not the Government over the capitalist class but the capitalist class over the Government!

* 

Lloyd's response to ours of DB98 reflects a belief that in a revolutionary situation, events will unfold in an ideal fashion. We think he should try to return to the real world! For example:

* The "Socialist majority" who are to capture political power may on the crucial day be no more than a very slim majority, even a mere plurality!

* The "Socialist majority" who will be called upon to adminis-
ter industrial production will be faced with a task of such infinite complexity that even a wholly united and coordinated Socialist Industrial Union would surely hesitate to promise a "smooth transformation from production for profit to production for social use."

* While in a revolutionary crisis it would be hoped that none of the "Socialist majority" would waver in their commitment to Socialism, it is nevertheless not improbable that substantial numbers of non-Socialists would continue to "listen to the employers" -- especially the top managers and chief executive officers among them, accustomed as they would have been to huge salaries!

De Leonists try to face the issue squarely, warning workers there is no Royal Road to Socialism, warning that half the struggle for the goal must be ADVANCE PREPARATION to overcome the formidable difficulties that can be expected to beset them, warning that an ill-conceived attempt to dethrone the Capitalist must surely summon the "furies" of private interest to retaliate!

Sincerely,

THE DE LEONIST SOCIETY OF CANADA

(from p. 17)

advocating libertarian communism—the overthrow of capitalism by the international working class and the creation of a truly egalitarian society from below, by means of autonomous, radically-democratic, and voluntarily-federated workers’ organizations. The Bad Days Will End draws its inspiration from the revolutionary traditions of council communism, ‘left’ communism, situationism, autonomist Marxism and the Italian New Left’s operaiismo movement and studies of class composition, ‘Chicago Idea’ surrealism and the traditions of anarchist-communism and anarcho-syndicalism.” This first issue contains Loren Goldner’s article on Seattle (also published in this issue of the DB) as well as “Autonomism versus Leninism: Harry Cleaver Debates the DSP.” The debate was carried on over the internet at AUTOPSY (lists.village.virginia.edu/~spoons/aust.html); the DSP is the Democratic Socialist Party, an Australian Leninist group. Autonomism, which the introduction refers to as a “tendency,” has much in common with the ideas of non-market socialists.

Subscriptions to The Bad Days Will End (12 standard pages) are $5 for four issues, $10 overseas. Mail to/payable to Merrymount Publications, PO Box 441597 West Somerville, MA 02144. <bronterr@earthlink.net>

-fg
NON-MARKET SOCIALISM IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Edited by M. Rubel and J. Crump

As promised in DB99, publication of this out-of-print book continues here with some adjustments. Unlike John Crump's introduction in the last issue which was of interest to most readers, Maximilian Rubel's Chapter 1, "Non-Market-Socialism in the Nineteenth Century," is less so. Despite its being an excellent source for those interested in the early divisions in the socialist movement, tracing the roots of non-market versus market socialism to references in the Communist Manifesto, it is clearly aimed at scholarly specialists. The DB is skipping it for the time being and going on John Crump's Chapter 2.

Space considerations prevent our publishing the entire chapter. We have about half of it here. The next subhead in this chapter is "Differences Between the Non-Market Socialists" on page 48. Pages 48-59 will appear in DB101.

The other chapters are:

Chapter 3 Anarcho-Communism, Alain Pengam
Chapter 4 Impossibilism, Stephen Coleman
Chapter 5 Council Communism, Mark Shipway
Chapter 6 Bordigism, Adam Buick
Chapter 7 Situationism, Mark Shipway
2 The Thin Red Line: 
Non-Market Socialism in the Twentieth Century 
John Crump

From a socialist standpoint, what is the most crucial difference between the nineteenth century and the twentieth century? Although one could point to numerous differences which are significant for socialists, surely the most crucial difference of all is that in the nineteenth century there were no states which claimed to be socialist. Despite the well-known distinction which Marx, Engels and others made between 'scientific socialism' and 'utopian socialism', even nineteenth-century 'scientific socialism' was utopian in the etymological sense of referring to nowhere - to no existing state. By way of contrast, for most of the twentieth century, states have existed which have been popularly regarded as 'socialist' or 'communist'.

