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DB 104 begins with a plan for what can only be a post-revolutionary society. Takis Fotopoulos's 'inclusive democracy' assumes a moneyless economy, the end of the market system, private ownership of the means of production, and, in many respects, it resembles the Libertarian Municipalism of Murray Bookchin, with whom Fotopoulos collaborated for some years in the publication of Society and Nature. Like libertarian municipalism it appears to be academically based, strictly the product of a think-tank rather than a social movement. Readers will find many familiar features in Fotopoulos's design for a new system including what appear to be labor time vouchers.
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INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY

Takis Fotopoulos

Inclusive democracy is a new conception of democracy, which, using as a starting point the classical definition of it, expresses democracy in terms of direct political democracy, economic democracy (beyond the confines of the market economy and state planning), as well as democracy in the social realm and ecological democracy. In short, inclusive democracy is a form of social organisation which re-integrates society with economy, polity and nature. The concept of inclusive democracy is derived from a synthesis of two major historical traditions, the classical democratic and the socialist, although it also encompasses radical green, feminist, and liberation movements in the South. Within the problematique of the inclusive democracy project, it is assumed that the world, at the beginning of the new millennium, faces a multi-dimensional crisis (economic, ecological, social, cultural and political) which is caused by the concentration of power in the hands of various elites, as a result of the establishment, in the last few centuries, of the system of market economy, representative democracy and the related forms of hierarchical structure. In this sense, an inclusive democracy, which involves the equal distribution of power at all levels, is seen not as a utopia (in the negative sense of the word) but as perhaps the only way out of the present crisis.

The conception of inclusive democracy

A fruitful way to define inclusive democracy may be to distinguish between the two main societal realms, the public and the private, to which we may add an "ecological realm", defined as the sphere of the relations between the natural and the social worlds. In this conception, the public realm, contrary to the practice of many supporters of the republican or democratic project (Hannah Arendt, Cornelius Castoriadis, Murray Bookchin et al.) includes not just the political realm, but also the economic realm as well as the social realm; in other words, any area of human activity in which decisions can be taken collectively and democratically. The political realm is defined as the sphere of political decision-taking, the area in which political power is exercised. The economic realm is defined as the sphere of economic decision-taking, the area in which economic power is exercised with respect to the broad economic choices that any society has to make. Finally, the social realm is defined as the sphere of decision-taking in the workplace, the education place and any other economic or cultural institution which is a constituent element of a democratic society.

It is therefore obvious that the extension of the traditional public realm to include the economic, ecological and 'social' realms is an indispensable element of an inclusive democracy. Correspondingly, we may distinguish between four main constituent elements of an inclusive democracy: the political, the economic, the ecological and 'democracy in the social realm'. The first three elements constitute the institutional framework which aims at the equal distribution of political, economic and social power respectively; in other words, the system which aims at the effective elimination of the domination of human being over human being. Similarly, ecological democracy is defined as the institutional framework which aims at the elimination of any human attempt to dominate the natural world, in other words, the system which aims to reintegrate humans and nature.

Political or direct democracy

In the political realm there can only be one form of democracy: what we may call in which political or direct democracy, in which political power is shared equally among all citizens, the self instituting society.

This means that the following conditions have to be satisfied for a society to be characterised as a political democracy:
1) that democracy is grounded on the conscious choice of its citizens for individual and collective autonomy and not on any divine or mystical dogmas and preconceptions, or any closed theoretical...
systems involving natural or economic 'laws', or tendencies determining social change.
2) that there are no institutionalised political processes of an oligarchic nature. This implies that all political decisions (including those relating to the formation and execution of laws) are taken by the citizen body collectively and without representation;
3) that there are no institutionalised political structures embodying unequal power relations. This means, for instance, that where authority is delegated to segments of the citizen body for the purpose of carrying out specific duties (e.g., serving in popular courts, or regional and confederal councils, etc.), the delegation is assigned, on principle, by lot and on a rotational basis, and it is always recallable by the citizen body. Furthermore, as regards delegates to regional and confederal bodies, the mandates should be specific.
4) that all residents of a particular geographical area (which today can only take the form of a geographical community), beyond a certain age of maturity (to be defined by the citizen body itself) and irrespective of gender, race, ethnic or cultural identity, are members of the citizen body and are directly involved in the decision-taking process.

However, the institutionalisation of direct democracy in terms of the above conditions is only the necessary condition for the establishment of democracy. The sufficient condition refers to the citizens' level of democratic consciousness, in which a crucial role is played by the paideia—invoking not simply education but character development and a well-rounded education in knowledge and skills, i.e. the education of the individual as citizen, which alone can give substantive content to the public space.

The above conditions are obviously not met by parliamentary democracy (as it functions in the West), soviet democracy (as it functioned in the East) and the various fundamentalist or semi-military regimes in the South. All these regimes are therefore forms of political oligarchy, in which political power is concentrated in the hands of various elites (professional politicians, party bureaucrats, priests, military and so on). Similarly, in the past, various forms of oligarchies dominated the political domain, when emperors, kings and their courts, with or without the co-operation of knights, priests and others, concentrated political power in their hands. However, several attempts have been made in history to institutionalise various forms of direct democracy, especially during revolutionary periods (for example, the Parisian sections of the early 1790s, the Spanish collectives in the civil war etc.). Most of these attempts were short-lived and usually did not involve the institutionalisation of democracy as a new form of political regime which replaces, and not just complements, the State. In other cases, democratic arrangements were introduced as a set of procedures for local decision-making. Perhaps the only real parallel which can be drawn with respect to Athenian democracy is that of some Swiss cantons which were governed by assemblies of the people (Landsgemeinden) and, in their day, were sovereign states. The only historical example of an institutionalised direct democracy in which, for almost two centuries (508/7 BC–322/1 BC, the state was subsumed into the democratic form of social organisation, is that of Athenian democracy. Of course, Athenian democracy was a partial political democracy. But, what characterised it as partial was not the political institutions themselves but the very narrow definition of full citizenship adopted by the Athenians—a definition which excluded large sections of the population (women, slaves, immigrants) who, in fact, constituted the vast majority of the people living in Athens.

Economic Democracy

If we define political democracy as the authority of the people (demos) in the political sphere—which implies the existence of political equality in the sense of equal distribution of political power—then economic democracy could be correspondingly defined as the authority of the demos in the economic sphere—which implies existence of economic equality in the sense of equal distribution of economic power. And, of course, we are talking about the demos and not the state, because the existence of a state means the separation of the citizen body from the political and economic process. Economic democracy therefore relates to every social system which institutionalises the
integration of society and the economy. This means that, ultimately, the demos controls the economic process, within an institutional framework of demotic ownership of the means of production.

In a more narrow sense, economic democracy also relates to every social system which institutionalises the minimisation of socio-economic differences, particularly those arising out of the unequal distribution of private property and the consequent unequal distribution of income and wealth. Historically, it is in this narrow sense that attempts were made by socialists to introduce economic democracy. Therefore, in contrast to the institutionalisation of political democracy, there has never been a corresponding example of an institutionalised economic democracy in the broad sense defined above. In other words, even when socialist attempts to reduce the degree of inequality in the distribution of income and wealth were successful, they were never associated with meaningful attempts to establish a system of equal distribution of economic power. This has been the case, despite the fact that in the type of society which has emerged since the rise of the market economy, there has been a definite shift of the economy from the private realm into what Hannah Arendt called the "social realm", to which the nation-state also belongs. But, it is this shift which makes a talk about democracy, which does not also refer to the question of economic power, ring hollow. In other words, to talk today about the equal sharing of political power, without conditioning it on the equal sharing of economic power, is meaningless.

On the basis of the definition of political democracy given earlier, the following conditions have to be satisfied for a society to be characterised as an economic democracy:

1) that there are no institutionalised economic processes of an oligarchic nature. This means that all "macro" economic decisions, namely, decisions concerning the running of the economy as a whole (overall level of production, consumption and investment, amounts of work and leisure implied, technologies to be used, etc.) are taken by the citizen body collectively and without representation, although "micro" economic decisions at the workplace or the household levels are taken by the individual production or consumption unit and

2) that there are no institutionalised economic structures embodying unequal economic power relations. This implies that the means of production and distribution are collectively owned and controlled by the demos, the citizen body directly. Any inequality of income is therefore the result of additional voluntary work at the individual level. Such additional work, beyond that required by any capable member of society for the satisfaction of basic needs, allows only for additional consumption, as no individual accumulation of capital is possible, and any wealth accumulated as a result of additional work is not inherited. Thus, demotic ownership of the economy provides the economic structure for democratic ownership, whereas direct citizen participation in economic decisions provides the framework for a comprehensively democratic control process of the economy. The community, therefore, becomes the authentic unit of economic life, since economic democracy is not feasible today unless both the ownership and control of productive resources are organised at the community level. So, unlike the other definitions of economic democracy, the definition given here involves the explicit negation of economic power and implies the authority of the people in the economic sphere. In this sense, economic democracy is the counterpart, as well as the foundation, of direct democracy and of an inclusive democracy in general.

A model of economic democracy, as an integral part of an inclusive democracy, is described in the first book-length description of Inclusive Democracy which was published in 1997 (see further reading).

Briefly, the dominant characteristic of this model, which differentiates it from similar models of centralised or decentralised Planning, is that, although it does not depend on the prior abolition of scarcity, it does secure the satisfaction of the basic needs of all citizens, without sacrificing freedom of choice, in a stateless, moneyless and marketless economy. The preconditions of economic democracy are defined as follows:

a) community self-reliance,

b) community (demotic) ownership of productive resources, and
c) confederal allocation of resources.

The third condition in particular implies that the decision mechanism for the allocation of scarce resources in an inclusive democracy should be based at the confederal rather than the community level, i.e. at the level of the confederation of communities (demai). This is in order to take into account the fact that in today's societies many problems cannot be solved at the community level (energy, environment, transportation, communication, technology transfer etc.). The mechanism proposed to allocate scarce resources aims to replace the market mechanism and the central planning mechanism.

