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About This Issue

By the time DB101 reaches readers they will know the outcome of the A-16 demonstrations and marches planned for Washington, DC, an event that organizers have christened Seattle II. Yesterday I
FROM SEATTLE TO WHERE?

The fragmentary groups who protested last year in Seattle against the world trade organisation (WTO) demonstrated the poverty of current working class politics and understanding of capitalism.

First, there were the naive groups wanting fair trade for developing capitalist countries as though capitalism could ever be fair. Second, there were the trade unionists who saw developing countries and their low-paid labour markets as a threat to their own members' jobs ignorant of the fact that employment can never be secure, predictable and permanent. And third, there were the ragbag of "anti-capitalist" groups who erroneously believed direct-action through demonstrations and riot would have any effect on capitalist production for profit when it is securely protected by the machinery of government.

What was lacking at Seattle? An overall historical perspective of capitalism as an anarchic and antisocial system. There was no recognition of capitalism as an integrated world system, which can only be run in the interests of the capitalist class. And there was no recognition that the only way in which to solve the numerous social problems facing our class is to replace capitalism with Socialism. Without such a perspective the demonstrators were simply wasting their time.

Capitalism has not developed evenly. Many of the countries are at a stage similar to Britain at the beginning of the 19th century. Then children were used in the factories and mines to supplement the destitute existence of the working class who had been driven into the cities like Manchester and Leeds. The parents as well as employers and their politicians all opposed the end of using child labours for different reasons and from different interests. Families needed the income and employers the cheap labour.

The same process applies in many of the developing countries of today with the added twist that multinationals also want to tap into this cheap source of labour. It is understandable why workers in developed capitalist countries are worried. In Los Angeles, for example, garment workers seeking to unionise saw their jobs move to lower-wage countries in Latin America. In 1994, according to the United Nations, including benefits, production workers cost $25 an hour in Germany and $16 in the United States, compared with $5 in South Korea, $2.40 in Mexico, $1.40 in Poland, and 50 cents or less in China, India and Indonesia.

The pressure of wide discrepancies in labour costs around the world and the ability of capital to tap into these markets for cheap labour have led to fear for both jobs and incomes. Unfortunately capitalism is not about meeting the needs of workers, but of making profits for the capitalists. When commodities can be made more cheaply in one country rather than another, then production gets re-located to where it is cheapest. Workers under capitalism have to compete against each other for jobs, both within and between countries. Instead of complaining about how unfair or unpleasant this competition is workers should become Socialists and put an end to such a repulsive and antisocial system.

The free trade lobby believe they have all the hard-edge practical arguments on their side against the emotional outbursts of the anti-capitalist demonstrators. They draw upon arguments derived from the Manchester Free Trade School of the 19th century. They assert that freedom to exchange goods will make for efficient economies, that trade is good for growth and that growth is good for the environment, liberal democracy and human rights. It is all nonsense.
From Free Trade to No Trade

In his article On the Question of Free Trade (1848), Marx showed the fallacy of Free Trade arguments. He showed that neither free trade nor protectionism favoured the working class. Of free trade in particular he wrote:

The growth of capital implies the accumulation and concentration of capital. This centralisation involves a greater division of labour and a greater use of machinery. The greater the division of labour destroys the especial skill of the labourer; and by putting in the place of this skilled work labour which any one can perform it increases competition among the workers.

And he went on to say:

This competition becomes fiercer as the division of labour enables a single man to do the work of three. Machinery accomplishes the same result on a much larger scale. The accumulation of productive capital forces the industrial capitalist to work with constantly increasing means of production, ruins the small manufacturer, and drives him into the proletariat... Finally, the more productive capital grows, the more it is compelled to produce for a market whose requirements it does not know, the more supply tries to force demand and consequently crises increase in frequency and intensity. But every crisis in turn hastens the concentration of capital, adds to the proletariat. Thus as productive capital grows; competition among the workers grows too, and grows in a far greater proportion. The reward for labour is less for all, and the burden of labour is increased for some at least.

This was a speech Marx delivered to the Democratic Association of Brussels in 1848. It could have been delivered today.

From Capitalism to Socialism

Capitalist economics attacks the working class, both in organising into trade unions and in trying to get higher wages. For two decades economic liberalism has wanted the deregulation of the labour market, more competition between workers, lower wages and flexible working. It is an employer’s economics, which cuts against the interests of workers. So, then, to prattle on as though free trade will give workers a higher standard of living and rights in the labour market is both hypocritical and an insult to our intelligence.

Marx was quite right to draw attention to the destructive nature of free trade just as he was correct to write off the conservativism of protectionism. Free trade and protectionism are two sides of the same capitalist coin. Free trade is the freedom of capital. Protectionism is the protection of capital. Workers have interests in neither. Marx continues his address:

When (free trade) has torn down the few national barriers which still restrict the free development of capital, (free trade) will merely have given it com let freedom of action.

And he concludes:

So long as you let the relation of wage-labour to capital exist, no matter how favourable the conditions
under which you accomplish the exchange of commodities, there will always be a class which exploits and a class which is exploited. It is really difficult to understand the presumption of the free traders who imagine the more advantageous application of capital will abolish the antagonism between industrial capitalists and wage workers. On the contrary. The only result will be that the antagonism of these two classes will stand out more clearly.

This leads on to the most important consideration of the question of free trade and capitalism generally. Many people in Seattle were united in opposing fragments of capitalism. They wanted to save the environment. They wanted to save wildlife. They wanted to save the peasant farmer. They wanted to end child labour. Yet they had no grasp of capitalism as it really is. Nor did they have a practical alternative to put in its place. They wanted capitalism without the effects of capitalism. And this is something they cannot have.

The WTO ended in failure. The success or failure of the conference was irrelevant to workers. Yet the protesters believed that they had won. What did they win? The WTO met again in Geneva this year. The social problems still exist. and Capitalism goes on regardless.

Is there an alternative to the political childishness of the demonstrators in Seattle? The Socialist response is that there is an alternative to capitalism: Socialism. That is, the common ownership and democratic control of the means of production and distribution by all of society. In short, the abolition of the wages system.

These two demands were tragically missing from Seattle as demonstrators ran around blindly, not from the police batons, the CS gas and mustard spray but from being unaware of the social system they actually lived in and the necessity of replacing it with Socialism.
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watched a “consultant” on anti-terrorism hired by the Washington Police Department to handle demonstrators. A couple of days earlier a network TV news segment showed demonstrators in a training camp learning how to lie down properly and block access to buildings where the IMF and World Bank would be holding meetings. The reality a couple of days later was rather anti-climactic; the delegates got up and reached the meetings before the demonstrators got there, the numbers were small, as nearly as I could tell—no figures have been given out a week later—, and the only victory Michael Moore could claim at the rally on the Ellipse was that the delegates had been forced to get up at five o’clock in the morning.

In the first article here, “From Seattle to Where?,” Socialist Studies raises the question that all demonstrators should have been asking: “Why am I here? What purpose is served by the demonstration?” If we can believe the stock answers we got from the radical and leftwing press we were there to shut down the international banking system, inform the people of the effects of the banks, and to “build a movement”—for what purpose we weren’t told. Next is the call for “A Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc.” Clearly issued to raise the level of direct action and addressed to all elements of what the DB refers to as the anti-market, anti-capitalist, anti-state political sector, it calls for a “bloc” that will oppose the efforts of the “respectable” elements to control the demonstrators. Next is the endorsement of the “call” by three publications—all in the council communist strand of the “thin red line” of non-market socialism. It strikes me that the Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc, its name notwithstanding is much closer to the reformist World Bank closers and
REVOLUTIONARY ANTI-CAPITALIST BLOC

Washington DC, April 9-16

Due to differences in politics, tactics, and organizing principles with the current direct action networks that are springing up throughout the world, we are calling for an organized bloc of all stripes of anti-authoritarian, anti-capitalist, revolutionaries at the upcoming demonstrations against the IMF/World Bank. We are not, however, calling for a strictly anarchist bloc. We want to open the call to those "outside of anarchism", comrades who struggle for much the same truly revolutionary anti-capitalist goals that we do: the abolition of capitalism, the state, and all forms of hierarchy and oppression. Our intent is not to be divisive of the larger protest but to more effectively support it by organizing autonomously. We feel that it is necessary to organize separately as autonomists, anarchists, anti-state libertarian marxists, wobblies, council communists, etc. for a number of reasons:

The reformist message of fair trade, not free trade, and all of the talk about pruning and fixing that was in the streets in Seattle and has subsequently been pushed in the organizing of the A16 demo as well as within the larger anti-globalization movement is unacceptable. While we realize the need to combat the issues that effect our daily lives and those of our comrades the world over, this must be done within a larger anti-capitalist, revolutionary critique that doesn't stop with single-issue struggles.

National protectionism and calls for national sovereignty, which pit the international working class against itself, cannot be tolerated. One nation-state is just as bad as any other nation-state, and so we have to agitate for the abolition of all of them. We are internationalists and therefore, regardless of political borders, see the need to globalize resistance to all of capitalism.

We cannot accept the active participation of cops and/or peacekeepers in this or any other movement, protest, or demonstration. Those whose job it is to protect the ruling class interests cannot be trusted to simultaneously support us. While our main goal is to shut down the IMF/World Bank meeting, it is quite predictable that the cops will aggressively attack those actions, immediately drawing lines between the protesters on one hand, and the cops, police liaisons, and peacekeepers on the other. We do not support collaboration with the enemy at large and they should not be invited nor supported at this demonstration. These and other authoritarian turns that the organizers have taken are extremely dismaying to us and begin to show hastily covered fractures among those of us working to make this demonstration happen.