The effect of this popular identification of 'socialism' with certain states has been disastrous. Millions of wage-earners have drawn the conclusion that socialism has been tried in the twentieth century and found to fail. Even many stern critics of the 'socialist states' have been reduced to describing such countries as examples of 'actually existing socialism'.

Capitalism has been given a new lease of life because, compared with the brutality of state capitalist regimes or the cynicism of Social Democratic administrations, government by even avowedly capitalist parties has seemed preferable to many.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND LENINISM

During the twentieth century, 'socialism' has come to mean for most people either Social Democracy or Leninism. Social Democracy has been strongest in the countries of Western and Northern Europe, where Social Democratic Parties have
held power for varying lengths of time. Most Social Democratic governments have practised a policy of selective nationalisation, bringing key (and often problem-ridden) industries under state control. Implicit in such a policy has been both the preservation of the state, which is obviously strengthened as sectors of the economy are brought under its control, and the preservation of capitalism. Social Democracy has had the effect of preserving capitalism because the Social Democratic 'mixed economy' is a mixture of private capitalism and state capitalism. Private companies in the 'mixed economy' remain profit-making enterprises. Part of their profits is reinvested in production, while the residue is partly consumed by capitalists who own shares in the companies and partly acquired by the state in the form of taxes. The nationalised sectors of the 'mixed economy' conform to this pattern of profit distribution no less than private companies. State enterprises are intended to make profits, although lack of commercial viability has often been a reason for declining industries being nationalised. Where profits are realised by nationalised concerns, there is the same three-way division of the profits as in private industry, between the reinvestment fund, the state, and capitalists who own shares or bonds.

Throughout the 'mixed economy', in private and nationalised concerns alike, goods and services are produced for sale on the market. Production is geared to market requirements rather than to human needs, and distribution of goods and services is handled by buying and selling operations, achieved by the use of money. Similarly, throughout the 'mixed economy', production is undertaken by working men and women who sell their labour power for wages (or salaries). Whether the 'mixed economy' is considered from the viewpoint of consumers, whose level of consumption is determined by the money at their disposal, or from the viewpoint of wage-earners, who must sell their labour power to an enterprise which is prepared to employ them, the differences between the private capitalist and state capitalist sectors of the economy are insignificant. 5

At its most well-meaning, Social Democracy has represented an attempt to humanise and reform capitalism by means of state intervention. One reason why Social Democrats have failed in their attempts to transform capitalism into a
The humane system is that invariably they have attempted to carry out their reforms within the narrow confines of a single nation-state, which has necessarily remained an integral part of the world market. In the end, the world market has had a more decisive influence on the production of wealth and the intensity of labour than the however-well-intentioned reforms legislated by Social Democrats. Social Democrats inevitably have been driven to administer capitalism in the only way it can be administered—against the interests of the wage-earning majority. Social Democracy has suffered this fate of continuing to oppress wage-earners not because of the failure of its leaders, because they lacked will and nerve, but because of the very nature of capitalism. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that once most Social Democrats have tasted state power, and have found themselves responding to the dictates of the world market, so their good intentions have rapidly been eroded by political cynicism. The record of Social Democracy in the twentieth century has not only been one of submission to capitalism, but also one of support for wars, apology for privilege and compromise with the spurious democracy of parliamentarism. The result of advocating a 'mixed economy' is that the achievement of 'socialism' has been endlessly postponed. The Social Democrats' 'socialism' continually has receded into the future, in a similar fashion, as we shall see, to the 'communism' of the Leninists.