The former is rejected because it can be shown that the system of the market economy has led, in the last two hundred years since its establishment, to a continuous concentration of income and wealth at the hands of a small percentage of the world population and, consequently, to a distorted allocation of world resources. This is because in a market economy the crucial allocation decisions (what to produce, how, and for whom to produce it) are conditioned by the purchasing power of those income groups which can back their demands with money. In other words, under conditions of inequality, which is an inevitable outcome of the dynamic of the market economy, the fundamental contradiction with respect to the market satisfaction of human needs becomes obvious: namely, the contradiction between the potential satisfaction of the basic needs of the whole population versus the actual satisfaction of the money-backed wants of part of it.

The latter is rejected because it can be shown that centralised planning, although better than the market system in securing employment and meeting the basic needs of citizens (albeit at an elementary level), not only leads to irrationalities (which eventually precipitated its actual collapse) and is ineffective in covering non-basic needs, but it is also highly undemocratic.

The system of allocation proposed by the Inclusive Democracy project aims to satisfy the twofold aim of

1. meeting the basic needs of all citizens- which requires that basic macroeconomic decisions are taken democratically and
2. securing freedom of choice- which requires the individual to take important decisions affecting his/her own life (what work to do, what to consume etc.).

Both the macro-economic decisions and the individual citizens' decisions are envisaged as being implemented through a combination of democratic planning which involves the creation of a feedback process between workplace assemblies, community assemblies and the confederal assembly— and an artificial 'market' which secures real freedom of choice, without incurring the adverse effects associated with real markets. In a nutshell, the allocation of economic resources is made first, on the basis of the citizens' collective decisions, as expressed through the community and confederal plans, and second, on the basis of the citizens' individual choices, as expressed through a voucher system. The general criterion for the allocation of resources is not efficiency as it is currently defined, in narrow techno-economic terms. Efficiency should be redefined to mean effectiveness in satisfying human needs and not just money-backed wants. As far as the meaning of needs is concerned, a distinction is drawn between basic and non-basic needs and a similar one between needs and 'satisfiers' (the form or the means by which these needs are satisfied). What constitutes a need -basic or otherwise- is determined by the citizens themselves democratically. Then, the level of need-satisfaction is determined collectively and implemented through a democratic planning mechanism, whereas the satisfiers for both basic and non-basic needs are determined through the revealed preferences of consumers, as expressed by the use of vouchers allocated to them in exchange for their 'basic' and 'non-basic' work.

Basic vouchers (BV's—allocated in exchange for 'basic' work, i.e. the number of hours of work required by each citizen working in a job of his/her choice so that basic needs are met) are used for the satisfaction of basic needs. These vouchers— which are personal and issued on behalf of the confederation— entitle each citizen to a given level of satisfaction for each particular type of need which has been characterised (democratically) as 'basic', but do not specify the particular type of satisfier, so that choice may be secured.

Non-basic vouchers (NBV's—allocated in exchange for non-basic work) are used for the satisfaction of non-basic needs (non-essential consumption) as well as for the satisfaction of basic needs beyond the level prescribed by the confederal assembly. NBVs, like BVs, are also personal and are issued on behalf
of each community, rather than on behalf of the confederation. Work by citizens over and above the 'basic' number of hours is voluntary and entitles them to NBVs, which can be used towards the satisfaction of non-essential needs. 'Prices' in this system, instead of reflecting scarcities relative to a skewed income and wealth pattern (as in the market economy system), function as rationing devices to match scarcities relative to citizens' desires, i.e. as guides for a democratic allocation of resources. Therefore, prices, instead of being the cause of rationing-as in the market system-become the effect of it

and are assigned the role of equating demand and supply in an artificial "market" which secures the sovereignty of both consumers and producers. The 'prices' formed in this way, together with a complex drawn on the basis of the citizen's preferences as to the type of work which citizens wish to do, determine a 'subjective' rate of remuneration for non basic work, in place of the 'objective' rate suggested by the labour theory of value.

As the above brief description of the model of economic democracy makes clear, the project for an inclusive democracy refers to a future international political economy which transcends both the political economy of state socialism, as realised in the countries of the ex 'actually existing socialism' in Eastern Europe, and the political economy of the market economy, either in its mixed economy form of the social democratic consensus, or in its present neo-liberal form.

Democracy in the social realm

The satisfaction of the above conditions for political and economic democracy would represent the re-conquering of the political and economic realms by the public realm- that is, the reconquering of a true social individuality, the creation of the conditions of freedom and self-determination, both at the political and the economic levels. However, political and economic power are not the only forms of power and, therefore, political and economic democracy do not, by themselves, secure an inclusive democracy. In other words, an inclusive democracy is inconceivable unless it extends to the broader social realm to embrace the workplace, the household, the educational institution and indeed any economic or cultural institution which constitutes an element of this realm.

Historically, various forms of democracy in the social realm have been introduced, particularly during this century, usually in periods of revolutionary activity.

However, these forms of democracy were not only short-lived but seldom extended beyond the workplace (e.g. Hungarian workers' councils in 1956) and the education institution (e.g. Paris student assemblies in 1968).

The issue today is how to extend democracy to other forms of social organisation, like the household, without dissolving the private/public realm divide. In other words, how, while maintaining and enhancing the autonomy of the two realms, such institutional arrangements are adopted which introduce democracy to the household and the social realm in general and — at the same time—enhance the institutional arrangements of political and economic democracy. In fact, an effective democracy is inconceivable unless free time is equally distributed among all citizens, and this condition can never be satisfied as long as the present hierarchical conditions in the household, the workplace and elsewhere continue. Furthermore, democracy in the social realm, particularly in the household, is impossible, unless such institutional arrangements are introduced which recognise the character of the household as a needs-satisfier and integrate the care and services provided within its framework into the general scheme of needs satisfaction.

Ecological Democracy

If we see democracy as a process of social self-institution in which there is no divinely or 'objectively' defined code of human conduct there are no guarantees that an inclusive democracy would secure an ecological democracy in the sense defined above. Therefore, the replacement of the market economy by a new institutional framework of inclusive democracy constitutes only the necessary condition for a
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Democracy in the social realm
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The issue today is how to extend democracy to other forms of social organisation, like the household, without dissolving the private/public realm divide. In other words, how, while maintaining and enhancing the autonomy of the two realms, such institutional arrangements are adopted which introduce democracy to the household and the social realm in general and - at the same time - enhance the institutional arrangements of political and economic democracy. In fact, an effective democracy is inconceivable unless free time is equally distributed among all citizens, and this condition can never be satisfied as long as the present hierarchical conditions in the household, the workplace and elsewhere continue. Furthermore, democracy in the social realm, particularly in the household, is impossible, unless such institutional arrangements are introduced which recognise the character of the household as a needs-satisfier and integrate the care and services provided within its framework into the general scheme of needs satisfaction.

Ecological Democracy

If we see democracy as a process of social self -institution in which there is no divinity or 'objectively' defined code of human conduct there are no guarantees that an inclusive democracy would secure an ecological democracy in the sense defined above. Therefore, the replacement of the market economy by a new institutional framework of inclusive democracy constitutes only the necessary condition for a
harmonious relation between the natural and social worlds. The sufficient condition refers to the citizens' level of ecological consciousness. Still, the radical change in the dominant social paradigm which will follow the institution of an inclusive democracy, combined with the decisive role that 2aeoela will play in an environmentally-friendly institutional framework, could reasonably be expected to lead to a radical change in the human attitude towards Nature. In other words, there are strong grounds for believing that the relationship between an inclusive democracy and Nature would be much more harmonious than could ever be achieved in a market economy, or one based on state socialism. The factors supporting this view refer to all three elements of an inclusive democracy: political, economic and social.

At the political level, there are grounds for believing that the creation of a public space will in itself have a very significant effect on reducing the appeal of materialism. This is because the public space will provide a new meaning of life to fill the existential void that the present consumer society creates. The realisation of what it means to be human could reasonably be expected to throw us back toward Nature.

Also, at the economic level, it is not accidental that, historically, the process of destroying the environment en masse has coincided with the process of marketization of the economy. In other words, the emergence of the market economy and of the consequent growth economy had crucial repercussions on the society-Nature relationship and led to the rise of the ideology of growth as the dominant social paradigm. Thus, an instrumentalist view of Nature became dominant, in which Nature was seen as an instrument for economic growth, within a process of endless concentration of power. If we assume that only a confederal society could secure an inclusive democracy today, it would be reasonable to assume further that once the market economy is replaced by a democratically run confederal economy, the grower-die dynamics of the former will be replaced by the new social dynamic of the latter: a dynamic aiming at the satisfaction of the community needs and not at growth per se. If the satisfaction of community needs does not depend, as at present, on the continuous expansion of production to cover the 'needs' which the market creates, and if the link between economy and society is restored, then there is no reason why the present instrumentalist view of Nature should continue to condition human behaviour.

Furthermore, democracy in the broader social realm could also be reasonably expected to be environmentally-friendly. The phasing out of patriarchal relations in the household and hierarchical relations in general should create a new ethos of nondomination which would embrace both Nature and Society. In other words, the creation of democratic conditions in the social realm should be a decisive step in the creation of the sufficient condition for a harmonious nature-society relationship.

Finally, the fact that the basic unit of social, economic and political life in a confederal democracy would be the community might also be expected to enhance its environmentally-friendly character. It is reasonable to assume—and the evidence of the remarkable success of local communities in safeguarding their environments is overwhelming—that when people rely directly on their natural surroundings for their livelihood, they will develop an intimate knowledge of those surroundings, which will necessarily affect positively their behaviour towards them. However, the precondition for local control of the environment to be successful is that the community depends on its natural surroundings for its long-term livelihood and that it, therefore, has a direct interest in protecting it—another reason why an ecological society is impossible without economic democracy.