We can not work with people who dictate what tactics are and are not appropriate. No one should be pretending to own this movement or this demo. Unfortunately, to disallow participation because of opposition to tactics and actions that aren't solely symbolic betrays a reformist agenda from the word "go." We are not advocating for any particular tactic; we are simply defending the individuals right to act autonomously however they see fit against our real enemies. If aggressive self-defense or property destruction is unacceptable to some, then they shouldn't engage in it.

This is a call for more active participation of anarchist and other like-minded revolutionaries in the entire anti-globalization movement to counter reformist perspectives and goals with revolutionary, anti-capitalist, anti-authoritarian actions and ideas. At A16 we envision an active and creative contingent of revolutionaries marching under black, red & black, and green & black flags, anti-capitalist and anti-authoritarian banners, and a hail of revolutionary drumbeats. We are mobilizing marching bands, radical cheerleaders, and planning a whole assortment of highly organized creative mayhem! To all of our comrades who support this call, we
encourage you to get in touch, endorse it, and take to the streets with your anti-capitalist imaginations and desires!

Do not let the blows against this capitalist system cease! From the streets of Seattle, to Washington, DC, may our resistance be as transnational as capital!

SOLIDARITY AND REVOLUTION!

Signed,
Nosotros Group (Baltimore, MD), Group Anarchiste Emile-Henry (Quebec), Active Transformation (Detroit-East Lansing, MI), Global Action (Eugene, OR), Mutual Aid Legal Defense (Seattle, WA), We Dare Be Free (Boston, MA), Sabate (Boston, MA), Lancaster ABC-SG (Lancaster, PA), Flint Jones Northeast Regional Delegate of the Workers Solidarity Alliance (WSA-IWA), Morgantown Anarchist Group (Morgantown, WV), Prole Revolt (Morgantown, WV), Mid-Atlantic InfoShop (Washington, DC)

For general information about the protest see www.A16.org To get involved with the revolutionary bloc contact:

Nosotros Group
PO Box 65341 Baltimore, MD 21209 email: DURRUTI36@aol.com

(from p. 5)
the IMF improvers than the actual revolutionary anti-capitalists. If I thought breaking windows and wearing masks promoted understanding of the role of capitalism and of the need to abolish it—and indeed all trade—before we can begin to build a just world, I’d be all for it. Somehow the use of the word “understanding” in connection with the choice of tactics “the call” lists seems a bit optimistic.

The LA Workers’ Voice criticism of Elizabeth Burke’s article in DB100 typifies the response one might expect from an anti-capitalist revolutionary. Like thousands of well meaning people who call themselves liberals, anarchists, socialists, and even communists, Comrade Burke has no trouble seeing the effects of capitalism but somehow can’t imagine a society without it. From his tone Ronald Young is less willing than many of us to ascribe Burke’s analysis of Seattle to ingrained habits of thought or cultural brainwashing.

First published around 1966 or 7, the Socialist Labor Party leaflet on Vietnam was distributed at demonstrations throughout the war years. I said “at demonstrations;” actually “near” would be a more exact preposition, and we distributors had to live with rules that prevented us from getting near enough so that we could be mistaken for marchers and demonstrators. In my estimation the disgust engendered by the rules regarding participation in the anti-war movement was one of the major causes of the split in the SLP in the late sixties and early seventies. I believe ideas in the leaflet are just as valid now as they were thirty-some years ago. As for the decision not to allow SLP members and sympathizers to march and carry signs expressing the sentiments in the leaflets, one would have to analyze the mind set of Nathan Karp and the NEC at the time.

The letter from the De Leonist Society takes issue with John Crump’s assertion that there is no such thing as market socialism, socialism ruling out the existence of a market by definition. For DeLeonists the problem here is that DeLeonism no longer has the standards of orthodoxy it maintained before Nathan Karp took over the SLP management. Some of us, including the DLS and I have slipped the ideological collar although not always on the same topic. I also have a few words on vouchers and the market.

Part 2 of John Crump’s Chapter 2 of Non-Market Socialism... describes the evolution of
Endorsing the Call for a Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc

Recently a number of anarchist groups issued a call for a Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc for the upcoming "A16" demonstrations against the International Monetary Fund in Washington D.C. Not restricting themselves to organizing an anarchist black bloc, these activists extended a hand to autonomists, "anti-state libertarian marxists," anarcho-syndicalists, and council communists to form a common front, organized separately but acting in concert as a revolutionary and anti-capitalist pole of attraction within the larger movement against "globalization." As adherents of council communist political perspectives, the publications Collective Action Notes, Red & Black Notes, and The Bad Days Will End endorse this call issued by our anarchist friends. We do so not as representatives of membership organizations, and still less as "leaders" of any kind, but rather as individuals who represent publications with modest circulations.

The "A 16" actions are intended to build on the momentum from last years anti-WTO demonstrations in Seattle. In the growing resistance to "globalization" and global financial institutions such as the WTO, the IMF, and the World Bank, some are now heralding the emergence of a "new movement" and even a "new anti-capitalism." These protests certainly demonstrate that globalization is not the inevitable juggernaut that the capitalist bosses and bureaucrats say it is. But the "new anti-capitalism" that was on display in Seattle was a mixed bag, containing, it turned out, a lot of the old reformism, in the form of the AFL-CIO bureaucracy, the Sierra Club, the National Lawyers Guild, Ralph Nader and his ilk, and assorted "NGOs." These elements see the movement against globalization simply as a way of putting pressure on the capitalist state to curtail or revamp international financial institutions or to replace "free trade" with "fair trade." This reformist perspective brings with it an ugly nationalist protectionism, where what is needed is thoroughgoing international solidarity. Tensions between some among the reformists and radicals surfaced in Seattle, where "peacekeepers" willingly acted as adjuncts for the state and its brutal cops in trying to keep radicals "in line." As the movement builds for At 6 in Washington, so does the need for political clarification.

On a whole host of questions, the call for a Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc takes the road of class struggle rather than reform. The call declares that the reformist message of "fair trade, not free trade" and of "pruning" and "fixing" global capitalist financial institutions is unacceptable. The call rejects the narrowness of "single-issue" organizing and opts instead for a total revolutionary critique of capitalism. The call repudiates the protectionism and nationalism that infect much of the anti-globalization movement, agitating instead for the abolition of nations. The call rejects the participation in the movement of so-called "peacekeepers" and insists on the right of groups and individuals to organize and act autonomously within the larger movement against globalization. All of these things are not only supportable, but are necessary.

The anarchists call for a Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc is not a call to split the movement. It is a call to strengthen and concentrate a political pole of attraction within the anti-globalization movement which advances the understanding that, to be against globalization, you must be against capitalism, the state, and the nation. This opposition necessitates a proletarian perspective: To be for the working class and for the working class revolutionary self-organization through workers councils.

This idea is not the stale "old left" or Leninist dogma in which only the factory proletariat, organized in the trade unions, is allowed to be the "real" subject of history. Globalization itself has meant the de-industrialization of large segments of the U.S. workforce. At the same time, modern capitalism has made of
society as a whole a "social factory" in which we are all workers. As the British journal Aufheben wrote in a recent editorial on the J18 demonstrations in London, "if we are fighting capital then we must constitute ourselves as the proletariat." Through this union of the working class and its essence, we forge the basis of a genuine international unity, which will one day lay the basis for the abolition of capitalism, wage slavery, and work itself. Its with this perspective in mind that we support the call for a Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Bloc.

Signed,
Curtis Price / Collective Action Notes
Neil Fettes / Red & Black Notes
Ed Caldwell / The Bad Days Will End

March 2000

Contact addresses: Collective Action Notes, POB 22962, Baltimore, MD 21203 USA, <cansv@igc.apc.org>; Red & Black Notes, PO Box 47643 - 939 Lawrence Ave E, Don Mills, ON M3C 3S7, Canada, <benn@director.comp>; The Bad Days Will End c/o Merrymount Publications, PO Box 441597, Somerville, MA 02144, USA <brotterm@earthlink.net>
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socialist and anarchist thinking that resulted in the rise of social democracy and Leninism and the marginalizing of non-market socialism of all varieties. Next A. Smeaton continues his attack on the IWW but from a direction entirely different from that of the DeLeonists.

Preceding the review and gracing the cover of Loren Goldner’s book on events in Portugal and Spain a few years ago is a picture of revolutionary luminaries of the past 150 years examining Portugal. I was thinking of offering a prize to anyone who could identify all the caricatures. As for the book itself, Goldner’s main idea seems to be that despite its general acceptance as political wisdom, state capitalism is not a step toward non-market socialism but is rather a step in the economic evolution toward market capitalism.

Derek Devine expected better recall about the Daily Planet and Superman from an old man than was the case. The irony is that I had some doubts about the Gotham City/Metropolis thing and checked with what I thought was an unimpeachable source. Next Adam Buick’s letter provides some further questions on the DeLeonist/World Socialist debate on the nature of a socialist society. And as usual we end with some “Notes, Announcements, and Short Reviews.”

Finances

I have some good news and some bad news regarding international postage rates. The good news is that because the U.S. Postal Service didn’t inform me of a rate increase we saved $0.24 on each DB mailed at surface rate outside the U.S. since May 1999. The bad news is that surface mail for the DB now costs $1.04 instead of $0.80, a significant increase. The other good news is that we remain in the black as we have for several years now. Once again, thanks to contributors, receipts exceeded costs despite the unusually high bill for stamps this time.

Contributions: Joe Tupper $20; Perry Sanders $7; Gene Rodriguez $12; Eric Chester $19; Edward Shacklett $5; Kevin Glover $10; Harriett Machado $25; Anna V. Boone $17; Jack Cedar $1.
Total $116. Thank you, comrades.
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Reply to Burke: The Battle in Seattle—Lessons for the Continuing Class War

The mass actions and sharp confrontations with "democratic" State authority protests against the WTO (World Trade Org.) Conference provides many valuable lessons for honest workers and activists from the 'heat' of their actual experience.