In contrast to Social Democracy, most of the countries where Leninist Parties have taken power have been located in Eastern Europe and East Asia. The different geographical locations of Social Democracy and Leninism reflect the fact that these two political movements have developed in response to the needs of countries at different stages of economic development. Whereas Social Democracy has made little headway in other than advanced countries, Leninism has largely been confined to backward countries. Except in the case of certain East European countries, where the imposition of the Leninist political model has resulted from the extension of Russian military influence, Leninist Parties have generally captured power against a backdrop of revolutionary upheaval arising from the failure of the pre-revolutionary regimes to achieve sustained economic growth and industrialisation.
Following the revolutionary seizure of power, Leninism proceeds with an attempt to achieve forced economic development by means of restricting workers' and peasants' consumption in the interest of rapid capital accumulation. Under these circumstances, in Leninist vocabulary, 'socialism' means a policy of generalised nationalisation (at least within the industrial sectors of the economy) and a vast increase in wage labour, since newly created enterprises require fresh drafts of wage-earners to operate them. The strengthening of the state by virtue of its role as the general employer, and the extension of wage labour, clearly contradict the nineteenth-century socialist prescriptions that the state should wither away and that the wages system should be abolished. Leninism has 'solved' this problem ideologically by re-creating the waning away of the state and the abolition of wages to a continually receding 'communist' future. Meanwhile, the term 'socialism' is retained as a descriptive label for a situation where the state has unparalleled power and where workers have no alternative but to work for wages in order to gain the means of life. In other words, Leninism uses a 'socialist' label to hide the real nature of an economy which differs from private capitalism only in the fact that the state has replaced the privately owning capitalist class as the owner of the means of production. Since the countries where Leninist Parties hold power exhibit all the key features of capitalism (production for profit, monetary distribution, wage labour, accumulation of capital) and are forced to function in line with international competition as it registers on the world market, they are best understood as state capitalist countries.

If state capitalism expresses the economic reality of Leninism, politically the hallmark of Leninism is the extreme concentration of power. No political formation is tolerated outside the umbrella of the ruling triumvirate, made up of the party, the state and the armed forces. The vanguard party operates in the name of the working class but in fact looks after the interests of the de facto state capitalist class, which is composed of the upper echelons of the party, state and military hierarchies. Nationalism and militarism are other important elements in the political cocktail of Leninism, and the prominent role which they play reflects the economic backwardness of most countries where Leninist Parties have
taken power. In the cut-throat world of capitalist competition, economic backwardness is generally accompanied by subordination to imperialism, so that revolutions aimed at developing a backward country on a state capitalist basis are also expressions of national independence. Hence, flying in the face of the socialist common sense of the nineteenth century that 'the working men have no country', Leninist Parties that have come to power have attempted to hitch the working class to the chariot of military defence of national interests.

For the reasons outlined above, our contention is that Social Democracy and Leninism are bankrupt so far as the interests of the wage-earning working class are concerned. Anyone who has preserved the critical consciousness of nineteenth-century non-market socialism can see that, in the twentieth century, Social Democracy and Leninism have bolstered, rather than subverted, capitalism. The bankruptcy of Social Democracy and Leninism should be particularly clear in the light of the present economic crisis. The crisis has arisen because the chaotic nature of capitalism has led to capital's inability to realise sufficient profit in production, and hence to a contracting world market. It has been a worldwide crisis, affecting private capitalist, 'mixed economy' and state capitalist countries alike. Social Democracy and Leninism have been unable to offer any credible solutions to the crisis (and are unable to solve the hardships which capitalism imposes on wage-earners even outside of crisis situations) because the alternatives to private capitalism which they represent are no more than alternative methods of organising capitalism. They have no alternative to production for the world market, even though it is the world market which has produced the crisis.

THE THIN RED LINE

To find a coherent set of ideas which are subversive of capitalism, and which do offer an alternative to production for the world market, one must turn to the 'thin red line' represented by the five currents which are examined in the following chapters. In roughly chronological order of appearance, these five currents are: anarcho-communism; imposibility; council communism; Bordigism; situationism. A
thorough consideration of each current will be left until the relevant chapter, but there are brief profiles of these currents in the Introduction for the benefit of readers who may be unfamiliar with them.