A new conception of citizenship

The above conditions for democracy imply a new conception of citizenship: economic, political, social and cultural. Thus, political citizenship involves new political structures and the return to the classical conception of politics (direct democracy). Economic citizenship involves new economic structures of community ownership and control of economic resources (economic democracy). Social citizenship involves self-management structures at the workplace, democracy in the household and new welfare structures in which all basic needs (to be democratically determined) are covered by community resources, whether they are satisfied in the household or at the community level. Finally, cultural citizenship involves new democratic structures of dissemination and control of information and culture (mass media, art, etc.), which allow every member of the community to take part in the process and at
the same time develop his/her intellectual and cultural potential.

Although this sense of citizenship implies a sense of political community, which, defined
geographically, is the fundamental unit of political, economic and social life, still, it is assumed that this
political community interlocks with various other communities (cultural, professional, ideological, etc.).
Therefore, the community and citizenship arrangements do not rule out cultural differences or other
differences based on gender, age, ethnicity and so on but simply provide the public space in which such
differences can be expressed; furthermore, these arrangements institutionalise various safety valves that
aim to rule out the marginalisation of such differences by the majority. What, therefore, unites people in a
political community, or a confederation of communities, is not some set of common values, imposed by a
nationalist ideology, a religious dogma, a mystical belief, or an 'objective' interpretation of natural or
social 'evolution', but the democratic institutions and practices, which have been set up by citizens
themselves.

It is obvious that the above new conception of citizenship has very little in common with the liberal
and socialist definitions of citizenship which are linked to the liberal and socialist conceptions of human
rights respectively. Thus, for the liberals, the citizen is simply the individual bearer of certain freedoms
and political rights recognised by law which, supposedly, secure equal distribution of political power. Also,
for the socialists, the citizen is the bearer not only of political rights and freedoms but, also, of some
social and economic rights, whereas for Marxists the citizenship is realised with the collective ownership
of the means of production. The conception of citizenship adopted here, which could be called a
democratic conception, is based on the above definition of inclusive democracy and presupposes a
'participatory' conception of active citizenship, like the one implied by the work of Hannah Arendt. In this
conception, political activity is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. It is, therefore, obvious that this
conception of citizenship is qualitatively different from the liberal and social-democratic conceptions
which adopt an 'instrumentalist' view of citizenship, i.e. a view which implies that citizenship entitles
citizens with certain rights which they can exercise as means to the end of individual welfare.

Applications

A well-developed body of knowledge already exists regarding Inclusive Democracy and its applications.
Crucial matters such as strategy of transition to an inclusive democracy, the relationship of science and
technology to democracy, the significance of the rise of irrationalism with respect to the democratic
project, the interrelationship between culture, mass media and democracy, the catastrophe of
marketization in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the welfare state in Western Europe, an analysis of
class divisions today have all been explored in the International Journal of Inclusive Democracy (see further
reading).

Further reading:

Economy and the Need for a New Liberatory Project. (London: Cassell.) pp. 401) [The
definitive exposition of inclusive Democracy]. (Italian and Greek editions of the book have
been published in 1999 and a German and a Spanish edition have been scheduled for 2000
2001)

Democracy & Nature, The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy. The journal is published by the
Taylor & Francis Group three times a year. Five volumes (of three issues each) were published by
the end of 1999 and a further two issues (vol 6) by July 2000. D & N is a political journal which
publishes theoretical articles and dialogue on inclusive democracy and related topics.
Dear DB

I can't believe it! The DeLeonist of Canada (DB102) knows better than the SPGB what the SPGB stands for! I had thought of doing a detailed reply pointing out how SPGB policy is decided not by some oracle or high priest interpreting our declaration of principles, but by a democratic vote taken at a conference of branch delegates; how there had been a prolonged series of members' meetings in 1906 at which our position (workers should organise both politically and economically to end capitalism, but with political organisation being the more important; and that in the meantime Socialists should join the existing unions) was thrashed out; that there is nothing in our declaration of principles saying that we support workers struggling for better wages and conditions under capitalism either, yet the DLSC illogically accepts (and criticises) this as our position. But what's the point? The DLSC would rule all these decisions out of order as they conflict with their interpretation of our principles.

Frank, in his editorial comments, has unfortunately also got us wrong. The passages from past Socialist Standards I quoted in DB100 did not say that the SPGB favours "socialist industrial unionism". What they showed is that the SPGB holds that, to carry out the socialist revolution, workers should organise themselves economically (to keep production going) as well as politically (to take away state power from the capitalist class). Precisely how workers organise themselves economically will be up to them and there is no reason to suppose that they will follow the SLP blueprint as to how they should organise. Nor are we advocating that the existing "capitalist trade union movement" can serve this purpose. When a majority of workers have become socialists they can/will transform the existing unions (or form new ones, who knows?) to suit their purposes and which will therefore cease to be pro-capitalist and become pro-socialist.

I don't know where Frank gets the idea that the SPGB envisages production and distribution in a socialist society being organised by "the existing state or some sort of neo-state". I presume this is because (like, ironically, the DLSC has come to accept) we can't imagine the members of socialist society opting for this to be democratically controlled by delegates elected exclusively on an industrial basis. In our view, the democratic structure of socialist society will involve delegates elected geographically as well as industrially—for all sorts of reasons, e.g. where we live is equally as important, if not more so, than where we work, and what about temporary and permanent non-workers?

If Frank chooses to call any democratic organisation on a geographical basis a "state" that's his right. Obviously it's not our definition, but he ought to be consistent and also accuse the DLSC of wanting to continue with the state since they too (correctly) see that a democracy based on geographic constituencies can exist independently of the state. And while he is at it he ought to level the same accusation of being "statists" against the anarcho-communists and other anarchists who sees communes, as geographically-based local communities, playing a role in future socialist society . . .

Adam Buick, Brussels, Belgium. 30 July 2000
REPLY TO ADAM BUICK

First, while I characterized the generally approving tenor of the quotations about Socialist Industrial Unions that Adam culled from Socialist Standard articles, I backed off a bit from “favorable.” The actual sentence reads “Next the De Leonist Society of Canada replies to Adam Buick’s DB100 letter which quotes earlier issues of the Socialist Standard showing that the SPGB favors— or does not oppose— Socialist Industrial Unionism.

Adam again emphasizes an important aspect of post-revolutionary unionism: keeping production going during and immediately after the revolution. DeLeonists, though, may regard this as less important than the SIU’s function of replacing capitalism’s top-down workplace dictatorship with the representative democracy called for by SIUism. In fact, to my mind, failure to have any plan for the socialization of production is the major flaw in the SPGB plan for socialism.

The socialist revolution will begin, I should think, in bits and pieces in the workplaces—a realization of the old IWW idea of “building the new society in the shell of the old.” Wherever socialists have reached the proportion of the workforce where they can begin to exercise their power in a particular workplace, they will do so, displacing the old management and managing production of goods and services to satisfy human needs. I would guess that the movement that brought such infant SIUs into existence piecemeal—workplace by workplace as circumstances dictated—would do so in the same way that worker defiance of the laws of private property created the sitdown strike movement of the 1930s. And like the sitdowners, the revolutionary workers will not wait for a victory at the polls or action by the state institutions to legalize their confiscation of the means of production after—in Adam Buick’s phrase—“take[ing] away state power from the capitalist class.”

I find troubling Adam’s statement, “...the SPGB holds that to carry out the socialist revolution, workers should organize themselves economically (to keep production going) as well as politically (to take away state power from the capitalist class).” What this seems to mean is that the working class organized in the SPGB will exercise state power (now at the service of the capitalist class) through the existing government. It strikes me that the SPGB should ask itself just how this scenario differs from the trajectory of the Russian Revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

SPGB literature seems to be of two minds about the abolition of the state after the revolution. From Capitalism to Socialism: How We Live and How We Might Live (page 26, May 1998 printing) has this to say, “The state is the machinery for the defence of a system of minority ownership by a ruling class, and also that class’s instrument for administering that system. It follows therefore that before capitalism can be abolished and socialism established the state must be taken over, firstly to prevent it being used to forcibly resist the change, and secondly so as to utilise its administrative facilities within the new system.” Nothing here about abolishing the state or its “withering away.”

Socialism as a Practical Alternative (p. 7, 1999 printing) seems to contradict the above. Consider the following: “...with a majority of socialists having taken over democratic control, the common ownership of the means of production will be instituted... At the same time the state will be abolished and this means that the socialist movement will lose its political character.” At the very least the SPGB program does not call for the instantaneous abolition of the state.

Compare this with the DeLeon’s unequivocal statement on the subject in his speech “Socialist Reconstruction of Society” (in Socialist Landmarks, pp. 231-2): “... in short they [the means of production] are to be taken and held in order to save them for civilization / It is exactly the reverse with ‘political power.’ That is to be taken for the purpose of abolishing it... Suppose that, at some election, the class-conscious political arm of labor were to sweep the field;... What would there be for them to do? Simply to self-own themselves, on the spot, sine die. Their work would be done by
“The political movement of labor that, in the event of a triumph, would prolong its existence a second after the triumph would be a usurpation.”

Adam also attributes to me the belief that any territorially based political entity is a state. And certainly SLP study classes of my day implied as much. The social organization of society on an industrial basis advocated by the SLP was contrasted to the geographically based economic systems (slavery, feudalism, capitalism) that succeeded the tens of thousands of years during which our species lived under the kinship-based structure of primitive communism. I confess to having some reservations about the departure from DeLeonist orthodoxy in respect to the state by two post-SLP DeLeonist groups, People for a New System and the De Leonist Society of Canada—not to mention the similar community governments of Bookchin and the Libertarian Municipalists and the general run of anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndicalists. The community government idea that form the basis for their views could become socially divisive. I’m not sure I’d care to live in a post-revolutionary Mormon community, for example.

Frank Girard

(from p. 2)


The letter from the De Leonist Society of Canada in DB102 and the review of Dave Perrin’s book on the Socialist Party of Great Britain in DB103 provoked some responses. Adam Buck takes the DLSC to task for its temerity in trying to interpret the policies of the Socialist Party of Great Britain and also gets on my case for various offenses against the SPGB. My reply relates largely to the question of the post-revolutionary relations of production, comparing the proposals of the SPGB with the DeLeonist version. Bill Martin’s letter sets readers straight on what he also regards as my misstatement of the SPGB’s concept of a socialist society. S.M.’s letter refers to material on the SPGB in DB102. It includes a critique of DeLeonism for what might be termed its “political” syndicalism as opposed to the “anarch” variety espoused by some members of the IWW and the A.I.T/IWA. The letter proper ends with a mildly left-communist oriented critique of the SPGB. My reply responds briefly to the three letters.

