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About This Issue

At this writing, December 39, it rather looks as though DB99 will come close to making the January 1, 2000 deadline which was set as a catchup date to get publication back on schedule for the next millennium. But since the post office is closed on New Years Day, we can’t get it in the mail until Monday, January 3, at the earliest. Close, but no cigar. The short interval between the publication of 98 and 99 has caused another problem. This issue has fewer of the debate/forum articles written by advocates of the various currents in our political sector. This being the case, it seemed appropriate to publish an excerpt from what I consider to be the best description of the political tendency the DB
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The Discussion Bulletin is affiliated with the Industrial Union Caucus in Education (IUCE). It serves as the financially and politically independent forum of a relatively unknown sector of political thought that places the great divide in the “left,” not between Anarchists and Socialists but between capitalism’s statist leftwing of vanguardists and social democrats and the real revolutionaries of our era: the non-market, anti-statist, libertarian socialists. They are organized in small groups of syndicalists, communist anarchists, libertarian municipalists, world socialists, socialist industrial unions, council communists, and left communists. The perspective of these groups with their rejection of capitalism’s wage, market, and money system as well as capitalist politics and unionism constitutes the only real alternative to capitalism in both its market and statist phases.

In the DB the often antagonistic groups that make up this sector can debate and discuss the issues that divide them, gain some understanding of their history and future possibilities and begin a process, we hope, of at least limited cooperation.

The pages of the DB are open to anyone in the political sector, the only limitation being that submissions be typewritten, single-spaced, and copy-ready. We do no editing here. As to content, we assume that submissions will be relevant to the purpose of the DB and will avoid personal attacks.
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Introduction to Non-Market Socialism

Published in 1987, *Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* is a rare bird in the annals of commercial political science book publishing. It is not about the conventional left of Leninist/Trotskyist/Stalinist/Maoist/Fidelist socialism or communism for which there is a market among leftwing academics. Rather it explains the positions of the remnant of an earlier tradition of socialism/communism that sprang from the revolutionary movement that had quickly become the social democratic left wing of capitalism prior to the 1900s. As small independent revolutionary parties and groups or factions within the established parties, they had become the critics of the reformist socialist movement that would become the eager partners with their national capitalist class in the war that convulsed the industrialized world for four years, 1914-18. The Russian Revolution would splinter and isolate them still further as the Bolsheviks under Lenin established hegemony over the revolutionary left through the Third International. By 1925 the basic strands of what John Crump refers to as “the thin red line” had been established.

The book is also unique as a cooperative effort by writers from the diverse and often hostile parts of this political sector. It made a profound impression on me, coming as it did, a few years after I began publishing the *Discussion Bulletin* as a forum for revolutionary socialists. For one thing its title provided a new criterion for political classification. It also widened my political horizons.

The nine-page introduction below written by John Crump, one of the editors, contains thumbnail sketches of the five main strands of the “thin red line” and describes the purpose of the book. I differ politically with some of the contributors, among them Steve Coleman regarding the Socialist Labor Party and the editors’ decision to include the Bordigists, whose vanguardist/proletarian dictatorship ideas I have difficulty stomaching. Unfortunately *Non-Market Socialism* is now out of print.
Introduction

It is in the face of this situation that we have chosen to use the term 'non-market socialism'. Our purpose is straightforward, and we do not hide it. We want to re-establish the genuine meaning of socialism. We are not arguing that absence of the market is the sole defining feature of socialism. On the contrary, socialism is not merely a marketless society; it is also a stateless society, a classless society, a moneyless society, a wageless society ... and so on. However, in choosing to use the term 'non-market socialism', we are selecting one among a number of qualities which socialism possesses (its characteristic of being a marketless society) and focusing on this in order to stress the difference between socialism and all varieties of capitalism.

Undoubtedly, our use of the term 'non-market socialism' is not, without danger. Maximilien Rubel brings out this point in Chapter I. By talking in terms of 'non-market socialism', we may inadvertently imply that other varieties of socialism (even 'market socialism') could exist. Nothing could be further from our intention, of course. But at least 'non-market socialism' does have the merit of emphasising firstly that the marketless society of socialism has never been established anywhere in the world, and secondly that most so-called 'socialists' are nothing of the sort. The fact that Social Democrats, Leninists and other supposed 'socialists' or 'communists' envisage a role for the market, tells us that they represent forces for maintaining capitalism, not for achieving socialism.

One final point needs to be made with regard to our terminology. Despite the inaccuracy of calling an organisation such as the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) a communist party, or the Socialist Party of Italy (PSI) a socialist party, we have regarded organisational labels simply as proper names which deserve to be used neutrally. Hence our references to organisations such as the CPGB and PSI do not imply any recognition of their supposedly 'communist' or 'socialist' (in fact, state capitalist) character.

In Chapter I, Maximilien Rubel looks at 'Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth Century'. Rubel explains that rejection of the market was an integral component of Marx's
and Engels's conception of socialism and he demonstrates that the approach which Marx and Engels adopted towards this question separated them from Proudhon and the other false 'socialists' of their day. Rubel's chapter is complemented by Alain Pengam's discussion in Chapter 3 of other nineteenth-century, non-market socialists, such as Joseph Déjacque and Peter Kropotkin.

In Chapter 2, John Crump examines 'Non-Market Socialism in the Twentieth Century'. In addition to identifying those currents which have represented the 'thin red line' of non-market socialism in the twentieth century, Crump identifies a number of key principles which distinguish non-market socialists from Social Democrats, Leninists and other advocates of capitalism. These key principles have served as litmus paper, as it were, in deciding which currents to include in a book on non-market socialism and which to exclude.