Even a perfunctory acquaintance with the five currents which jointly represent the 'thin red line' of non-market socialism in the twentieth century leads to the realisation that their importance does not lie in the number of their adherents, or in their influence on the course of world history. Although some of these currents have enjoyed moments of transitory glory/notoriety, throughout most of the twentieth century it has been possible to discount them in terms of the support which they have attracted and their impact on the world. The question therefore arises: if the significance of the non-market socialists does not lie in their numbers and influence, where does it lie? The answer is that non-market socialism is significant because its various currents represent successful attempts by groups of working men and women to formulate a fundamental critique of capitalism and simultaneously to pose a genuinely socialist alternative. Considered in isolation, it is easy to dismiss any one of the five currents as too small and too uninfluential to be important. Taken together, however, they represent a sustained response on the part of wage labour to capitalist exploitation and irrationality. Irrespective of the limited numbers of wage-earners involved, non-market socialism should be seen as an authentic response to capitalism by wage labour because, as the existence of the various non-market socialist currents demonstrates, groups of wage-earners have repeatedly, and largely independently of one another, formulated the same critique of capitalism and the same alternative of socialism. The fact that this has occurred at different historical junctures, and in different geographical and cultural contexts, gives weight to the claim that, as long as world capitalism persists, groups of wage-earning men and women are certain to emerge who will challenge capital's priority of production for the market and call on their fellow-workers to take joint action in order to establish the human community of socialism.

It is important to emphasise the scale of the claim which is being made here with regard to non-market socialism. It
is not being suggested that non-market socialism is another socialist tradition which should be placed alongside Social Democracy and Leninism, and seen as a rival to them. The claim is considerably more audacious than that. What is being argued is that, collectively, anarchocommunism, impos- sibilism, council communism, Bordigism and situationism are socialism in the twentieth century. Outside these currents, socialism has not existed, since what conventionally are considered to be the great victories of 'socialism' in the twentieth century have been nothing more than extensions of state capitalism at the expense of private capitalism. Social Democracy and Leninism have made priceless contributions to world capitalism by deflecting working-class criticism away from the key elements of capitalism as a mode of production to the contingent, and increasingly obsolete, manifestations of capitalism in its private capitalist form. Only those working men and women who have looked at capitalism from the perspective provided by non-market socialism have been able to see through capitalism in all its forms and have avoided capitulation to one side or another in struggles between rival capitalist interests.

Implicit in this argument is a criticism of the conventional method of political analysis, which seeks to understand the world in terms of a 'left/right' dichotomy. The 'left' and the 'right' are different only to the extent that they provide a different political and organisational apparatus for administering the same capitalist system. What the 'left' and the 'right' have in common is that they both accept the world market, as the framework in which they must operate. Since both the 'left' and the 'right' stand for the perpetuation of wage labour, it follows that they cannot offer convincing solutions to the problems which inevitably confront wage-earners. A permanent solution to the problems which are inherent in wage labour, such as insecurity and intensity of work, can only lie in the abolition of the wages system. Yet the abolition of the wages system is a demand which cannot be located on the 'left--right' political spectrum. Only the various currents which represent non-market socialism have consistently demanded an end to wage labour, and that is why they too cannot usefully be identified in terms of a 'left--right' orientation.
THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

In order to sustain the claim that, collectively, anarchocommunism, impossibilism, council communism, Bordigism and situationism are twentieth-century socialism, it needs to be demonstrated that there is a basic set of socialist principles which these currents share. Initially, four such principles can be identified. The currents of non-market socialism are all committed to establishing a new society where:

1. Production will be for use, and not for sale on the market.
2. Distribution will be according to need, and not by means of buying and selling.
3. Labour will be voluntary, and not imposed on workers by means of a coercive wages system.
4. A human community will exist, and social divisions based on class, nationality, sex or race will have disappeared.