Harry Sittenon’s letter lifts the spirit after reading the daily papers and “recorded history.” It raises a question – Where did our species go wrong? Some of the possible answers aren’t very encouraging. Does anyone have a book in mind that relates to this question? Next Derek Devine comments on the anarchism of the IWW. Ronald Young provides us with a well-reasoned discussion of Ed Stamm’s DB 102 “Response to Ronald Young” deploring the use of violence in confrontations between workers and the capitalist class and its state.

I have a problem with El Nuevo Tepo’s “On the Anti-Imperialist United Front”: It’s the result of a lifetime of opposition to Leninist “united front” opportunism and domination of capitalism’s leftwing. The authors are at some pains to dissociate their call from the kind of “united front” we all remember from the last century. But it strikes me that non-market socialists will be vastly outnumbered in any united front including the one that is probably in the process of being formed right now in the wake of Seattle, Prague, and Washington D.C.

Stop the Clock was reviewed briefly in DB103. The articles by non-market groups in various industrial nations all relate to the relationship between the rise in the prosperity of our masters and the decades-long decline in the social wage and wages in general. These excerpts include Autheben’s

(to p. 13)
Dear D.B.,

With regard to Frank Girard's review of Cde. Perrin's book I would like to address a few points.

i) The basis for Cde. Perrin's model of distribution is an accepted Party position, and can be found at length in the Pamphlet *Socialism as a Practical Alternative*.

ii) In a society of common democratic ownership and control, the consumers, in sum, are necessarily also the producers, so communal decision making cannot be in contradiction to workers' control of their own labour.

iii) Capitalist firms are run according to representative democracy, the boards performing plenary/parliamentary role, with ultimate authority resting with the chief executive, etc. Under a delegative system ideas, plans and decisions would rest with the community at large, with the delegates having as much control as a secretary has over the layout of a letter.

iv) This system can be thought of as a series of subcommittees, with the main committee being composed of 6 billion members, with individual advisory bodies (such as the U.N. food administration) and productive co-operatives reporting to it as subcommittees. The 'experts' would thus not be passing down orders, but collating information to be used and accepted/rejected by the community in general. The basis of this idea is predicated fundamentally on rejection of faceless bureaucratic control. Such a hierarchical interpretation as Friend Girard propounds would be fundamentally antithetical to the concept of 'from the government of people to the administration of things'.

v) The Party's concept of revolution does not relegate the working class to passive voters, but does relegate "the role of the party" to merely being the tail the dog wags: being sent to Parliament simply to remove the state apparatus from capitalistic hands. Again, the party would be sent as delegates, not representatives. This conception is as against the plenitude of leftists and others who put the revolutionary organisation at the centre of the revolution.

Yours for World Socialism,

Bill Martin.

(from p. 12)

cover blurb and the "Preface."

The Faridabad Wageworkers' News is unique among non-market socialist journals in its content and its method of distribution. Five thousand copies of this four-page Hindi tabloid are printed each month and distributed free along the pedestrian paths leading to the factories in the industrial city of Faridabad, a suburb of Delhi. Probably the U.S. paper closest to FWN in method of distribution is the *New Unionist* in Minneapolis/St. Paul. Locally the NU is distributed free, but through free news racks in coffeehouses, convenience stores, self-service laundries, and the like, not at factory gates. The FNS's content consists in large part of communications from workers about conditions on the job, obtained either from letters or verbal exchanges during distribution or at meetings at the Majdoor Library. In this respect it reminds me of *News & Letters* and its predecessor, *Correspondence* (I believe that was its name). R&L is published in Chicago by Marxist-Humanist

(to p. 15)
Dear DB:

The WSM at least knows what socialism is, and that it is necessarily internationalist and of world-scale. DeLeonism on the contrary offers the labor-voucher dogma, parochialism, and even patriotic continuity with Founding Fathers. DeLeonist/WSM revolutionary parliamentarism may be impossible, but what is utterly astounding is that in this day and age there are still those that advocate DeLeonist/IWW syndicalism. The WSM can certainly be criticized for limiting its notion of useful class-struggle to use of the ballot-box, but it is quite another matter to take it to task for failure to advocate the non-electoral aspect of class-struggle on the impossible DeLeonist/IWW model of trans-revolutionary unionism ("seed of the new within the shell of the old").

And that brings me to specific comments on some matters raised in DB 102.

1) Regarding Frank's comments about the one-sidedness of the Pengan piece — i.e. its near total concern, in a rather heavy and convoluted French context, with the question of anarchist views on Free Access, to the exclusion of discussion of class-struggle anarcho-syndicalism — note that issues 46, 47 and 48 of "Organise" (publication of the Anarchist Federation, a class-strugglist anarchist-communist group found largely in Britain) contain an excellent and reader-friendly three-part article entitled The Union Makes us Strong? Syndicalism: A Critical Analysis. It is online at the following URLs:

http://burn.ucsd.edu/~act/origs/issue46/union.html

http://burn.ucsd.edu/~act/origs/issue47/union2.html

http://burn.ucsd.edu/~act/origs/issue48/syndi.html

DB may want to reprint all or parts of it. It is roughly parallel, though non-Marxist, to the critique of unionism (including ostensibly revolutionary unionism) under capitalism made by (Marxist) left-communism* of the type contained within a continuum running from Pannekoek, Gorter, and Mattick to Damen or Munis, and not including Bordiga. What it says is equally applicable to both non-industrial unionist anarcho-syndicalism and the DeLeonist/Chicago IWW recipe.

The article is especially recommended to the De Leonist Society of Canada, a group that following in the well trodden footsteps of (North-)American Particularism, Bellamy Nationalism, and DeLeonist provincialism, will be surprised and edified to know that there exists, relative to their obsession, a whole world of history and theory beyond the borders of the Greater USA. (By the way, is Mexico part of the DLSC's "North America" or not?)

2) Frank Girard wrote "Nor does SPGB theory seem to provide for post-revolutionary organizational machinery for a socialist society other than [the] existing state or some sort of neo-state to organize production and distribution". Strange formulation. "State" is not a swear-word of arbitrary meaning and Frank ordinarily knows very well the Marxist definition and function of "state", and how this differs from "administration". In the absence of sectional ownership (property) and thus of classes, how can there be any State? In any case, that the WSM does not in the manner of utopian socialism (or prophetic DeLeonism with its trans-revolutionary industrial union) offer a blueprint of the organization
of free access production and consumption (vs. DeLeonism's necessarily heavily administered labor-vouchers) in no way amounts to statism, default or otherwise. In fact, if any thing, the WSM may be faulted — in its vision of parliamentary capture and neutralization of the bourgeois state — for too little "statism", as it discounts the necessity or possibility of the working-class organized (through workers councils etc) even as a temporary "semi-state" (i.e. the D.o.P.) for the express and exclusive purpose of suppression of sectional ownership and production-exchange (i.e. of Capital).

S.B.

*This is no endorsement of that self-declared Church of Left Communism, the ICC, purveyor of phantasmagoric class-struggle optimism on the one hand and conspiracy theory on the other, a group so abounding in paranoid megalomania that its website does not even provide an email address. Recently it has charmed and entertained with the news that New Democracy's views are not simply confused, ill-informed, prejudiced, or idealist but actually form part of a plot; and along with that, the ICC's apparent belief that the DB is not a forum but a quasi political party with ICC-defined "obligations toward the class". The fact that the ICC's published material offers, in combination, sometimes excellent history of the workers' movement along with utter nonsense (including incantations against "anarcho-bordigism" and other manifestations of "parasitism" traced back to the 1860s) makes it all the worse. If one were to adopt the ICC's own pathological thinking, it would be easy to conclude that the ICC is a clever conspiracy out to discredit left-communism.

(from p. 13)

disciples of Raya Dunayevskaya. Included in this selection is the Hindi masthead of FNS. Readers can get the English translation of the entire January and February 2000 issues by e-mail from <revolution@hotmail.com> or by dropping a card to the DB requesting a free hard copy. As usual we end with "Notes, Announcements, and Short Reviews."

**Finances**

The DB has just passed through two months of unparalleled prosperity, the result of the canny monetary policies of the Fed and of an unusually large number of sub renewals and donations and the sale of back issues. Before I complete plans for a four-way stock split, though, we'll see what's left after the annual bulk mailing fee and postage rate hikes.

**Contributions:** Harry Siitonen $7; Connie Furdeck $27; Pat Eyttchison $22; Joe Tupper $20 "for the abolition of capitalism"; Anthony Wong $4; Mighty Slow Walkin $5; Phil Colligan $12; J.T. Plant $56. Total $153. Thank you, comrades.

**BALANCE**

August 24, 2000

$ 387.06

**RECEIPTS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions</strong></td>
<td>$ 153.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subs and Sales</strong></td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 378.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(to p. 30)
Dear Discussion Bulletin,


There are a number of inaccuracies in the book, which you did not touch upon notably the untrue reference in a footnote to the Socialist Party of Great Britain who were reconstituted in June 1991.

It should also be recalled that Mr Perrin a Clapham Party member, under the Conference decision that was used to expel Camden and North West London Branches, is not allowed to use the full name of the Party for academic or political purposes. No doubt these points will be made in a future edition of Socialist Studies when the book is reviewed.

As for your own review, you make a number of observations about the SPGB, which need answering.

1). "The problem I have with extending the SPGB's system of organisation to production is that it sounds remarkably like the system that governs production under capital" (Discussion Bulletin no 103 p28).