Understanding the methods of social control by capital is of key importance if the capitalist bull (no pun) is ever successfully to be 'taken by its horns'.

Ms. Burke's analysis unfortunately applies very little materialist science. It ends up as just a hodgepodge of 'leftist' petty reform illusions, not facts or critical analysis.

Her "Green Party" is an explicitly middle class reformist party. It offers not even any definitive political break with capital's Democrats. It even makes unprincipled deals not to run against Democrats where the Democrat might be in a close election race, or posture a bit 'left'. The Greens thus use their leverage for possibly securing some patronage/temporary petty concession from the Democrats, whereas liberal bosses' candidates prevail.

In any case this opportunism is typical of bourgeois horse trading politics, and can only demoralize further any honest activists it temporarily attracts. It goes hand in glove with the illusion of liberation via passive/elitist methods where politicians promise to 'walk on water' for us so we can be saved. In an age of monopoly capitals' class dominance over the "democratic" State machine, these tactics only help certify the election results—always a victory for capital over the working class, ideologically- and organizationally.

Burke does point out that the WTO rules undermine national laws on environmental, labor and public health, etc. But she hides the fact, that none of these nation-state "laws" are ever seriously enforced by any government, if they seriously cut onto overall capital profit making. Rape of the environment, labor, and public health programs, etc. has been ongoing long before the bosses nation states set up the WTO to control their vicious and lingering disputes over trade-investments, etc. Exploitation, plunder for profit is endemic to capitalist social relations, not just the WTO commissions.

Burke thinks capitalist trade-investment can be reformed so as to become "tools for promoting ideals, such as equality. 'Democracy', good jobs, clean environment and healthy communities." These are raptures from the lips of slick liberal bourgeois political hucksters. These ideals will never be a reality in any capitalist society. Capitalist production is based on the marketplace rat-race. Equality is not possible because there is more profit to be made via inequality and racism. "Democracy" is also a commodity. Those that have capital get their share. Those without it are out of luck. Good jobs: these are also based on the needs of the marketplace, where capital has to find better ways to offset its overall accumulation problems, the value of labor power is being driven down—not up, as exploitation overall, grows more vicious. Healthy communities! The bosses are only concerned if workers are not healthy enough to create maximum profits for them. Otherwise their class slogan is "each person for himself—devil take the hindmost."
Ms. Burke thinks "global institutions" should help protect the environment, fight diseases, defend human rights." Which ones we might ask? The NGO's, the UN, the CIA? All of these accept the capitalists' hegemony, so they, like the WTO itself, end up in service of the ruling classes. What about workers organized internationally in a class Party and other mass organizations to fight the class battles and a future struggle to end the rule of capital once and for all? But this is verboten for the US Labor Party or the Greens!

Ms. Burke says corporations must pay their fair share of taxes, provide employees with a decent standard of living and limit their pollution. But then they could not be profitable enough to "beat the competition" and the corporations fight tooth and nail to reach the highest profit rate. If mass workers actions did force a slightly higher corporate tax rate, wages and benefits, history shows that as soon as the bosses break the movements up—usually thru election charades, (that the Greens promote)duery, and violence (carrots and sticks), the government/bosses roll back the reforms and go onto a merciless counteroffensive. Any 'gains' won today are fleeting for workers. We need to organize to directly oppose the capitals rule over us, even in the day to day struggles.

Fair Trade is no better for workers than Free Trade because its all capitalist trade and the market dictates the bosses have to suck more bone marrow out of the workers to be the most successful traders. The weaker peripheral countries take investment/aid from the big powers in order to keep up and accumulate. The economic ties lead to closer political/military bloc ties. The big powers invest more because they must increase profit rates to meet and beat their rivals in the world marketplace. The best 'protection' the workers have is to get organized to fightback with new industrial and political groups. This does NOT mean reforming the AFL unions, in the modern era, these outfits accept the rule of the rich, the wages system, plead poverty for the bosses, and promote chauvinism and militarism to ingratiate themselves to the US rulers & their government.

We desperately need rising workers combativity, education, organization, and anti-capitalist mass action. The Seattle anti-WTO masses in action was a hearty skirmish in this fight. But the class war is a long and grueling one. We can only become more confused by the political illusions promoted by the likes of "Green Party" and "Labor Party". Especially suggested visitations to "your congressperson". They're not ours, Ms. Burke! They are the boss's congresspersons. That's why our well-beeled rulers put up 95 % of the money + mass media to promote the election charades.

Neil, LA Workers' Voice, Box 57483, Los Angeles, Ca. 90057
Communist-left web: http://www.ibrp.org
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALANCE</th>
<th>February 26, 2000</th>
<th>$391.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECEIPTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs and Sales</td>
<td>$139.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$255.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revolutionary Greetings Frank & DB Readers:

I got a good chuckle from the press release entitled "Anarchists Condemn Anti-WTO Riots" that appeared in DB 100. Whether the ten signatories (herein referred to as "The Ten") to this capital apologist statement are anarchists is very questionable.

If anyone has a "weak or inconsistent" understanding of anarchism it is these ten armchair revolutionaries. While they eloquently enunciate the "core values of anarchism," they also support the "rights" of the capitalists to be unobstructed in their activities of wealth appropriation and planning for future worker exploitation and environmental devastation.

It's apparent that The Ten are attempting to soft-peddle a version of anarchism for main-stream consumerist consumption that has a benign relationship with capital and the state. As a Chicago anarchist puts it, "Worrying about how a brainwashed country perceives anarchy seems divorced from the reality of the situation. Our job is to clearly attack the state through word AND deed." They refer to the Seattle direct actions of black bloc anarchists as being an "authoritarian strategy," while at the same time defending the rights of the ruling class. To quote a Eugene anarchist, "The idea that you can label yourself 'anarchist' yet openly stand behind and support a figure of authority in society is hypocritical and absurd."

The Ten also fail to condemn the violent acts of the state's repressive police forces, choosing instead to chastise fellow revolutionaries and their courageous acts of destruction against targeted companies that were specifically targeted due to their major involvement in transnational corporate hegemony.

The black-clad, masked revolutionaries of black bloc committed "violence" against property—private property. There has not been one account brought to the public's attention where rioting anarchists injured bystanders. On the other hand, there is overwhelming videotape evidence documenting the horrendous acts of repression—indiscriminate acts, mind you—perpetrated by the police against the bodies of living, breathing people. They attacked not only protesters but also innocent local citizens going about their daily business.

Since The Ten's press release moves from expressing the core values of anarchism to supporting the core values of capitalism (i.e., private property), it's easy to see why they would overlook the violent acts of the police against the people and instead attack the anarchist's actions against private property. I'm sure in their distorted view of things the "peaceable" capitalists were merely protecting their property interests. I wouldn't be surprised if some members of The Ten actually participated in "peace police" attacks on anarchists.

This smells a whole lot like the ruling class rubbish we've been fed all these many years that puts property rights above human rights. The Ten's statement make a dismal attempt to cloak capitalist ideology behind anarchist ideals.

The small affinity group organizational method also doesn't sit well with The Ten. They prefer, in typical authoritarian fashion, that we all dance together or not at all. Contrary to what these "anarchists" say, small groups are very compatible with anarchism. They are also less likely to be infiltrated by agents of the state, and allow for extreme flexibility. These groups didn't act as vanguardists, but were moved to act against the state in a very deliberate and concise manner. There was no "supreme leader" as the mainstream media would have people believe. It looks like The Ten bought into this lie.
While condemning the acts of black bloc, The Ten make no mention of the coercive and intimidating tactics employed by the corporations and their accomplice government against the people of the world every single day. MikeTown getting trashed is nothing compared with the ongoing slaveshop conditions that Mike workers are forced to endure. Yet, The Ten insist that anarchists must be angelic in our efforts to overthrow capitalism.

Did passive resistance by the "nonviolent" protesters protect them from the rubber bullets, tear gas, and pepper spray being used by the enforcers of capitalist authoritarianism? The Ten, naturally, lay blame of the state's repressive measures on the actions of the repressed who chose to fight back against the onslaught of chemical warfare.

The Ten are somewhat confused about the difference between practicing anarchist ideals among fellow anarchists, incorporating them into society and defending ourselves against the capitalist state. We can apply anarchist principles in our lives under capitalism but we are not required by those principles to defend ourselves from capitalism, or overthrow it, by treating the ruling class as comrades. That’s pure folly.

This idea that we should act kindly toward the occupying army because fighting against its repressive nature only leads to more repression is not only fanciful but downright dangerous on our part. The Ten feel that their is a moral dilemma between adhering to anarchist principles and taking direct action against the state. This is the same as saying that because we hold to libertarian principles we should not attack a totalitarian state that has declared war on us. Their alternative is that we should agitate the state out of existence exclusively through passive means—bombard it with propaganda and nice-nice while it bombards us through military force and the use of chemical weapons.

While I believe that anarchists should work to convince people that anarchism is preferable to capitalism, that does not mean we abandon direct actions and self-defense against corporate and state violence directed at the people.

Those people who believe that capitalism is going to give up the ghost without a fight need to get a grip on reality. "Oh please, great rulers, won’t you all come down out of your ivory towers so we can speak with you about anarchy?" It ain’t gonna happen. As it’s stated in the aims and principles of one UK anarchist organization: "Because the ruling class will not relinquish power without the use of armed force, this revolution will be a time of violence as well as liberation." It’s not that we anarchists want it that way, but that’s the way the ruling class intends to keep its heel on the necks of the working class.