Let us clarify these four principles for those readers who may not immediately grasp all their ramifications.

1. Production for Use

The means of production will be owned and controlled communally, and will be used to produce whatever men, women and children need to enjoy full and satisfying lives. Levels of production will be determined by people's freely expressed desires - that is, their desires for articles of individual and social consumption and their desires to engage in creative work. Communal ownership means that all people will freely have access to the means of production, and that no section of the population will be able to exclude others from using the means of production or from enjoying the fruits of production. Production will be coordinated at local, regional and global levels, and communal control means that all people will again be free to participate in managing production and administering society as a whole. Just as no individual or group will be able to prevent others from engaging in direct production, so no section of the population will be able to exclude others from the management of production or from the administration of society.
The details of what to produce and how to produce will be decided locally. The responsibilities of the regional and global bodies will be threefold. In the first place, they will provide the statistical services which will allow production to be coordinated. Second, they will ensure that products which localities need but cannot produce are available to those localities. Third, they will handle the movement of local products at the regional and global levels. By confining the functions of regional and global bodies to these activities, they will not assume the role which the state fulfills in class-divided societies. They will not be provided with armed forces, and therefore will not be in a position to impose decisions on others.

All this is in evident contrast to capitalism. Like any mode of production, capitalism is provided with a mechanism for coordinating production. In capitalism's case, this mechanism is the market. But the price inherent in relying on the market is that levels of production are determined not by people's social or even biological needs, but by the population's 'effective demand' expressed as buying power. The needs of those without the ability to pay do not register on the market, and this results in means of production lying idle while millions of people are deprived. Such a barbaric situation would be impossible in the society envisaged by non-market socialists.

2. Distribution According to Need

People will be free to take whatever they choose from the consumption outlets ('shops without cash registers') in the new society, without making any payment, since money will not exist. Similarly, people will freely make use of social facilities, such as theatres and libraries, without entering into exchange relationships (i.e. buying tickets or paying fees). Non-market socialists are confident that society could run smoothly on this basis, without being undermined by people becoming insatiably greedy or indulging in recklessly extravagant consumption. Our confidence derives from a number of considerations. First, the production of useful articles would be much greater in the new society than in capitalism, not only because production would be freed from the constraints of the market, but also because all those pre-
sently engaged in activities which are specific to a commercial society (banking, insurance and so on), or in activities which are specific to a class-divided society (such as staffing the numerous arms of the repressive apparatus of the state), could redirect their efforts towards production. Second, since greed and conspicuous consumption are reactions to scarcity, we can expect these forms of behaviour to disappear in a society which raises production to the level where it guarantees everyone an abundant supply of all that is required for a comfortable and satisfying life. Third, in a society which is based on cooperation rather than competition, not only would the individual’s sense of solidarity induce him or her to exercise self-control on occasions when this was necessary, but social disapproval would be a powerful restraint on anyone who were disposed to reckless extravagance.

3. Voluntary Labour

In the new society, everyone will have the right to consume, irrespective of whether they are engaged in productive activity or not. Nevertheless, non-market socialists anticipate that people will volunteer to work, and will freely give their time and effort to ensure that an abundant supply of products is constantly available. To those whose horizons do not extend beyond capitalist society, these expectations must seem preposterous. Under capitalism, workers are coerced into engaging in production by the system which makes their consumption dependent on their wages. Work within capitalism therefore is conflated with employment, and popularly is regarded merely as a means to leisure (≡ consumption), which becomes the end to which life is supposed to be directed.