For the SPGB, the framework of a Socialist society will be the common ownership and democratic control of the means of production and distribution by all of society. So those engaged in production will be just as much a part of the democratic process governing production as those outside production like, the elderly, the sick, the disabled and those in non-productive work like medical workers, scientists, teachers and carers and so on. Just because someone has a function within production will not entitle the person to hold a privileged position over other sections of society.

Obviously free and voluntary labour will have a say in the way production takes place, how they produce and reassure that the environment they work in is safe, pleasant and enjoyable. Labour being free and voluntary means that if a process is found to be disagreeable or dangerous, but is one people do need, every effort would be made to find a safer way of producing it by an alternative technology. Failing that, every possible protective method will be made to safeguard the workers involved, or if that cannot be achieved, to consider whether this product is so essential an alternative cannot be found.

The argument many people put to Socialists about who decides who will do the dirty or dangerous work in a Socialist society can be answered but not by reference to the methods adopted by capitalism which relies on compulsion and blackmail. Leninist/Stalinist policies like workfare in which "he who does not work neither shall he eat" will play no part in Socialism. Likewise with the policies pursued by Western capitalist States, like the US and the UK, who cut off state aid to the unemployed unless they prove they have been seeking work. The governing principle of Socialism will be "from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs".

2). You also say "goods in a Socialist society would be determined by the same mechanism used in capitalist enterprises to maintain stock control" (p.28).

What will determine production in a Socialist society will be human need. Obviously when people consume there needs to be some way of ensuring production meets that consumption. Stock control is one technique. There may well be others.
More to the point the object of the SPGB is not to set out detailed plans of production, distribution and social organisation. Nor is it to get embroiled in the planning techniques a future Socialist society will adopt. It will be for a future Socialist society to determine its own democratic structures using the information, technology and degree of development in the forces of production at the time. All else is utopian speculation.

Yours sincerely, Richard Lloyd

Brief Responses to Bill Martin, S.B. and Richard Lloyd

Some of the points raised in the three letters above were covered in the “Reply to Adam Buick” elsewhere in this issue.

Bill Martin: i. Further reading has convinced me that I was wrong in saying, in regard to distribution, “...it [the SPGB’s plan] appears to be—in part, at least—based on Perrin’s own thinking.”

ii. I think that communal and even global decision making will determine what is produced, but the question of how the workplace will organize and produce it will be handled the workers organized in their Socialist Industrial Unions.

iii. What is needed here is an explanation of the difference between a representative and a delegate.

iv. As soon as Bill Martin introduces the word “cooperatives” he opens a can of worms. Surely he doesn’t mean that production will be carried on by cooperatives. Whether Bill realizes it or not the word “administration” is so associated with top-down management in all usages, at least in the U.S., as to make “administrator” synonymous with “boss.”

v. As nearly as I can see the role of the working class in this revolution is to vote for the SPGB “delegates” to parliament. The delegates will then “...remove the state apparatus from capitalist hands.” How can the SPGB, whose victory at the polls constituted the revolution, remove itself from “...the centre of the revolution”?

S.B.: Obviously a believer in the dictum that a good defense begins with an attack, SB starts by laying into the Socialist Labor Party and De Leon. It strikes me that much of what SB decries has simply disappeared from party positions and policy. Unfortunately the SLP’s habit of reprinting its century-old pamphlets keeps outdated or incorrect ideas in circulation. Also unfortunately, not all of these have “disappeared,” the SLP’s “administration” being what it is and has been for 86 years. All this doesn’t mean that I agree with SB’s implication that DeLeonism is not internationalist and his assertion that socialist industrial unionism exemplifies impossibilism.

1) I think the anarcho-communist websites SB provides are interesting. The articles (from the Anarchist Federation’s journal Organise!) may well be printed in a future DB for readers who lack access to the Internet.

2) “In the absence of any sectional ownership (property) and thus of classes, how can there be any State?” For an answer to this question I would refer SB to Brinton’s book, The Bolsheviks and Workers’ Control or any other history of the USSR including official Soviet versions.

Richard Lloyd: 1) My point would be that the only people knowledgeable enough to engage in “governing production” are those in the workplace engaged in production. How would democratically making decisions about production place workers on the job in a “privileged position”?

I have no problem with the next paragraph except to ask why such matters can’t be settled democratically by the relevant members of the SIU. And no disagreement with the next.

2) I agree with Richard’s comments in this section of his letter.

—Frank Girard
TO THE EDITOR:

The following article appeared in the conservative London Times of Aug. 19, 2000. Next time someone tries to tell you that the selfish, acquisitive character of capitalist society is just "human nature", show them this example. Cooperation and mutual aid are also human nature—its better side.

"PREHISTORIC MAN WAS VERY OLD LEFT", by Nigel Hawks, science editor.

"Prehistoric human beings were able to flourish and spread throughout the world because they lived in a state of 'primitive communism,' a psychologist has claimed.

"Professor Andrew Whiten from St. Andrews University told a conference at the Royal Society of Edinburgh University that our ancestors evolved through a form of cooperation not very different from the ideals of communism. Human beings were able to dominate the world against predators such as big cats and wolves, he said, only by adopting socialist values. All members of the prehistoric tribes were considered equal, he said, and food and clothing were equally shared.

"Human beings are the most social species on Earth and our ancestors formed hunter-gatherer groups which pulled together to adapt to their new lifestyle," he said. "Unlike every other species, they had an egalitarian culture where everything was shared out equally: no other culture does that."

"There was also no hierarchy in the society or tribal chiefs, as anyone who tried to lead was pushed back down by the others. Everyone was considered to be equal and they lived in a culture of primitive communism.

"We might expect as the products of evolution our ancestors would be selfish, but it was their ability to work together and support each other which made them more successful than any other. This supportive culture allowed technology and skills to be passed down and improved with each generation.

"Although this egalitarian lifestyle is not present in most of the world today, it may be resting dormant within us waiting to be reawakened.

"It has been suggested the next step of evolution for humans would be to form a great super-organism which uses the Internet as a nerve center."

(My main worry is this "super-organism". Will it be akin to the rank and file self-management dreamed of by the Wobblies and others, or will it turn out to be another power elite interested in only its own rule from above for its own benefit? It's up to us to fight for the former.—HS). Harry Siitonen, Berkeley, CA.
Dear Frank/DB:

Just a word or two on the recurring theme of attempts to rewrite the history of the IWW and define it as anarchist or syndicalist/anarchist-syndicalist.

Prior to "syndicalism" being defined as pro-anarchist with the formation of the IWA/AIT, the IWW considered itself superior to European syndicalism for three main reasons:

1. The IWW was not anti-political, or pro-anarchist and therefore open to all radical workers.

2. Industrial unionism was considered to be a more class-conscious form of organisation than the local, autonomous, spontaneist forms of organisation favoured by syndicalists.

3. The IWW sought to build a class conscious majority and repudiated the syndicalist's reliance on the vanguard minority who would goad the masses into action when the situation was ripe — "the revolutionary situation."

If the IWW is now pro-anarchist and not inclined toward industrial organising, it is placing itself in a very narrow political ghetto. The dangers of this were recognised by the IWW way back in 1919:

"Years later, however, Richard Brazier, a one-time member of the GEB, wrote: "There was a strong anarchist element among the IWW that refused to accept majority rule and were strong for local autonomy" (Richard Brazier to T.T. Bogard, n.d.) However, IWW publicists always insisted did not represent the majority view in the IWW. One criticism of Paul F. Briissenden's book, The IWW: A Study of American Syndicalism, in IWW circles was that it placed too much emphasis upon anarchist and anarchosyndicalist trends in the organization. "The use of those terms," a Wobblly reviewer wrote when Briissenden's book was first published, "are(sic) very misleading as they are bound to give the wrong impression to the reader of the Industrial Workers of the World."'' (Irving Freeman in One Big Union Monthly, Vol. 1, 191, p. 473)


If the IWW is now definitely pro-anarchist, then now is the time for it to dissolve itself and join the I.W.A.

Derek Devine

P.S. Verity Burgmann's Revolutionary Industrial Unionism: The Industrial Workers of the World in Australia (Cambridge University Press, 1995) offers very good arguments against labeling the IWW as syndicalism and is the best book on the IWW that I've ever read.
Anarchist Principles In A Capitalist World

In DB 102, Ed Stamm posed the question in respect to the Seattle WTO protests, "Do anarchists respect the rights of people they disagree with or do we attempt to prevent or destroy any form of expression that we disagree with?"

In order to answer this question we must first make a distinction between what "rights" we are talking about and whether exploitation and brutalization of the entire human race, in practice, is a protectable form of "expression." Under the principle of egalitarianism, anarchists are opposed to all forms of hierarchy and patriarchy (i.e., the State and its police forces, racism, sexism, ageism, homophobia), as well as exploitation in its many manifestations—including capitalism and wage slavery.

Capitallists Do Not Have A 'Right' To Exploit Humanity

Anarchists believe in freedom, but the exercise of hierarchical authority is not freedom. No one has a 'right' to rule, exploit, or coerce others. Anarchism supports 'freedom for everybody ... with the only limit of the equal freedom for others; which does not mean ... that we recognize, and wish to respect, the 'freedom' to exploit, to oppress, to command, which is oppression and certainly not freedom" (Enrico Malatesta).

As in his previous pronouncement on this subject, Ed once again shows himself to be somewhat confused concerning the basic principles of anarchism. It is quite a stretch to accuse anarchists who stand up against the State of taking "the Leninist position that their opponents have no rights." As concerns capitalism and its propensity to reduce humans to mere commodities exploitable for the best maximization of profits, no Ed, the corporate barons do not have a right under anarchist principles to do such a thing. And the State, with its various police and military forces does not have a right to enforce this system of exploitation. If anyone is to be labeled a Leninist, Ed Stamm best fits the category. He expounds unswerving support for the legitimacy of the State and its use of violence against the revolutionary forces that may be so brazen as to rise up against it. That is exactly the tool Lenin used to smash the Russian social revolution (killing many anarchists in the process) and installing totalitarian capitalism.