While The Ten sit on their hands waiting for the plutocrats to come down from their ivory towers and pow-wow, many courageous revolutionaries have taken it upon themselves to begin dismantling the towers of power brick by brick if necessary. They should be supported by all who profess to be anarchists.

War is not a pretty thing, but that’s exactly what the fight is all about—CLASS WAR! Every revolution has its starting point, usually beginning with small skirmishes that build in momentum as the masses begin to move. If you don’t have the stomach for it then I suggest you renew your membership at the country club and begin planning with your righteous capitalist pals what counter-revolutionary measures you intend to take to suppress it.

For Anarchist Communism,

Ronald Young
Huntsville, Texas
VIETNAM:
Understanding vs. emotion
Do demonstrations have value?

Despite the manifold problems with which the disintegrating capitalist system daily confronts the people of this nation (above all the working class), the number-one subject on the minds of most people currently is Vietnam. There obviously is a growing concern that this "miserable little war" may yet prove to be the spark that will set off the holocaust that could destroy our civilization and all humanity. It is a fear that prevails throughout the entire world.

This has been demonstrated by the many "protest movements" that have attracted so much attention throughout the world - the "teach-ins," the antiwar parades, the "civil disobedience" demonstrations, etc.

Basically, these movements are an expression of social unrest. They are born of the insecurity and frustration that permeate our entire society. The participants in these movements are for the most part no doubt sincere and deeply concerned about their own futures, as well as the future of society generally.

Conscious of the fact that the Vietnam war could escalate into a full-scale nuclear holocaust, they denounce the immorality of that war specifically. In doing so they have exposed some of the hypocrisies that have been resorted to in the attempt to justify U.S. policies in Vietnam. But primarily they concentrate on demanding that the U.S. "stop the war in Vietnam."

Unfortunately, the demonstrators lack an understanding of the true nature of the problems confronting them. They completely ignore the basic cause of war. In fact, they disdainfully reject every effort made to call it to their attention as "dogmatic sectarianism." The result is that they are split up into dozens of factions and jerry-built "organizations." Since none of them is based on a correct theory or premise, they cannot establish any unifying principle. This in turn makes it impossible for them to adopt any workable program or seek an attainable goal. All of them vociferously proclaim their desire to eliminate an evil, but not one of them attacks the cause of that evil. The result is that despite all the protests, parades, demonstrations, etc., the war in Vietnam has been and is being steadily escalated.

What the demonstrators and paraders need more than anything else is a sound knowledge and understanding of the nature of the capitalist system and its inherent compulsions to war. They have to learn that "hatred of war" and "love of peace," no matter how widely, or how loudly, or how frequently proclaimed, cannot halt or eliminate war. They must learn that they are wasting their time and efforts in hacking at the branches of evil and leaving the root-cause untouched. And they must learn what must be done to replace the war breeding capitalist system with the sane Socialist society.

The imperialist struggle

The repeated crises to which the world is being continuously subjected are not caused by men. There is a more basic cause, one that explains why as one crisis subsides another flares up, and one that also explains why all these crises follow a pattern that has become almost monotonous. This is not to say that men do not play their part, sometimes hastening, sometimes slowing the pace of events and their immediate consequences. The really determining factors, however, are social forces that exert an irresistible pressure on both men and events.
The world in which we live is dominated by two giant imperialist camps. Capitalist America and its "allies" constitute one of these camps—the "Western" camp. The despotic Sino-Russian State Bureaucracies and their satellites constitute the other—the "Eastern" camp. There are, of course periodic clashes of, material interests within each camp, but this does not alter the basic overriding conflict that is raging between the Western and Eastern imperialist camps in many widespread areas of the world.

The two giant imperialist camps are engaged in a "death struggle." Each is determined to survive, to maintain its ruling-class privileges and to dominate the world. The stakes are enormous. They are nothing less than control of the markets and riches of the earth and of the producing workers everywhere. Both camps possess the means for totally destroying one another. With each crisis they move closer and closer to open conflict—to the point of mutual destruction.

In the worldwide conflict between these two colossi, all other nations are mere pawns. Some are potential markets; others are sources of raw materials; still others are strategically located along the important trade routes and are considered essential to their defense; many are areas for profitable investment. All of them are "battlefields" on which the East and West are clashing for imperialist objectives.

Vietnam is one of the pawns— one of these "battlefields" where the "cold war" has erupted into a "hot war." It is an effect of the worldwide conflict, not the cause. Even if the Vietnam war was somehow "neutralized," even if some sort of agreement was reached and respected, as in Korea, the peril to the peace and continued existence of the civilized world would remain. Sooner or later, and probably sooner than later, the next crisis would erupt in some other area of the world.

**Material interests rule**

It is against this background that the Vietnam war must be considered. It is not an individual or isolated problem. It is not, as claimed by capitalist spokesmen, a question of preserving a democratic regime. It is not a defense of the "free world." It is not a case of "good guys" versus "bad guys." It has nothing to do with "national honor." Nor with the so-called "integrity of the American commitment." It has nothing to do with morality or justice. It has nothing to do with freedom or liberty. It has nothing to do with "national security" or "national liberation."

It has everything to do with coldly calculated material interests. With world markets. With sources of natural resources essential to capitalist survival. With spheres of influence. With lines of communication and trade. With areas of profitable investment. In short, it has everything to do with "hot ... commercial (capitalist) and industrial rivalry." It is one of the consequences of the compulsion inherent in capitalism, specifically, and class-divided society, generally.

**A truce is just a breathing spell**

Consequently, even if the Vietnam crisis were to subside by mutual agreement into an uneasy truce, the larger conflict would continue unabated. Such a truce would indicate that the fear of a nuclear cataclysm still exerted a powerful influence on both imperialist camps. It would but provide the world with another "breathing spell." But each "breathing spell" gets shorter and shorter, each crisis more and more critical. We are rapidly approaching the "point of no return." The fact remains: When panic-stricken men play with dynamite, explosions are all too likely to take place.
This is the mess in which the world finds itself today, brought about by the outmoded and decadent capitalist system and its class-divided blood brother, bureaucratic State Despotism. Neither of them is capable of serving the needs or assuring the safety, freedom and security of the overwhelming majority, the international working class. Both serve the interests of the minuscule ruling classes only, and in doing so they threaten to drag all civilization and all humanity into the abyss.

Insofar as the American plutocracy and its political State are concerned, the war in Vietnam is an illegal war. It is being conducted in violation of their own basic law, the Constitution of the United States. Only Congress has the legal power to declare war.

There is one solution - and only one

Only one thing can prevent the catastrophe toward which the world is heading. That is the establishment of genuine international Socialism. There is no acceptable alternative. We must establish a society in which private ownership of the means of life will be replaced by social ownership and democratic control; in which production for sale and the profit of a few will be replaced by production for the benefit and use of all; in which the outmoded political form of government (the State) will be replaced by an industrial form of government. This is the only way we can end the economic ruling-class rivalries that lead to war and the recurring economic crises that increase the compulsions to war.

Socialism will be the opposite of capitalism and of bureaucratic State despotism. Poverty, insecurity, unemployment will be eliminated. Warbreeding struggles for markets will be a thing of the past. Totalitarianism will be impossible. Everyone will lead a full life, contributing his or her fair share of the work and receiving his or her fair share of the total social product. We shall have laid the material and economic foundation for social harmony, peace, plenty and liberty, on the basis of international human brotherhood.

The Socialist Labor Party does not question the sincerity of many of the protesters. It is not disdainful of that sincerity. But it is duty bound to point out that sincerity is not the issue. Sincerity is like the good intentions that pave the road to hell. Undisciplined by sound knowledge and theory, sentiment runs riot and commits tragic errors. When the looked-for result is not soon achieved the "movement" based on sentiment alone-sincere or otherwise-collapses like a pierced balloon.

To conclude: Sentiment and emotion for a good cause are laudable. But without a sound premise and attainable goal, they can only lead to failure and despair. The crying need of our time is not parades, or demonstrations for limited and impossible objectives, but determined, unrelenting action to awaken the working class to the imperative need for a Socialist reconstruction of society, and to enlighten them on the principles and program for accomplishing that social change in a peaceful, civilized manner. At this late hour on the social clock it is the only way to strike a decisive blow for peace and freedom for the workers of all nations, on both sides of the Iron Curtain. All else is futile and hopeless.

Space does not permit a detailed explanation of the Socialist Labor Party's program for establishing a Socialist society of peace, plenty and freedom for all. Send for additional literature. Use the coupon below.

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY
Concerning John Crump's introduction to *Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (DB99):

At the outset Crump has it that the qualifier *Non-Market* is not intended to indicate that there is also a *true* market Socialism but, rather, that there is not. Quoting as follows:

"If we use words accurately, it is unnecessary to qualify 'socialism' with 'non-market' because socialism is, by definition, a marketless society. The market cannot coexist with socialism because socialism means that society owns and controls the means of production and the goods which result from productive activity. For the market to exist, some sectional interest (an individual, a joint-stock company, a nationalised concern, a workers' cooperative and so on) has to be in control of part of the social product, which it then disposes of by entering into exchange relations with others. Exchange cannot take place when society, and none other, controls the means of production and the social product. Far from socialism being compatible with exchange and the market, the generalised production of goods for exchange on the market is the hallmark of an entirely different type of society—capitalism."

We cannot agree that "socialism is, by definition, a marketless society." For as we maintained in our article *SOCIALISM'S MARKET ECONOMY* (DB97):

"Anyone who has given [enough] thought to the matter will know that whereas *market economy* is descriptive of a capitalist economy, it will also correctly describe any other economy wherein, directly or indirectly, an *EXCHANGE OF PRODUCTS PREVAILS*.