However, non-market socialists argue that once work and employment are conceptually distinguished, work can be seen as an activity which is not merely enjoyable, but which is biologically necessary for human beings to engage in (on a par with eating, drinking, breathing and sex). Freed from its alienating form of wage labour, work will become a creative and rewarding experience which it would be painful for people to deprive themselves of. The boring and monotonous toil of capitalism will be replaced by stimulating and diversified patterns of work, and many of the dangerous occupa-
tions which are found within capitalism will be eliminated. Capitalism has already made these changes technically possible, but is prevented from realising them because considerations of profit outweigh human welfare. Any dangerous work which remains in the new society will be undertaken voluntarily and the only reward for the men and women engaged in it will be society's affection and esteem (as with lifeboat crews and mountain rescue teams, for example, even under capitalism).

4. A Human Community

Capitalism is a divided society. The basic divisions within capitalism are class divisions, which exist because the means of production are owned and controlled by sections of the population and not by society as a whole. Sectional ownership can be maintained only when it is constantly reinforced by the state, and since states exercise their authority over geographical areas, national divisions are perpetuated by capitalism. Furthermore, since labour power is a marketable commodity under capitalism, wage-earners throughout the world compete with one another to sell their labour power to those who employ them. Such competition forms the basis of the sexual, racial and other divisions which divide the working class, and which are skilfully manipulated by the ruling class in order to maintain capital's ascendancy over wage labour.

The society envisaged by non-market socialists would remove all these divisions at a stroke, by realising the communal ownership of the means of production. Since capitalism is an integrated economic system whose market encompasses the whole world, it can be removed only by an equally world-enveloping system which displaces the market. The new society which non-market socialists envisage must therefore be a human community on a global scale. National frontiers will not exist. Cultural and linguistic diversity might flourish within the human community of socialism, but in a moneyless world where distribution was according to need, there would be no way in which the embracing of a certain culture or the use of a certain language could confer economic advantages or disadvantages. In a world owned by all, all would be brothers and sisters.
Although these four basic socialist principles are shared by the currents which represent non-market socialism, they are not sufficient for distinguishing the non-market socialists from all their political opponents. We said before that 'communism' figures in Leninist ideology as a mirage which is forever receding into the distance; and this enables Leninists of all hues to subscribe in the long term to these four basic socialist principles. For example, books published with the approval of the Russian state inform us that:

Under communism, consumer goods – to say nothing of capital goods [sic] – cease to be commodities. Trade and money will outlive themselves. Flats, cultural, communication and transport facilities, meals, laundries, clothes, etc., will all be free.

Stores and shops will be turned into public warehouses where members of communist society will be supplied with commodities [sic] for personal use. The need for wages and other forms of remuneration will disappear.

Apart from the silly slips about capital and commodities existing in communism, this could be taken as an acceptable sketch of the new society. Even better – since he drops Lenin's arbitrary distinction between 'socialism' and 'communism' – is what the Trotskyist Ernest Mandel has written about a 'socialist economy':

The withering-away of commodity and money economy is, however, only one of the factors bringing about the disappearance of social inequality, classes and the state.

A fifth principle is therefore required in order to distinguish the non-market socialists from all varieties of Leninists, including the Trotskyists. This principle can be formulated as follows:

(5) Opposition to capitalism as it manifests itself in all existing countries.

Non-market socialists do not take sides in the wars and struggles for supremacy between rival states which are a permanent feature of world capitalism. On the contrary, non-market socialists are hostile to all states, including those which falsely
proclaim themselves as 'socialist' or 'workers' states'. Indeed, it was the various currents of non-market socialists who pioneered the theory of state capitalism in order to clarify the nature of self-styled 'workers' states', starting with Russia, and in order to give a theoretical explanation for their refusal to support such states.

STATE CAPITALISM

Following the Russian Revolution of 1917, the US government deported a number of activists who were of Russian origin, including the anarcho-communists Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman. Berkman and Goldman went to Russia and observed Leninist rule at first hand. On the basis of his experiences, Berkman described the Russian economy in 1922 as 'a combination of State and private capitalism' and this view was echoed by anarcho-communists elsewhere. As Osugi Sakae wrote in Japan, also in 1922: 'the struggle between the proletariat on one side and state and private capitalism on the other is still continuing in Russia'.