Anarchists Must Defend Against exploiters

The police violence in Seattle, and later in D.C., was both political repression and heavy-handed law and order. Whose law and order? That established by the ruling class in the interest of capitalism. Instead of viewing the world through anarchist principles, Ed prefers to honor the contrived constitutional system of hierarchical control established by the ruling class to keep the working class under its heel.

Anarchists are obligated—have a duty, if you will—to defend themselves and the people against the exploitative and violent nature of capitalism. Ed would have us believe that the act of self-defense against the capitalist State is an act of coercion and oppression. How more wrongheaded could a proclaimed anarchist be? I suppose if Ed saw a person on the street defending himself or herself against being robbed and brutalized by a thug, he would accuse that person of being coercive and oppressive for taking such a stance. Most people, in such circumstances, will do whatever is necessary to free themselves from the clutches of the perpetrator. Most anarchists, likewise, believe the violent acts of the State, and the robbing and brutalizing of workers under capitalism, require whatever active resistance is necessary to free the working class from its enslavement.

Capitalists Will Violently Oppose Egalitarianism

It is the State and its violent response to the will of the people that dictates by what means the people shall free themselves. Unfortunately, in too many ways to enumerate here, the State has shown itself to actively oppose the will of the people whenever that will threatens the foundation by which the State oppresses us. As Ed so rightly points out, when the Latin American peoples defended their democratic will for a socialist society, the right-wing capitalist interests, backed by the United States, smashed the will of the people under the heel of violent oppression. What this merely shows us is that the people must be better organized and prepared to battle violent repression from the State. In a circular form of logic, however, Ed blames this State violence on the people defending themselves against ... State violence.
The Difference Between Black bloc and Anti-Abortionists

Ed compares VTD protesters to anti-abortion protesters. Let me lift the fog on your thinking here. There is a profound difference between what Black bloc was protesting against as opposed to the agenda of abortion clinic blockaders. Black bloc was protesting against a capitalist society that, above all, puts property rights above human rights. In contrast, anti-abortion protesters act under the patriarchal principle that a woman's body is not her own but is the subservient property of some "other"—whether that "other" is the State or the woman's husband.

Workers and Bosses Are Not "Equal" Partners

It is totally ludicrous, as Ed surmises, that Third World Nike workers have freely chosen to "strike a deal" with Nike by working in its sweatshops. Most of Nike's exploited workforce are women and children—the most vulnerable people of any society, but particularly so in Third World countries where patriarchal property rights treat women and children as chattel. The relationship is really one of people living in such desperate circumstances that they must choose between death and exploitation, willing to do almost anything in order to survive. Nike and all the transnational corporations are well aware of this and exploits these people for maximum profit while barely raising them up out of their miserable conditions. The availability of such easily exploitable Third World workforce is also used as a stick against Western workers attempting to raise their living standards. Transnational capital is free to move across national boundaries. Most workers are not. Equal partners in making the deal? Hardly. Why do you think we call it "wage slavery"?

The State Is Already Disarming Potential Resistance Fighters

The problem with Ed is that he's a reformist at best, a counter-revolutionary at worst, masquerading as an anarchist. The reason that previous attempts of workers fighting the class war have met with such utter failure and suffering isn't because they dared rise up in armed rebellion against the State. The stumbling block put in the way of the working class has always been the co-option of the social revolution by liberals and statistis. Ed Stamm, by his own words, is part of this continuing attempt to thwart genuine social revolution. Social libertarians of all persuasions should have learned a long time ago that the revolutionary anarchist way is the only way to reach the stateless, classless, egalitarian society we desire. The co-option of the Russian revolution stands as the pivotal event of the 20th century that disheartened the workers movement up to this very day. It bares out what anarchists have long known—allowing the State to linger on spells doom for any social revolution.

Conclusion

All in all, Ed merely states a truth that I thought all anarchists are aware of—the State will use whatever violent means necessary to protect its grip on power. If we want a social revolution we have no choice but to prepare ourselves for confrontation. If, as an anarchist, you are afraid that your actions will be met with state-sanctioned violence, then you need to change your politics, sticking with the safe haven of the ruling class Republicans. The anarchist movement has no need for soft-ballled reformers and State sympathizers.

Capitalism is exploitative and oppressive. The ruling class enforces this systematic brutality through the use of ... systematic brutality. It has no "right" to do so under the principles of egalitarianism recognized by most anarchists. On the other hand, anarchists have every right, under those some principles, to oppose the capitalist system and the State by any means necessary.

Ronald @ Young, Huntsville, TX
Imperialism is not obvious. It is hidden in the United Nations, sub-imperialisms, in dependency relations; it is even hidden within the human rights groups and NGOs. To the exploited imperialism is almost invisible because its power appears to be in another world where money seems unlimited far away from the daily struggle for survival.

Imperialism is not only economic and political, it also has an ideological form. It is prevalent in the universities and among intellectuals in its "liberal" form. It is not enough if we just protest against imperialism. We have to struggle against the ideological hegemony of imperialism.

Within the broader struggle against imperialism there needs to be a struggle against reformism. We face "progressive" politicians like Jesse Jackson who criticize certain actions of Imperialism without opposing imperialism. Also ecological groups who criticize the destruction of forests, without criticiizing imperialism.

Within an Anti-Imperialist Front there will be centrist tendencies with connections to reformism. We do not suggest that centrist tendencies should be excluded. But there should be political struggle with the framework of our agreement. We should not support "anti-imperialist" bourgeois governments such as Noriega, Hussein, and Milosevic, whose struggles against imperialism have been partial and incompetent. Our military support to them should not be confused with political support.

In large part the protests against Imperialism have been led by militant reformism. But protests can form part of a revolutionary strategy, as well...thus the result can easily be confusion. Protests cannot be a substitute for revolutionary political activity. The reformist "leaders" do not want to even name the enemy "Imperialism" or "capitalism". They prefer words like: "globalization" or "neoliberalism." What they want is to pressure Imperialism...they want to be included in the decisions Imperialism makes. Or as they say it "To gain access to power." They would like to "democratize" Imperialism or perhaps have capitalism without imperialism...the utopia of reformism! It would be an error to boycott such protests, but we need to demand that revolutionaries be on the platform, where we can confront the reformist confusion.

We must insist that the enemy is CAPITALISM and not something called "Neoliberalism." By changing these key words the reformists have an opening to propose Keynesian capitalism Roosevelt style as a solution!

The face of benevolent Imperialism is the United Nations. The majority of the Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are connected to the United Nations and the labor bureaucracies (and left tendencies like the Lambertists) are connected to the International Labor Organization (I.L.O.) They sponsor dinners and conferences on human rights and labor rights that are a magnet to opportunists. Our task is not to pressure Imperialism so that human rights are respected within the imperialist framework. Our task is to show that Imperialism and genuine human rights are not compatible.

The protest in Seattle against the "free trade agreement" showed the exploited of the world that they have allies in the United States. But instead of protests that block streets, which are perhaps successful for one or two days, we need to raise the banner of the GENERAL STRIKE, of workers solidarity in action. Perhaps it is an abstraction in the United States but elsewhere class struggles are leading to General Strikes. We need to show the
power of class protest as opposed to non-class protest.

The youth that protest are workers, but often do not bring their politics to the job. We cannot continue to just repeat the same protests over and over. Instead of only going to Washington or Seattle to block streets, the youth need to be orientated to the working class.

Two years ago the dockers of Liverpool organized two international work stoppages together with dockers throughout the world. There was no publicity for these international strikes as there was for Seattle. This different class model requires the building a network of rank and file workers throughout the world, as the existing network of labor bureaucrats only leads to Conferences that solve nothing.

We have to bring out material on General Strike in the past. We have to investigate and study the multi-national corporations.

When there is a strike anywhere in the world, we have an obligation to explain the relation between the individual bosses and the capitalist system as a whole.

We will have to transcend Lenin’s analysis of Imperialism, particularly in regard to the inclusion of privatized social security funds (AFPs) as a source of capital. Also there is a new factor in that multi-national corporations are exporting capital without using the banking system.

We need to prepare special material on Imperialism for young soldiers who are the cannon fodder for future wars. The military theory they are taught reflects right wing economic theory. Although it is difficult to place revolutionary material in military bases, we need to develop propaganda in high schools and in rural areas where the armies recruit youth.

We must defend all national cultures against Imperialism which erases culture to broaden “Ira” market. We need to organize contests, tours with artists, music, actors who are willing to be in a cultural movement against Imperialism. We propose an international cultural magazine of protest and struggle. We need to use the technology of video for the exchange of videos of struggle.

In the struggle against Imperialism we need to confront paternalism and the dependency of the smaller organizations in relation to the larger ones. Solidarity needs to be reciprocal! The tasks that we propose in the struggle against Imperialism require work by small cells, political education in Marxism, and clandestine functioning. Let the reformists look for television publicity so they can shine as leaders!

After the protests, EDUCATION AND ORGANIZACIÓN, TOWARD THE GENERAL STRIKE AND WORKERS POWER!

SOCORRO OBRERO SINDICAL
The magazine "EL NUEVO TOPO"
Caella 1125 P.O. Box 424725
Centro de Gobierno San Francisco, Calif. 94142
San Salvador tel/fax (415)285-9564
e-mail: glitapia@igc.org
[Note: Aufheben has published a collection of articles from journals that share its view of the economic and political action capital is taking to preserve itself. The major point of these articles is that the reforms, presented as actions to improve the condition of the working class, are actually designed to preserve the system. I'm less sure than Aufheben and its fellows that this is a new insight. It reminds me of the DeLeonist dictum that all reforms are just "concealed measures of reaction." Basic information on Stop the Clock appeared in DB102 with the promise of more. Below are the opening pages, which describe the content and purpose of the pamphlet.]