The underpinning for our affirmation that Socialism, too, will feature a market economy is to be found in Marx's *The Gotha Program*. In what he terms "the first phase of Communist [i.e., socialist] society," Marx details in easily understood language the exchange relations that he believes will prevail there, thus:

"The social labor day consists of the sum of the individual labor hours; the individual labor time of the single producer is the fraction of the social labor day supplied by him, his share of it. He receives from the community a check showing that he has done so much labor (after deducting his labor due to the common fund), and with this check he draws from the common store as much of the means of consumption as costs an equal amount of labor. The same quantity of labor that he has given to society in one form, he receives back in another form."

"Evidently, there prevails here the same principle that today regulates the exchange of commodities, in so far as it is an exchange of equivalents. Substance and form have changed, be-
cause under the changed conditions no one can give anything except his labor, and because, on the other hand, nothing can go over into the possession of individuals, except individual means of consumption."

We now have (1): According to Crump, exchange cannot take place in a socialist society and (2): According to Marx, exchange can and will take place therein. It should hardly be necessary for us to add that we continue to stand by the Marxian position, not because it was Marx who spelled it out but because what Marx spelled out makes sense!

But all is not said when that is said! Thus while Crump's unqualified assertion that Socialism is a marketless society cannot stand the light of Marxism, there is nevertheless an ideal or ultimate condition under which the assertion might pass muster. This condition is described by Marx thus:

"In the higher phase of Communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual under the division of labor has disappeared, and therewith also the opposition between manual and intellectual labor; after labor has become not only a means of life, but also the highest want in life; when, with the development of all the faculties of the individual, the productive forces have correspondingly increased, and all the springs of social wealth flow more abundantly--only then may...society inscribe on its banners: 'From everyone according to his faculties, to everyone according to his needs!'" (Ibid.)

It but remains for Crump et al. to explain why they leapfrogged over market Socialism (the "first phase" of socialist society) without so much as a nod in its direction! Why? Did they perhaps conclude that it had become an anachronism due to the unprecedented increase of "the productive forces" under Capitalism itself? In any case, and as Marx makes clear, there is a lot more than adequate productive forces required to warrant society's transition from market Socialism to non-market Socialism!

"What we are dealing with here [in the first phase] is a Communist society, not as it has developed on its own basis, but, on the contrary, as it is just issuing out of capitalist society; hence, a society that still retains, in every respect, economic, moral and intellectual, the birth-marks of the old society from whose womb it is issuing." (Ibid.)

Not the least moral hangover from capitalist society that could be expected to plague a newborn socialist society would doubtless be a continuing belief, shared by the dethroned capitalist class and its supporters, that the wages system had been too rewarding a system to be scrapped. It should go without saying that this element, a rapacious element, would stop at nothing in order to abort a socialist revolution. And how does Marxism prepare to meet such eventuality? Marxism safeguards the "first phase" of Socialism with a market economy that revolves around the labor voucher. On the other hand, Crump etc. "safeguard" the new social order by rejecting the labor voucher
and moving directly to non-market Socialism—that is to say, by providing free access to consumer goods for one and all including the aforesaid destructive element bent on the restoration of wage exploitation!

Socialism does not build for disaster; on the contrary, it builds moneyless market economies designed to keep anti-social reaction at bay!

The De Leonist Society of Canada
P.O. Box 944, Station F
Toronto, Ontario M4Y 2N9

Comment on “Socialism and the Market”

Somehow the De Leonist Society of Canada and I seem fated to disagree. Part of the problem is the loosening of the theoretical restraints over the past few years. All DeLeonists, including those in the Socialist Labor Party and the DLS have departed from the orthodoxy they prevailed—at least on the surface—before about 1975. Unfortunately we didn’t all depart at the same time nor did we all forsake the same articles of DeLeonist faith.

I’ll admit to having been a firm believer in the idea of labor vouchers up to quite recently. For one thing the idea has impeccable antecedents, based as it is on the thinking of both Marx and De Leon. And there is another reason that resonates with anyone who has tried to convert newcomers to the idea of non-market socialism: Vouchers provide a mechanism to prevent lazy people from avoiding their share of the work in a socialist society. If you don’t work, you don’t eat. And there is an even better refinement possible: Since the amount of labor time embodied in any good or service can be determined to the second, each of us can decide for him/her self the standard of living we want to enjoy and put in just the number of hours necessary to produce the material things we feel we need. And best of all, the real slackers in capitalist society, the capitalists and their business and political bureaucracy, who do no useful labor at all, will have to do some heavy lifting.

But there are problems with the voucher idea. For one thing, as described in SLP literature vouchers are remarkably like money, and the new system sounds like the old market system with a new medium of exchange. Next there are the problems involved in quantifying goods and services in terms of time. This in itself requires labor time by people working outside the areas we usually think of as useful production. In fact their activity would be remarkably like that of banking or business accounting and might well develop the aspect of control associated with accounting.

I won’t even go into the DLS’s ideas about the two-stage transition to socialism and the “destructive element” in the new society, both of which seem to be borrowed from Leninism.
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In the preceding part of Chapter 2 of Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, John Crump identified the five strands of non-market socialism that exist at the present time: anarchocommunism, impossibilism, council communism, Bordigism, and situationism. He then spelled out the five principles that distinguish these from the varieties of Leninism and Social Democracy that constitute the leftwing of capitalism:

1. Production for use
2. Distribution according to need
3. Voluntary labor
4. A classless society
5. Opposition to state capitalism

Crump then goes on to discuss briefly the disagreements among the five “strands” that constitute the “thin red line” of non-market socialism. He concludes that the differences, some of which stem from the historical circumstances of their formation, are not so important as to render their cooperation impossible at the time our class is forced to overthrow capital. In fact he believes one likely development will be some kind of coalescing of these strands.

-FG

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE NON-MARKET SOCIALISTS

Having identified the five principles which the various currents of non-market socialists collectively hold, the issues which have separated these currents and provoked their mutual criticism must also be considered briefly.

The anarchocommunists have seen Marxism as yet another
form of politics which seeks to maintain the power of the
state. Not only have anarcho-communists identified Marxism
with statism in general, but in particular they have identified
Marxism with the Leninist states. They have argued that the
characteristics of Leninist state capitalism derive from the
Marxist principles on which it claims to be based. Conversely,
just as the anarcho-communists generally have made no dis-
tinction between Marxism and Leninism, so the other non-
market socialist currents have reciprocated by indiscrimi-
nately lumping the anarcho-communists together with all
other varieties of anarchists, be they Stirnerite individualists,
anarcho-capitalist 'libertarians' or whatever. In other words,
they have chosen to ignore the commitment of the anarcho-
communists to communism.

Although not all impossibilists have been committed to par-
liamentary activity, the SPGB – as the best-known impossibilist
group – has been separated from the other currents of non-
market socialists perhaps above all by its belief that parlia-
mentary elections can be put to a revolutionary use. The SPGB
has insisted that the paradigm of socialist revolution consists
of the working class consciously electing a majority of socialist
MPs to the national assemblies in different countries, where-
upon 'the machinery of government . . . may be converted
from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emana-
tion'. A parliamentary strategy of this type has been
anathema to the other currents of non-market socialists.

Council communism has emphasised the part to be played
by councils in the projected socialist revolution; and has com-
bined its advocacy of councils with hostility towards trade
unions. One repercussion of this emphasis on councils has
been a perennial difficulty faced by council communists when
it comes to deciding the respective roles of the workers' coun-
cils and the political party. Hence, one can say that not only
has the council communists' emphasis on councils separated
them from the other currents of non-market socialists, but
that it has also acted as a source of division among the council
communists themselves. In extreme cases, attachment to the
workers' councils as an organisational form has entirely
eclipsed the communist element in council communism,
resulting in a variety of 'councillism' which is compatible with
production for the market.
The Bordigists have seen themselves as a vanguard which must lead the working class to socialism. Their conviction that they have the responsibility to lead the working class derives from the premise that only after the achievement of socialism could the mass of the workers become conscious socialists. The other currents of non-market socialists have denounced the Bordigists' vanguardism and have argued that (to quote from the statutes of the First International) 'the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself' and not of self-appointed leaders.

Perhaps because of their artistic origins, the situationists have often seemed to be more concerned with self-expression than with communicating their ideas to wage-earners. The situationists have seen the other currents of non-market socialists as outdated and, at best, the products of earlier stages of capitalist development. On the other hand, the other currents of non-market socialists have often criticised the situationists as 'modernists' who have been overly influenced by current intellectual fashions and who have shirked the arduous toil of sustained, organised activity within the working class.

The differences between the various currents of non-market socialists are deep-rooted and have acted to keep these currents separate from one another and mutually hostile. Despite this, the claim which is advanced here is that these differences constitute a 'periphery' which is relatively less important than the commonly held 'core' of socialist principles which were examined earlier. What grounds are there for regarding the 'core' as more significant than the 'periphery'? Essentially, the argument is that the 'core' principles of socialism relate to the vital task of posing a socialist alternative to capitalism, while the 'peripheral' differences largely arise from the debate over how socialism can be achieved (by means of parliamentary elections, workers' councils, vanguard parties and so on). Of course, one cannot pretend that the method of achieving socialism is an unimportant question. Certainly, the choice of means has implications for the nature of the projected end. Nevertheless, in the circumstances of the twentieth century, when socialism is widely misunderstood as Social Democracy and Leninism, the prime responsibility of socialists is to encourage wage-earners, as
they come into conflict with capital, to see that a non-market alternative to capitalist production represents the only lasting solution to their problems. In this regard, all five currents of non-market socialists have played a positive role. On the other hand, precisely because for most of this century mere handfuls of wage-earners have been committed to non-market socialism, the fierce polemics over the means to achieve socialism which non-market socialists have engaged in have been largely academic.