The council communist Otto Rühle journeyed to Russia in 1920 and reported in 1921, after his return to Germany, that: 'The dictatorship of the party is commissar-despotism, is state capitalism.' A decade later, various council communist groups issued in Holland a set of Theses on Bolshevism, which declared in part:

The socialization concept of the Bolsheviks is therefore nothing but a capitalist economy taken over by the State and directed from the outside and above by its bureaucracy.

The Bolshevik socialism is state-organized capitalism.

Despite the fact that no members of the impossibilist Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPCB) visited Russia in the immediate aftermath of the 1917 Revolution, by 1920 from its vantage point in Britain, the Socialist Standard was already able to discern that Leninist policy amounted to state capitalism. At a later stage, when Lenin was dead and his successors were engaged in a vicious struggle for power, the SPCB clearly expressed the non-market socialist conviction that, since Leninists of all types are advocates of capitalism,
from a working-class standpoint there is nothing to choose between them. Commenting on the struggle between Stalin and Trotsky, the Socialist Standard wrote: 'Both Trotsky and Stalin draw up their programmes within the framework of state and private capitalism which prevails in Russia'.

Although the Bordiguists and the situationists reached the conclusion that state capitalism exists in Russia and elsewhere at a later stage than the other currents of non-market socialists, for many years now all five currents have attempted to dispel popular illusions about the state capitalist countries. Not only have they exposed the capitalist features of the state capitalist countries, but they've counterposed to state capitalism the alternative vision of a genuinely socialist society which could liberate humanity from multitude and oppression by incorporating principles 1-4 which we outlined above. It is this, above all, which distinguishes the non-market socialists from the Trotskyists and other varieties of Leninism.

The Trotskyists have been inhibited from counterposing to capitalism the alternative of non-market socialism, because the focus of their attention has been the relatively minor differences which exist between traditional, private capitalism and capitalism as it manifests itself in their so-called 'workers' states'. To express this schematically, the Trotskyists' failure to embrace principle 5 has caused principles 1-4 to be relegated to (at best) the background of their concerns. Alternatively, one could say that the Trotskyists have lost their 'utopianism' (i.e. their identification with no nation-state) by allowing themselves to be sucked into struggles between rival capitals and by electing to defend some capitalist states against others. This has resulted in an unbridgeable divide between Trotskyism and the five currents of non-market socialism.
mainly WSM members and sympathizers, it tolerates others, and WSM members endeavor to convert them to the true faith. The topics are relevant to the concerns of non-market socialists—reform or revolution, human nature or nurture, free access, the proper activity for N-M Socialists, etc. It is this sort of thing that I expect will replace the DB. To subscribe send a message to W_S_M_Socialism_Forum@onelist.com

Daily Planet numbers 1, 2, and 3 are produced by the “World of Free Access” Movement. At one time the Daily Planet was the Gotham newspaper that employed Clark Kent and his girlfriend Lois Lane. Clark could instantly don cloak and tights and transform himself from a meek newspaper reporter into Superman, who could jump the tallest buildings, etc. to defend the people of Metropolis from the nefarious, fiendish plans of various evil doers. In 2000 A.D. The Daily Planet has been transformed into the journal of the WFA and Clark now limits his activity to writing. These three issues include articles on the train crash at Paddington, the WTO, London politics, and Britain’s efforts to discourage immigration. The political positions discernible bear a remarkable resemblance to those of the Socialist Standard but in a rather lighter vein as its name suggests. Free from D. Devine, 115 Henderson Row, Edinburgh, Scotland EH3 5BB.

Probably all of us at one time or another have concluded that the failure of the “revolutionary project” lies in the lack of appeal of revolutionary literature. Depending on the circumstances, those of us who feel strongly enough about the matter have been repelled or expelled by revolutionary groups and taken pen in hand and written our own literature. Here are three