Stop the Clock: Critiques of the New Social Workhouse, 73 pages, is available for £2.40 (UK) and £2.70 (elsewhere) postpaid, sterling checks only, payable to Aufheben. From Aufheben, Brighton & Hove Unemployed Workers Centre, 4 Cresway Parade, Hollingdean, Brighton BN1 7BL UK (aufheben99@yahoo.co.uk)

What is the link between the struggle to mitigate alienation (for higher wage, shorter hours, more benefits, less work intensity etc.) and the struggle again alienation itself? The answer to this question distinguishes communist practice from merely leftist practice. In recent years, a number of ex-autonomist and left groups have been trying to build a broad European-wide movement around a common programme of radical demands concerning unemployment, working time reduction and a guaranteed minimum income. In the UK, too, such demands as a 'basic income', seen as a strategy for undermining the relation between work and human needs embodied in the wage, have been taken up not only by postautonomists but also by Greens and more traditional leftists. Such strategies need to be judged in terms both of whether they come out of a real movement (though this is still no guarantee of a communist content - vide social democracy and their historical context. In times of working class strength, it is possible that achieving demands such as a reduction in working-time might serve as a basis from which we could push on towards 'the point of no return'. But when the working class is weak - as we are now - such demands merely contribute to the dynamic of capital. The articles in this pamphlet on reforms already taking place in Europe show very clearly how apparently radical demands, such as working time reduction, have been gratefully co-opted as part of the post social democratic project.

We have put this collection of articles together because we feel that each of them serves as an important contribution to a confrontation with and critique of some of the prevailing currents in the political debate over how to take the working class struggles forward. However, this collection does not necessarily reflect a common project among the different groups; and nor do we necessarily endorse every argument expressed here. Nevertheless, you will find some common elements in the groups' perspectives - such as the refusal of work as basic element of working class struggle, and the conviction that working class emancipation will come from working class self-activity not from mediators such as trade unions which seek accommodation with capital and the state.

The critiques in this pamphlet refer to specific demands, but they also have general applicability. The kind of radical-reformist strategies we are attacking here are likely to re-emerge in different guises again and again until the line between the struggle to mitigate alienation and the struggle against alienation itself is finally realized and transcended, and human history can at last begin.

Aufheben Summer 2000
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Preface:
Putting the critique of capitalism back on the agenda
Wildcat (Germany)

We are fed up with working more and more for lower wages, being pushed around by the bosses and forced into workfare schemes by the state. We are also fed up with those who are helping to smooth the way for new methods of exploitation, with their 'radical' demands for working time reduction, for new social benefits - or worse still for more jobs. Under threat of unemployment, previously radical types have abandoned the critique of capitalism in favour of an alliance with the state to defend the 'good old days' of social democracy and Keynesianism against 'neoliberalism'. They no longer question the barbarism of the whole of society, grounded in the daily control of our minds and bodies by the compulsion to work. Instead of expressing the real anger of millions of people at the daily loss of our lives in the workplace (the fundamental basis of capitalist social relations), they tell us to regain the 'primacy of politics over economics' and to demand a 'humanitarian' administration of the capitalist economy. But politics and the economy are two sides of the same coin: the global workshop.

The articles in this pamphlet deal with such political illusions, which have become influential in campaigns against unemployment, for working time reduction and for a guaranteed basic income. In examples from Britain, France, Italy and Germany, it is shown exactly how campaigns for such demands have provided a rationale for the state and employers to attack working conditions and social benefits, to intensify exploitation - and above all, to stifle any radical movement by the workers themselves.

After twenty years of losing ground for a fundamental critique of capitalism, it is necessary to sweep away a lot of the ideological garbage. For those fighting the deterioration of our living conditions, working time reduction or reformed social benefits seem at face value to provide ideal demands for uniting people in collective struggles. But working class history tells a different story. On the one hand, the slogan of 'working time reduction' has served as a pretext to make working time more flexible and to squeeze any free time out of working time; the reform of the welfare state - as well as its very introduction, for that matter - was never a genuine working class aim, but rather a concession to ease class tensions, to atomize people and to subordinate their daily lives. On the other hand, real struggles which confronted capital started, not from political parties or other representative groups drawing up demands, but from the daily resistance of the working class to exploitation, their collective struggle and the reassertion of their ability to confront and to suppress capital.
Demanding employment, working-time reduction and a minimum guaranteed income - in order to prolong exploitation

This collection of articles analyzes recent developments in class relations, in order to expose some of the main myths about the situations in different countries, and to show how these myths (such as the reputation of the unemployed movement in France and of working-time reduction in Germany) are used in other countries to sell reformist campaigns as brand new politics.

*Mouvement Communiste: Considerations of the agitations of the unemployed and casual workers.* In the winter of 1997-8, new actions in France seemed to indicate the possible emergence of a new movement of the unemployed. In some other countries, including Germany, this appearance was used by leftists to try to stimulate a movement of the unemployed from above, looking for the best demands with which to mobilize the unemployed. The article questions whether there was a 'movement' at all, or merely a political campaign by some groups, and offers a critique of the different ideologies of those involved in this campaign.

*Aufheben: Unemployed recalcitrance and welfare restructuring in the UK today.* The background of new 'make-work' schemes by the state is the subject of the article from Britain, about the Labour government's New Deal programme. It points out that it is a clear attack on the culture of refusal and recalcitrance, which emerged during the 1980s and which Thatcher failed to smash.

*Wildcat: Reforming the welfare state in order to save capitalism.* One of the central demands of these campaigns all over Europe is the 'guaranteed minimum (or basic) income'. The article on this subject explains the role of such a guaranteed income in the restructuring of the welfare state in the face of changed class relations (e.g., the case of Germany). Without an understanding of this context, we risk affirming illusions about the supposed 'improvements' provided by such a minimum income and participating in the fixing of the social workhouse with our demands and campaigns.

*Wildcat: The thirty-five hour week: Lower incomes and more work.* For many people, including those on the radical left, working time reduction in Germany looks like an exemplary success of the working class - beginning with the first agreement in the direction of the 35-hour week in 1984, and up to the spectacular introduction of the 'four-day week' by Volkswagen in 1994. This article demonstrates how the 35-hour week served as a Trojan horse for flexibilization, and how Volkswagen - in co-operation with the trade union bureaucracy - used the 1994 crisis in car production to impose wage cuts and flexible working practices on the workforce from above. In retrospect, the introduction of the so-called 'working day reduction' by many firms marked a historical shift towards extension of the working day.

*Precari Nati: The awkward question of times.* The article on working time reduction in Italy explains how working time reduction, whether by local or national bargaining, is part of a strategy for capitalist restructuring anywhere. In the Italian case, this is exemplified by the discrepancy between the negotiated working times and the actual ones.

*Mouvement Communiste: 'Thirty-five hours against the proletariat.' Working time reduction was introduced in Germany with the help of the trade unions, which are thoroughly integrated within Germany’s political system. In France, the same policy in the form of Aubrey Law was imposed by the state, under the auspices of the leftist government. The application of the law, with its provisions for gradual introduction of the 35-hour week, has to be negotiated in each company. This has given employers the welcome opportunity to intensify exploitation and cut labor costs. Next on the agenda, is our observation of and support for the first stirrings of industrial unrest against these attacks, which are carried out in the name of 'working time reduction.'
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Such are the times, therefore (7)

When those who daily chant tunes of cordial relations with the management start talking about struggle, it is but natural for wage-workers to get vigilant. The course of meetings and blistering speeches by leaders to “get rid of management’s stubbornness, to put it in its place, to teach the management a lesson” and in unison sbahis’ acts of instigation to provide the leaders with the material for their aggression are the warp and the woof of the web to entangle workers to carry out big attacks on them. After being hurt, the discourse of having been entrapped by leaders, the betrayal by them, leaders being sold out, sell outs by leaders has become so common that repeating it would be like breast beating. It should be enough to say that the ‘leadry’ department of managements is a little different in appearance but otherwise performs managements’ functions just like any other department of the management.

How to avoid getting entangled in the web/net of the managements? How to avoid getting pushed into the net by the ‘leadry’ apparatus? How to pierce their net? It is necessary to have extensive discussions around these questions.

Closed doors, protracted preparations

Schemes are made by different types of specialists. These are kept confidential. The preparations to carry out these schemes also take place in secrecy. Sometimes one may get an inkling but generally workers do not get information about the schemes of the management and their preparations. Things are like this only.
How Pandora’s box opens

Every wage-worker resists everyday in various ways the pain and the humiliation inherent in wage work. Conflicts that take place at every step give rise to temporary equilibriums. When the supervisors-managers disregard these temporary equilibriums and instead start giving weight to routine occurrences then be sure that trouble is afoot. Aggressive activity by the new-old leaders, their henchmen and arse lickers is the beginning of an attack by the management.

Tightening the net.

Managers start pulling the warp and the woof of the net by suspending or transferring somebody or the new – old leaders give weight to some new – old issue to start the game. Howsoever it might have been started, the process of tightening the grip is something like this: Whether it is an assault on one individual or deduction in salary/ delay in wage, by involving everybody in the issue, unity is put forth as the most important necessity. The new-old leaders with their henchmen and arse lickers get busy to make it seem that it is imperative for each and every worker to take only the same one step at the same time. Thi is done in the name of keeping everybody together or in the name of giving support. Their number is also large now because the managements have had to expand their leardry department as a result of the increase in the self initiated steps and actions by workers. They have had to make about ten percent of the workforce their touts. The leadry department of the management get busy in portraying that ‘slow down’ by everybody, ‘tool down’ by everybody, no one signing on the conditions to enter the factory, everyone sitting outside etc. are ways to put pressure on the management. In reality however these are ways to turn workers into targets.