One can illustrate the above argument by taking the Bordigists as an example and considering further their commitment to vanguardism. As has already been mentioned, with the exception of the Bordigists, most non-market socialists reject the idea that a vanguard can lead the wage-earners to socialism. They interpret the maxim of the First International that 'the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself' to mean that capitalism can only be overthrown, and that socialism can only be achieved, by a majority of conscious socialists. On the other hand, the Bordigists believe that a socialist majority is unattainable under capitalism. They envisage the socialist revolution in terms of action by a vanguard because they insist that only in the changed material conditions of socialism could the majority become socialists.

Some non-market socialists would see this as sufficient reason for denying that the Bordigists are socialists. However, I think it can be shown that the Bordigists' vanguardism is not crucially important in the present situation. Like the other currents of non-market socialists, the Bordigists engage in activity to challenge capitalist ideology and to popularise socialist ideas. Depending on the country and the cultural environment in which they exist, wage-earners may stumble across the Bordigists or across one of the other currents of non-market socialism. Just as with any other current of non-market socialism, wage-earners who make contact with the Bordigists will find the experience useful for gaining a recognition of what socialism genuinely means. Similarly, they can gain from the Bordigists an understanding that capitalism is a single, unified world system, which exists in all countries and dominates the entire globe. Looked at in this way, the question of vanguardism has little significance under present
circumstances. Any wage-earner who encounters the Bordigists and is impressed by their theories is accepted as part of the vanguard. Nobody who agrees is turned away; it is assumed that they are part of the vanguard.

The Bordigists' image of themselves as a vanguard is not vitally important at present because the question of vanguardism will ultimately be settled by the practical actions of wage-earners at the relevant time. It is up to the wage-earners to carry out the socialist revolution and to prove the Bordigists wrong. Of course, if the Bordigists persisted with their determination to act as a vanguard even in the face of a majority of conscious socialists, the situation would be drastically different from that which currently pertains— and this would call for a drastically different response. Suppose that under the circumstances where a majority of conscious socialists were actually engaged in transforming society to socialism, the Bordigists were to proclaim: 'Hands off the socialist revolution! It is our affair. We do not recognise that you workers are capable of achieving socialist consciousness.' Clearly, in such a situation, additional principles to those which have been formulated to cover present circumstances would swiftly be generated, and equally swiftly (and deservedly) the workers would sweep the Bordigists and all other would-be leaders aside.

Implicit in the foregoing discussion is the idea that the distinction between 'core' and 'periphery' is not fixed, but reflects the prevailing circumstances. In the current situation, the prime responsibility of socialists is to challenge the economic mechanism and the set of social relations which constitute capitalism by demonstrating that society would be organised differently in socialism. The core principles of socialism which were formulated earlier are a reflection of this priority, in that they are principally concerned with the question of (capitalist or socialist) ends. In a different situation, when the socialist revolution was imminent, the question of means (how to effect the socialist transformation of society) would also demand urgent attention. Consequently, the key principles of socialism would necessarily have to be extended in order to encompass the pressing questions of means as well as ends. As a result, the boundary between 'core' and 'peripheral' questions would naturally alter, and a more exten-
sive set of criteria for distinguishing socialists from non-socialists would be required than at present. However, to anticipate this development, and to construct artificially an extended set of socialist principles which encompass means as well as ends, even when the circumstances of the socialist revolution lie in the future and hence are speculative, is to ignore material conditions and to construct a suprahistorical theory.

One reason why the distinction between 'core' and 'peripheral' areas of their theory has not been made by the non-market socialists is the tendency of most currents to set themselves up as a minuscule group or 'party', which boasts a detailed programme encompassing every aspect of socialist theory. Under current conditions, the group then becomes a besieged citadel which confronts not only the hostile capitalist world but also the majority of wage-earners, whose ideas about socialism are the result of the illusions spread by Social Democrats and Leninists. In such a situation, the group battles to maintain its doctrinal purity in the face of the constant threat of being swamped by the ideology of capitalism. The very survival of the group seems to depend on the grim defence of every dot and comma of group doctrine, and the resulting 'besieged citadel' mentality makes it difficult to distinguish what is crucial in the group's programme from what is contingent (in the terms of this discussion, the 'core' from the 'periphery').

REJECTION OF THE 'TRANSITIONAL SOCIETY'

If and when the time comes when the mass of wage-earners turn to non-market socialism as the means to liberate themselves, it is possible, and even likely, that all the existing currents of non-market socialists will be superseded and that an entirely new movement will be built. Even so, the 'core' principles of socialism which the five currents of non-market socialists have collectively maintained will be the theoretical foundation stones on which a mass movement of genuine socialists will be constructed. In fact, the process of superseding the five currents does not lie entirely in the future. It is a process which proceeds continually, so that in recent
decades new developments have taken place and groups have emerged which are significant.

In my view, the most important development which needs to take place within the milieu of non-market socialism (and which, to an extent, is taking place) is for the notion of a supposed 'transitional society' between capitalism and socialism to be rejected. To the extent that this development occurs, it enables non-market socialism to differentiate itself even more clearly from Social Democracy and Leninism, by adding a further principle to the five socialist principles which we identified earlier. The sixth principle can be formulated as follows:

(6) Capitalism can be transcended only by immediately being replaced by socialism.

'To talk in terms of capitalism 'immediately being replaced by socialism' is not to suggest that socialism will be free of problems when it is first established. No doubt, the mess which capitalism has made of the world will ensure that there are major problems which a newly emergent socialist society will have to solve. Yet what the phrase 'immediately being replaced by socialism' does imply is that the solution of these problems bequeathed by capitalism will have to take place from the outset on a socialist basis. Various approaches which are popularly misunderstood as 'transitional' can be ruled out in advance. For example, one could not have bits of socialism transplanted into still-functioning capitalism, any more than elements of capitalism could be left in situ within newly established socialism. Still less could one legitimately describe the doomed offspring which would result from such far-fetched attempts at social hybridisation as a 'transitional society'.

One feature which capitalism and socialism have in common is their all-or-nothing quality, their inability to coexist in today's highly integrated world, which can provide an environment for only one or other of these rival global systems. In the circumstances of the twentieth century, the means of production must either function as capital throughout the world (in which case wage labour and capitalism persist internationally) or they must be commonly owned and democratically
controlled at a global level (in which case they would be used to produce wealth for free, worldwide distribution). No halfway house between these two starkly opposed alternatives exists, and it is the impossibility of discovering any viable 'transitional' structures which ensures that the changeover from world capitalism to world socialism will have to take the form of a short, sharp rupture (a revolution), rather than an extended process of cumulative transformation.

How, then, might a newly emergent socialist society solve problems, such as shortage of food, which capitalism has created? The first point to make is that the problem of twentieth-century hunger is a social problem and not a technical problem. Technically, the means to feed the world's population are within humankind's reach, but it is capitalism's priority of production for profit which prevents plentiful conditions from being actually realised. Socialism will remove the straitjacket which calculations of profitability impose on production, so that a situation of abundance – where men, women and children throughout the world will be able to take according to their self-determined needs – will be rapidly achieved.

Nevertheless, accessible though such a situation is, its achievement will require time. The time involved will certainly be nothing like the relatively lengthy process which Marx envisaged in 1873 before 'all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly.' Nothing is more ridiculous today than to repeat the stale formulae of more than one hundred years ago, and hence to ignore the immense developments in the techniques of producing wealth which capitalism has (or, more accurately, the wage-earning wealth producers within capitalism have) brought about. As far as the production of food is concerned, we are talking of at most a few harvests before enough food – and more than enough – could be produced for every man, woman and child to have free access to whatever they required. How might socialist society organise itself during the intervening months or, at most, few years before actual plenty would be produced?

Certainly the answer is not by constructing a 'transitional society' sandwiched between capitalism and socialism. What will be required will be temporary measures which are compatible with, and will lend strength to, emergent socialism; not the construction of a so-called 'transitional society' which
would need to be dismantled before socialism could even be instituted. Obviously, the men and women who have newly established socialism will first turn to the 'milk lakes' and the 'butter mountains' which capitalism has accumulated because of its inability to sell such commodities profitably on the world markets. Many nation-states also have strategic stocks of vital supplies, designed to provide some security against the disruption of supplies in the event of war. Since the establishment of socialism will entail the immediate abolition of all markets, nations and wars, sources of supply such as these will be turned to socially useful ends and made freely available.

The scale of any shortages which could not be eliminated by such stop-gap measures is a matter of speculation, but let us assume that shortages would exist for a time before production on a socialist basis could get fully under way and abundance could be attained. How would socialist men and women handle such shortages? It is out of the question that they would make selective use of the wages system or monetary distribution. Such measures would not be 'transitional' but would instead guarantee the continuation of capitalism. Equally unthinkable would be any suggestion that a machinery of state might be retained temporarily as a 'transitional' apparatus for enforcing a rationing system. The persistence of the state would signify that class divisions had not been eradicated. Newly emergent socialism, struggling to solve the problems which it has inherited from capitalism, will have to meet any shortages by relying on the very item it can safely be assumed it will have in abundance: revolutionary enthusiasm.

In the Critique of the Gotha Programme, Marx asserted that 'Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned thereby.' With regard to the long-term functioning of socialist society, he was absolutely right. Any attempt to run socialism, year after year, by compensating for material shortages by ideological appeals to revolutionary enthusiasm would be bound to fail. But thanks to the material advances brought about by capitalism, long-term shortages are not the problems with which socialism would now have to grapple. The problems which are likely to arise are those associated with temporary shortfalls prior to the attainment of abundance; and it is
precisely such a transient situation which could be negotiated by relying on revolutionary solidarity.