A perforation in the web

After covert preparations when the management suspends one of our co-workers then a tool down by all the workers of his/her department is a sure way of getting caught in the managements’ web – this we have suffered time after time. A one-day strike on delay in salary or on some other issue is a sure way to be pushed into the web of an eight-month lock out. And whether something is part of the confidential schemes of the management or not, this information is difficult for the workers to have.
That is why when the management suspends one of our co-workers then even at the department level it is appropriate to take multiple steps instead of one single step. Through many different sorts of steps and different types, we can have the management all vexed. This way without taking too much risk we can maintain, in the defense of our co-worker, a heavy and long lasting pressure, which can compel the management to backtrack. This method also seems appropriate for delay in salary etc. When we take multiple steps at the same time then one, we do not become targets and two, pressure is put on the management in such different ways that their leadry department and the personal department become kind of useless.
With however much cunning the experts weave the net/web behind closed doors, if the workers try to avoid paths that turn them into targets and take multiple steps on their own then they can make huge ruptures even in the most intricate net/web.
The warp and the woof of the web/net

Mitaso Domestic workers: “On 16.11.99 right on lunch time one director walked up in a huff and saying why the work had been stopped one minutes before lunch time, he got three workers out of the gate by their collars. Next day the leaders made us sit at the gate and the workers of Mitaso Appliances kept going in through the same gate and working in the factory. We got date after date in the Labor Department and we lost our one-month’s salary. Earlier we were 40 and we used to make 70 mixers. The 1997 management – union agreement fixed a production of 100 mixers per day. Then, 10 after 10, they fired 20 workers and started putting pressure on the remaining 20 workers to produce 100 mixers per day. It is in this chain of events that the director deliberately misbehaved. The 18.12.99 agreement is also linked to the same series of on goings.”

One worker: “I do not know the name of the company but I work at the plot no. 107 in sector 59. Do not know on what grounds the management fired all the earlier workers but yes, to fire them the management did get a strike organized. The walls still have ‘down with’ written on them. Now even those who operate the machines are contractor’s workers.”

Faridabad Forging workers: “Saying there is no work the management marked us absent for two nights even when we were actually present. On Diwali in 1998 the management had fashioned some trouble and fired 23-24 permanent workers. Now the management is again playing mischief. It used to give the money for overtime work along with the wages but this time it did not. When those who did 4 hours of overtime everyday opposed, they have not been given their December wages even till today, the 18th of January, and one worker has also been barred entry.”

DLF Industries workers: “The management is closing down this factory and shifting to Gurgaon but it is giving us transfer letters for Bihar – it is to compel us to give resignation letters.”

Rollatiners workers: “After installing CNC machines in large numbers the management has started delaying wage payment. It says that there was a delay in the dispatch of the goods, and the money will arrive late. They have not released some of our other dues also. The management is on the look out to retrench us by instigating us.”

J.M.A Industries workers: “Looks like the company is again up to some mischief. Two Westerners have come to take up important big posts and the production has been greatly decreased. They are giving us very little work and keep us just sitting.”

Escorts workers: “By creating a scare of closing down MORIIC situated in Escorts Ancillary, the management increased the production four times through an agreement. Even after putting so much work load on us the management talks of losses and is spreading rumors of closing down the company so as to keep the workers terrified.”

Faridabad Tools worker: “Before Diwali the union hung a flag at the factory gate and one by one the management fired 35 out of the 50 workers. When five of us refused to write our resignation then on 24.11.99 we were barred from entering the gate. We filed a complaint in the labor department. The management is ready to take us back on duty on one date but on another it refuses. On some dates it does not appear and while the labor inspector tells us to wait in his office he goes off to meet the management at the factory. On one date it talked of transferring us to Super Alloy Cast and on another the management asked for a week’s time. On some dates it talks of settling our severance accounts and on other dates it asks us to come to the factory to have some sort of a settlement and for some excuse or the other makes us sit at the gate the whole day. On the 28th of January neither the labor inspector nor his clerk reached their office for the hearing.”
To participate in the Faridabad Majdoor Samachar

- Expand discussions by getting your views and experiences printed here. Names are not revealed and there is no cost to get your own thoughts printed.
- To distribute the paper one does not have to stand at the roadside. To have your friends reading it collect as many copies as you want from the Majdoor Library after the 10th of every month.
- People who distribute, do this for free. While taking the Majdoor News on the street, one can give money too, without any hesitation. There is a problem with putting money together. We are able to print it only once a month and only 5000 copies are distributed free. If you find any writing that you think is inappropriate in the paper, then do let us know.

Law – law – law

Workshop workers: “Have to continuously do night duty. They give 1200 rupees for 8 hours and have to do 4 hours of overtime work at single rate everyday.”
Jupiter worker: “Helpers get 1500 and operators get 1800 rupees only as wages per month. There is no Fund nor E.S.I.”
Polar fan workers: “Workers working since long years are not made permanent by the management.”
J.P Industries workers: “Wages are 1400 – 1500 rupees per month only.”
M.S Textiles workers: “They give a salary of only 1800 rupees per month for 12 hours duty. When some officers come for checking then they are shown a salary of 1800 for 8 hours duty. The contractors’ 150 workers do not even get 1800 for 12 hours everyday – the money for Sundays is deducted. Have not given E.S.I cards and have not got the slip for the Fund. No bonus, no earned leave even.”

On 14.1.2000 the goons of the Jhalani Tools management once again attacked us while we were distributing the January issue of the 'Wage-workers News' at the Bata railway crossing. The goons of this management had also attacked on the 16.4.99 during the distribution of the paper. Wage workers face the question of dealing with the goonery of these bosses at every step. It is important to have extensive discussions on this subject.

(from p. 15)
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NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Chapter 3, “Anarchism,” and Chapter 4, “Impossibilism” have been reprinted and are available to all DB readers at no cost. Just send your request to the DB at P.O. Box 1564 or e-mail <figurard@iserv.net>. Readers who requested a copy more than two weeks ago and haven’t yet received it should drop me a line. I may have lost a few early orders.

Bulletin of the United States Section of the A.I.T is the new journal of the Workers Solidarity Alliance, formerly headquartered in New York City. The two issues January-March and April-June 2000 seem to concentrate almost entirely on the WSA’s activity in a strike in Duluth, Minnesota by members of a United Steelworkers of America, Local 1028 against an international corporation, MEI-GSI as well as the efforts of the employees of the USA’s District 11 to organize themselves against the wishes of the union management. The WSA has endeavored to gather support from MEI-GSI workers in Italy and from sections of the AIT in Italy and elsewhere. Included in this issue is much of the correspondence in this connection as well as correspondence from members related to what appears to be the re-organization of the WSA. No subscription price is given, but readers interested in getting additional information on the journals and on the strike should write to A.I.T, Minnesota, 323 Fourth St., Cloquet, MN 55720 E-mail <aitminnesota@hotmail.com>.

When Insurrection Die, Gilles Dauve. The central idea of this 43-page pamphlet is that fascism was the result of the failure of its predecessors, democracy and social democracy, to maintain social order as industrialism continued to produce an ever growing proletariat. The rise of fascist governments in the twenties and thirties was a capitalist class reaction to the disorders created by a rebellious working class—rebellious, but unfortunately not revolutionary. Fascism’s combination of political repression and military adventuring also turned out to be unstable. Its 1945 defeat in WWII forced capital to seek another solution: a democracy enforced by the military arm of U.S. capital. This form of government provided the social peace and financing (the Marshall Plan) needed to revive capitalism in Germany and elsewhere in Hitler’s former empire.

Unlike Germany and Italy, which came to power democratically, Spain’s fascist regime gained power through the instrument of the state’s military forces assisted by Germany and Italy and by the pseudo neutrality of the Western democracies. The role of the Soviet Union as the only important foreign support for the Spanish Republic gave the Communist Party a major voice in the councils of the Republic. Unfortunately the this influence enabled the USSR to demand disastrous political and military decisions from the Spanish government. At the same time the anarchists and syndicalists, the only revolutionary force in Spain, allied themselves with the Spanish state in the fight against fascism rather than continue the revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

“Collectivise or Communize?” and “Leaving the Twentieth Century?” The last two chapters of the book summarize Dauve’s message in an analysis of events on the events in Spain after the 1937 and in Russia after 1917. An excellent pamphlet published by Antagonism Press and available for $5 postpaid from AK Press Distribution, PO Box 40682. San Francisco, CA 94140.

Techsocracy is an indigenous—I guess the term applies—scheme for what might be called secular socialism or perhaps scientific socialism. I remember reading about it years ago in the SLP’s Weekly People. Apparently it is still alive and well. A reader has sent the DB copies of two journals whose
critique of the effects of capitalism sounds remarkably like that of any non-market socialist group. It is especially strong in its analysis of the effect a moneyless economy would have on solving social problems. If all goes well, we will have a representative article in a future issue. Readers interested in the magazines can write to The Northwest Technocrat, 2475 Harksell Road, Ferndale, WA 98248 and the Technocracy Digest, 2946 – 272 St., Aldergrove, B.C. V4W 3R4, Canada. Single copies of each – $2.00.

Granell Pinturas (Cinco Poems con Eugenio Granell) is a chapbook of Spanish language poetry by Granell and graphic art from the time of the Spanish Civil War. Edited by Daniel De Culla, it contains pictures of Granell as well as a couple of essays. No price given. Info from Daniel De Culla, P.M.U., PO Box 2117 Burgos, Spain 09080.

South Chicago ABC Zine Distribution Catalogue is a 40-page listing of mostly anarchist magazines and pamphlets sold by its publisher, Anthony Rayson. It is organized under the following headings: 1) Anarchism, 2.) Feminism, 3.) Anti-Racism/Abolitionism, 4.) Prisoner Zines, 5.) Miscellaneous Zines and Artwork. This is the best source I know of for self published pamphlets and magazines. None of Rayson’s magazines cost more than a dollar or two and in addition he has a discount policy. South Chicago ABC Zine Distro, P.O. Box 721, Homewood, IL 60430.

Left Wing Lies: What a Worker Found in His Quest for a Definition of Socialism is the title of Ken Ellis’s 547-page book on the Socialist Labor Party. Ellis, an SLP member and national office employee in the 1970s discovered flaws of character in the SLP leadership and flaws in the party’s program and the DeLeonist assumptions it is based on. Not only did he discover these, he insisted on talking about them, thereby getting on the nerves of the National Secretary. Ellis’s employment by the SLP national office was soon terminated, but his interest in the SLP continued. He spent spare time during the next twenty years working on his book. This is the fifth draft. Ellis got around the problem of finding a publisher or financing its publication himself by publishing it on the internet. Readers can find it at his website, <http://www.eenocities.com/kenellis2020>.

--fg