It will be the revolutionary enthusiasm of millions of socialist men and women, and their determination to make a success of the new society, which will bring about the transformation of the capitalist world in the first place, as they take whatever actions are necessary to bring the means of production under common ownership. These same qualities of enthusiasm and determination will not suddenly evaporate as soon as the means of production are freed from their role of capital. They will exist as a massive reservoir of popular commitment to the goals of socialism, and it is these reserves of revolutionary ardour which people will be able to tap in order to tide society over any period of temporary scarcity. It will be no great hardship for revolutionary men and women to restrict voluntarily certain areas of their own consumption until universal plenty is secured. Having recently stormed the citadels of capitalist power, these selfsame revolutionary men and women will make light of any further period of temporary and selective self-restraint that is necessary – perceiving it as a continuation of the revolution, a small additional price to pay in order to eliminate capitalist misery and indignity for ever.

It always was an illusion to imagine that the route from capitalist scarcity to socialist abundance lies along a diversonary path marked with signposts to an imaginary 'transitional society'. The route to socialism has to be direct; as a moneysocless, classless, stateless world community, socialism has to be achieved immediately, or not at all; and any temporary lack of abundance has to be compensated for by the revolutionary enthusiasm of the millions of men and women who will be the collective builders of the socialist world. Fortunately, it is the technological advances of capitalism which have ensured that – given the will for socialism – full-scale abundance can be instituted rapidly. In the light of the productive potential now available to humankind, the notion of a 'transitional society' should clearly be seen not as a bridge leading beyond capitalism, but rather as an ideological barrier obstructing the path to socialism.

The idea of a society which acts as a 'transitional' stage between capitalism and socialism has largely been absent from
the thinking of the anarcho-communists, impossibilists and situationists, but it has been entertained by some council communists and the Bordigists. For example, in 1930 the Group of International Communists of Holland (GIO) borrowed some of Marx’s speculations in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* and envisaged a ‘transitional society’ based on exchange and labour-time calculation. As for the Bordigists, they have taken the view that the party should exercise power after the revolution and administer a society which essentially would remain capitalist for a period until socialism could be achieved. We have seen the dire effects which result from the Trotskyist belief that Russia, China and the other state capitalist countries are ‘transitional’ ‘workers’ states’. Council communist and Bordigist ideas have been less damaging because, unlike the Trotskyists, these currents do not identify their notional ‘transitional society’ with any existing state. Yet even so, all notions of a ‘transitional society’ are both mistaken and fraught with peril. They are mistaken because capitalism and socialism (as market and non-market societies respectively) are totally incompatible, so that no ‘transitional’ combination of capitalist and socialist elements is possible. They are perilous because entertaining the notion of a ‘transitional society’ inevitably results in the goal of socialism, to a greater or lesser extent, being eclipsed. It is for these reasons that I have argued that all non-market socialists should reject the notion that a ‘transitional society’ will be interposed between capitalism and socialism. The problems confronting human-kind are too grim to allow the wage-earners of the world to solve them by ‘transitional’ half measures. Only the complete abolition of the market, classes, the state and national frontiers offers hope for the future.

**Notes**

3. Ibid.

(Note: If all goes well, DB102 will carry at least the first half of Alain Pengam’s 22-page Chapter 3, “Anarcho-Communism.” The intention is to publish the rest of *Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* in installments with the exception of Chapter 1, which deals with the nineteenth century. The remaining chapters discuss impossibilism, council communism, Bordigism, and situationism. –fg)
Another Reply to Mike Ballard

The historic fact of the organizational nature of the IWW is its nature as a federation. This was a historic reaction to the problems of trade unions and the political party domination of the trade unions at the turn of the century. The problem is that if the IWW voted to become the Boy Scouts of America they would do so, and it would be democratic.

The IWW does not take responsibility for what is printed in its own paper, even if it's the general secretary of the IWW itself advocating entry into trade unions in order to radicalize them enough so that maybe some workers might be able to get a fair shake.

Ballard writes that "the IWW neither endorses electoral programs nor abstention vis-a-vis elections" (except in their paper which of course they do not take responsibility for). This does not however indicate any clear position on the nature of elections within the capitalist national economy. Clearly, abstentionism is not action, but voting is the wrong action. Instead of voting it should be the main priority of revolutionaries to build a revolutionary press and to try to encourage, whenever and wherever possible, to form their own organizations of struggle.

It is indicative of the method of the IWW to maintain that it is possible to vote to achieve universal health care, like most of the "left" it fails to take into account the historical realities of the present period in which such social reforms represent expenditures that the capitalists as a class can no longer afford to make, essentially being viewed by the ruling class as a waste of capital. It is something that today cannot happen, and yet the "left" refuses to give up its grand dream of a functioning social democratic capitalism.

His take on my criticism of solidarity work in support of the EZLN, no matter how democratic their councils may function, that they are still tied via their leadership, whose economic and political program is one of support for national capital or state-capitalism. The EZLN has its beginnings when 12 would be guerrilleros marched off into the hills of southern Mexico. These people belonged to an organization called Linfa Proletaria that was avowedly Maoist. One of these went on to become Comandante Marcos himself, who holds more weight no matter how democratic, in the organization of this "revolution" than all of the IWWs combined. As in the unions the IWW tail ends the struggle for the defense of national capital as represented in the programs of both the EZLN (and the PRD) to restore government subsidies to agriculture and maintain what left of the state owned sector of the Mexican economy. What this mistaken view fails to take into account is the natural tendency of capitalism to tear down all national barriers to its expansion and the current crisis of capitalism which requires the elimination of all forms of the social wage everywhere, even in the great West European bastions of Social-Democracy.

Ballard's use of the quote from the Anarcho-Syndicalist Review indicates the misconceptions of anarchosyndicalism as a whole and the IWW in particular. That the Spanish Civil War is referred to as the Spanish Revolution is ironic in that the CNT-FAI in Spain fought side by side with the Stalinists in defense of the democratic republic, issuing joint slogans on posters with the Stalinist PCE such as "Fatherland or Death! ". The CNT even got representation in the Spanish Parliament. Often the record of anarchosyndicalism, in Spain is one of betrayals and contradictions to the oft proclaimed
principles of anarcho-syndicalism or comunismo libertario. Such betrayals were the direct consequence of their policies as well as their theoretical conceptions. The history of organizing peasants councils in Spain goes back a good deal further than the Spanish Civil War. In

The organization of councils in the Russian Revolution was not by any stretch of the imagination limited to anarchists. Indeed the Communist Left in Russia, the Worker's Opposition, did the same. These councils were the product of the struggles of workers, peasants and soldiers themselves with Communists, Social-Democrats, Anarchists and even Monarchists participating in them. Peasants councils in Russia during the revolution were often little more than the traditional town councils under the name of "soviet".

As for the direction that the struggle in Mexico has taken, it has been one of democratic capitalism and defense of national capital from day one. Again it is the fetish for the perfect democratic organizational form that has taken precedence over clarity of ideas and actions this manifests itself clearly throughout Comrade Ballard's polemics.

When a co-op fails or a union predictably betrays and works against the interests of workers it is not viewed as an outcome of their program in action but portrayed as a betrayal of some idea in principle. The reference made to the failure which I made, was simply to illustrate an example of the direction a co-op must take in order to survive in a capitalist economy. The IWW does not simply allow individual co-op members to join but allows cooperative businesses to join as IWW "job shops", there is a distinct difference.

Historically there are two forms that reaction to the direction taken by Social-Democrats and Stalinist State Capitalists. The first is the avoidance of any attempt to create a revolutionary party in favor of a federative or councilist approach like the anarcho-syndicalists who reacted to the control and betrayal of workers at the hands of the Social-Democratic Parties or the Council Comunists who place all emphasis on the organizational form of the council, or more recently the Autonomists with their "Autonomist Workers Nuclei". The second approach is to reduce these counter-revolutionary betrayals of the workers to a lack of proper leadership, as Trotskyists always do. In reality both these courses of action are wrong. What is needed is to take an entirely different political path, to lay the basis for a world revolutionary party whose job is not to take power in anyone's name but to draw out the historical lessons to be learned from the struggles of the past and to point a way forward to practical activity that seeks to bring about the downfall of capitalism worldwide. This polemic between myself and FW Ballard has illustrated quite clearly the differences between our respective groups.

A. Smeaton for Internationalist Notes, PO Box 1531, Eau Claire, WI 54702

Note 1, See: Spain 1936: Myth and Reality. Revolutionary Perspectives. Series 3 No. 1. Available from the Communist Workers Organization: PO Box 338, Sheffield S3 9YX, UK or online at: http://www.ibTP.orR
UBU SAVED FROM DROWNING: CLASS STRUGGLE AND STATIST CONTAINMENT IN PORTUGAL AND SPAIN, 1974-1977
by Loren Goldner
(Review: The Last Worker Revolts in the West in the Era of the Big Factory)

Little remembered today, the worker insurgencies in Portugal and Spain at the end of the Salazar and Franco dictatorships were, for a brief moment in the mid-1970s, at the center of world politics. They occurred in the midst of the 1973-1975 crisis of world accumulation, in which capitalism was "changing gears" from the era of the big factory and the assembly line to the era of "globalization", de-industrialization, outsourcing, downsizing and "just in time", the era in which we live today. They took place in a conjuncture that included the deepest economic downturn (to date) since the end of World War II, the advance of "Euro-communism", the U.S. defeat in Indochina, the triumph of "national liberation fronts" in the ex-Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, and the crisis in the Horn of Africa. World capitalism, centered in the U.S., seemed to be everywhere involved in putting out fires, but the Iberian insurgencies were unique among these simultaneous crises in being centered on the working class, and, particularly in the case of Portugal, directly posing the question of the state and unmasking the pretensions of different factions of "progressive" state bureaucrats. They were the most genuinely radical moments of the (mainly statist) "red mirage" that, briefly, seemed to have placed world capitalism on the defensive. By the late 70s, capitalism had returned to the offensive, and the era of Thatcher and Reagan inaugurated a rollback that swept away leftist statism, up to and including the Soviet Union itself.

What was ending was the century of the "progressive" state bureaucrat, who had entered the international workers' movement in the German SPD and its 1875 Gotha Program, and who for 100 years...
seemed, in "socialist" and "communist" guise, to represent something "beyond capitalism." Events since 1975 have shown that the "progressive state bureaucrat," everywhere from England to China, represented, rather, something before capitalism, throwing the old statist "left" into terminal crisis. This book analyzes the last two Western worker revolts just before this turn, and shows how they already pointed toward a new era, though hardly the immediately revolutionary era they seemed to portend.

Now that the statist illusion of the revolutionary workers' movement has been laid to rest once and for all, the Portuguese and Spanish worker revolts of the mid1970's offer one benchmark from which to judge present and future struggles.

To order send a $10 (U.S.) check or money plus $1 (for U.S.) and $3 (for non-U.S.) postage.
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Dear Frank/DB

Many thanks for the review of the Daily Planet in DB100. Your sketch of the historical evolution of the Daily Planet was probably the most interesting piece I have ever read in the Discussion Bulletin. However, I must take issue with a major point of historical inaccuracy in your otherwise excellent piece.

As Danielle De Lion stated just before the 1908 'ouster,' "The Daily Planet was forged in the heat of battle in Metropolis," not Gotham City. She further developed this tangible basis for the way forward by paraphrasing Marx, when she stated, "If the working class cannot can not distinguish Bruce Wayne (Batman) from Clark Kent (Superman) then basically they do not know their arse from their elbow. For this reason in spite of our lack of numbers, it is essential to be emphatic about the mechanism to be used for social revolution. To insist the aforementioned class in its efforts to distinguish one caped crusader another, we insist that parliament and socialist industrial unionism are the joint means to escape from their current entanglement."

Danielle later went on to state that the precise means for change was in fact 'was socialist industrial unionism and parliament' and not the other way around as she had previously suggested.

Meanwhile, not back in Gotham, the Special Philosophers of Great Britain proved, almost conclusively, that the mechanism for change must logically be parliament alone. The vast majority went AWOL from the entire discussion on the mechanism but that does not mean they didn't understand the nuances of the argument.

Yours for the planet, Derek Devine

115 Henderson Row (1F1), Stockbridge, Edinburgh, UK, EH3 5BB
Dear DB,
What does the De Leonist Society of Canada make of the following extracts from the Socialist Standard, official journal of the SPGB, over the years?

"The workers must prepare themselves for their emancipation by class-conscious organisation on both the political and the economic fields, the first to gain control of the forces with which the masters maintain their dominance, the second to carry on production in the new order of things. The economic organisation, however, must be upon a basis higher and having a wider view than the industrial base. It must be organised upon the basis of a working class which becomes-what the basis of industries never can-a social basis as soon as the idle class is abolished and society becomes a society of workers" (Socialist Standard, July 1915).

"The Socialist Party, therefore, whilst holding that the working class must be organised, both politically and economically, for the establishment of Socialism, urges that the existing unions provide the medium through which the workers should continue their efforts to obtain the best conditions they can get from the master class in the sale of their labour-power. That the trade unions must inevitably accept the Socialist theory as the logical outcome of their own existence, and as such will provide the basis of the economic organisation of the working class to manipulate the means and instruments of wealth production and distribution when the capitalist ruling class have first been dislodged from political power. The essential conditions for obtaining Socialism must never be underestimated. At the very moment that the workers have gained control of the State machine provision must be made simultaneously for the economic requirements of the community. The Socialist working class of the future will, no doubt, see to this as one of its supreme functions" (Socialist Standard, November 1937).

"In rejecting the fallacies of the Industrial Unionists the Socialist Party never asserted that Socialist society would result from the actions of parliamentary delegates alone. It is completely illogical to imagine that Socialist understanding could grow to the point of political victory without simultaneously resulting in a growth of understanding and hence organisation to prepare for the taking over of industry. The Socialist Party in fact knows well that organisation is necessary for the running of industry in the new-born Socialist society. It holds also that a sizeable spread of political clear-sightedness will lead to the growth of such organisations, for when many workers want Socialism they will begin to organise and plan for the rebuilding of society prior to the capture of political power. We in fact stand for the principle, democratic organisation of class-conscious workers in contrast to the Industrial Unionist concept of industrial bodies built up upon the 'open-house' principle" (Socialist Standard, May 1966).

So much, I would have thought, for their claim, that the SPGB advocates a purely political revolution and even less for their utterly ridiculous claim (DB100,page22) that the SPGB stands for the administration of industry in Socialism by "a socialist political government" (anyone who knows anything about the SPGB knows it stands for a classless, STATELESS, moneyless, wageless society).

Adam Buick, Brussels, Belgium
23 March 2000
NOTES ANNOUNCEMENTS AND SHORT REVIEWS

A sample copy of Internationalist Perspective, the journal of a Bordigist group with the same name, was sent to nearly all individual DB subscribers recently. The exceptions were those whose last names begin with T through Z. Wanting to increase its circulation, IP wrote asking whether they could send sample copies to DB readers. They suggested a mechanism whereby the DB mailing list would not have to be shared. They would ship the sealed envelopes containing IP and a covering letter. They would also send a check to cover the postage. I agreed to affix a mailing label and postage as well as the DB's return address.

The same service is available to other “non-market” socialist/libertarian publications. Keep in mind that the non-profit bulk mail rate applies only to the DB, so any group using this service will have to pay first class postage for U.S. recipients and surface non-U.S. postage at “printed matter” rates for those sent elsewhere. The current mailing list has 250 names including exchanges. About a quarter of these are non-U.S. It’s too early to know how successful this has been, but others can keep it in mind.

Fifth Estate has come out of hibernation, perhaps as a result of events in Seattle. Whatever the cause, this “Seattle issue,” (Winter/spring 2000) is great. Like most radical journals (including the DB) it focuses on the struggle against the WTO with several “We won! What next?” and pro Black Bloc articles. The seven articles on Seattle cover a variety of reactions to it. As one might expect, a majority deal with some demonstrators’ failure to recognize the sacred nature of private property. Among these are the view of Michael Albert of Z Magazine, who argues that window breaking is defensible only when it won’t offend anyone and that of a Black Bloc proponent against the criticism by “respectable” demonstrators.

Another notable article more in keeping with FE’s philosophy is David Watson’s “A Humble Call to Subvert the Human Empire.” I think that Watson’s call for people to cut consumption and restrain their reproductive urges, if properly presented, might gain the approval of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for whom a frugal working class that limits its numbers to equal capital’s labor needs would be the answer to a prayer. Certainly Watson’s concern, the almost explosive industrial expansion that has marked the twentieth century deserves our attention. But his willingness to blame it on human nature raises some questions about his understanding of history. Has he considered the possibility that the real problem is the growth-oriented capitalist system and that the solution is the abolition of that system? Speaking of capitalism, this issue contains a historical footnote by Peter Werbe of the FE collective. He ascribes the origin of the phrase “name the enemy: capitalism” to an incident at an anti-Vietnam War demonstration in NY (or Washington) at which the speaker, the then chairman of SDS spoke of naming the enemy to which some of the radical SDSers, among them Werbe, responded by doing just that at the top of their voices.

The WSM Socialism Forum has sent correct information on the nature of the forum and how to reach it. List description: “Humanity is finally outgrowing capitalism, and it’s time for a major upgrade. The future is one of post-scarcity common ownership, free access and democratic control, and it’s on the horizon now. Join this Forum to find out about the World Socialist Movement and the biggest change in society since the discovery of electricity.” Subscriptions: WSM_Socialism_Forum-subscribe@onetlist.com - Subscribe to the list through email
WSM_Socialism_Forum-unsubscribe@onelist.com - Unsubscribe from the list
WSM_Socialism_digest@onelist.com - Switch your subscription to digest
WSM_Socialism_Forum-normal@onelist.com - Switch your subscription to normal
WSM_Socialism_Forum-owner@onelist.com - Sends email to the list moderators

Mike Lepore's socialism website has moved to: http://www.idsi.net/~lepore/soc/ Available on his site are many documents associated with the DeLeonist version of socialism. Readers interested in Socialist Industrial Unionism and in the groups that advocate it like the Socialist Labor Party, the Industrial Workers of the World, the New Union Party, and the New System will find interesting material here including excerpts from the writings of Rosa Luxemburg, Daniel De Leon, Karl Marx, Lewis Henry Morgan and others.

Mike also has an online bookstore at http://chird.8m.com

Renewing the Anarchist Tradition is the name of a conference to be held in Plainfield, Vermont August 24-27, 2000. Readers wanting more information or wanting to submit a proposal should contact Cindy Milstein, 5641 S. Blackstone Ave., Chicago, IL 60637 cmilstcnaol.com or John Petrovato, PO Box 715, Conway, MA 01341 ssimon@shavsnecom

Three Japanese Anarchists: Kôoku, Osugi, and Yamaga by Victor Garcia and The Couriers Are Revolting! The Despatch Industry Workers Union, 1889-92 by Des Patchrider are two recent pamphlets from the Kate Sharpley Library. Garcia’s 30 page pamphlet chronicles an anarchist movement under almost constant repression. Des Patchrider’s 26 pages on the efforts of bicycle riding messengers in London to organize a union after the IWW/syndicalist pattern describes the frustrations and the high spirited activity of the youthful radicals who hung on to their union for three years. $1.30 each from Kate Sharpley Library, BM Hurricane, London WC1N 3XX or $5 each postpaid from AK Press, PO Box 40682, San Francisco, CA 94160.

-fg