The currents which have adhered to these principles are, presented in roughly the order of their historical appearance in Chapters 3 to 7. In Chapter 3, Alain Pengam differentiates 'Anarcho-Communism' from other varieties of anarchism. In Chapter 4, Stephen Coleman discusses 'Impossibilism' in general and the Socialist Party of Great Britain in particular. In Chapter 5, Mark Shipway examines 'Council Communism', paying particular attention to the theories of Anton Pannekoek. Similarly, in Chapter 6 on 'Bordigism', Adam Buick focuses principally on the ideas of Amadeo Bordiga. Finally, in Chapter 7 on 'Situationism', Mark Shipway analyses the ideas of the situationists. Some of the writers identify more closely with the currents about which they have written than others, but all were given the brief of producing chapters which fulfilled three objectives. First, each chapter provides a brief historical account of the current under examination. Second, each chapter outlines the principal theoretical ideas of the current. Third, each writer gives a personal assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the current.

It may be useful for readers to have an overall picture of the various currents which have represented non-market socialism in the twentieth century before they tackle the detailed, chapter-by-chapter analyses of each current. Accordingly, we present brief profiles of these five currents here.
ANARCHO-COMMUNISM

Anarchist-communism's roots extend back to the activity and writings in the nineteenth century of anarchists such as Peter Kropotkin, Elisée Reclus and Jean Grave. One of anarchocommunism's fullest expositions in this century was Alexander Berkman's *What Is Communist Anarchism?* (1929), better known in its abridged form as the ABC of Anarchism (1942). As examples of anarcho-communist revolutionary activity, we could point to the struggles of the Partido Liberal Mexicano in the Mexican Revolution and to some anarchist groups in the Russian Revolution. In both these revolutions, anarcho-communists worked with peasants and workers, encouraged them to substitute their own organisations for those of the state, and participated in attempts to organise production on the basis of free communes. What distinguishes anarchocommunism from other varieties of anarchism is the equal emphasis which anarchist-communism has placed on individual freedom and communal solidarity, and its belief that these twin goals can be achieved simultaneously through the establishment of a stateless, moneyless communist society.

IMPOSSIBILITY

'Possibilist' and 'impossibilist' were terms coined in the nineteenth century to distinguish different wings of the Social Democratic Parties. Social Democrats who concentrated their efforts on reforming capitalism were dubbed 'possibilists', while the 'impossibilists' were those who struggled solely to achieve the goal of socialism. In time, the impossibilists either split away from the Social Democratic Parties, or abandoned impossibilism as the price for remaining in the ranks of Social Democracy. In Britain, impossibilism has its roots in various revolts against the leadership of the first Social Democratic organisation to be formed, the Social Democratic Federation of 1884. Secessions from the Social Democratic Federation led to the formation, as early as 1884, of the Socialist League, in which William Morris was a prominent participant, and to the emergence in 1904 of the Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB). The SPGB has become the best-known impossibilist
group, and its journal, the *Socialist Standard*, is the most accessible written expression of impossibilism.

COUNCIL COMMUNISM

Although both workers' councils and groups which later formed the nuclei of the council communist movement existed before the First World War, council communism rose to brief prominence, principally in Germany, immediately following the War. Inspired by the Russian Revolution, the council communists saw the workers' councils (soviets) as the instrument of proletarian revolution. In a number of West European countries, groups of council communists were constituent elements in the Communist Parties when these were first formed, but they were criticised by Lenin in *Left-Wing Communism, an Infinitesimal Disorder* (1920) because of their opposition to communists participating in parliamentary elections and joining trade unions and Social Democratic Parties. The council communists split away from, or were expelled from, the Communist Parties of the Third International during the period 1920–1, and some of them organised alternative Communist Workers' Parties, such as the Communist Workers' Party of Germany (KAPD) in 1920. Sizeable council communist organisations disappeared as the post-war wave of radicalisation receded, and as the 1920s progressed the council communist movement was reduced to small groups engaged in theoretical work and propaganda activity. Paul Mattick's *Anti-Bolshevik Communism* (1978) represents some of the best fruits of the theoretical work in which the council communists have engaged.

BORDIGISM

Amadeo Bordiga and his comrades stood on the left wing of the Italian Socialist Party before the First World War and they were the most resolutely anti-war faction in Italy during the War. When the Communist Party of Italy was founded in 1921, the dominant position of Bordiga's faction within the new party was symbolised by the fact that Bordiga became
the party leader. Bordiga had already been criticised by Lenin in 'Left-Wing' Communism, an Infantile Disorder for advocating abstention from parliamentary elections, and in 1923 the executive committee of the Third International ousted him from the leadership of the Communist Party of Italy. Bordiga and his comrades remained within the Communist Party of Italy, but they suffered a defeat at the hands of Gramsci and his supporters, who were backed by the leaders of the Third International, at the congress held in exile in Lyons in 1926. Subsequently, the Bordigists either were expelled or withdrew from the Italian Communist Party. Bordiga himself being expelled in 1930. Although Bordiga was forced into political inactivity as long as Mussolini was in power, others who shared his views ensured that Bordigism maintained an organised existence. The form and name of the Bordigists' organisation changed at various junctures, but eventually became fixed as the International Communist Party, with members in Italy, France and elsewhere. Bordiga returned to political activity at the close of the Second World War and was associated with the International Communist Party until his death in 1970. Amadeo Bordiga's ideas on the nature of communist society have been presented in Jacques Camaute's Bordiga et la passion du communisme (1974).

SITUATIONISM

The situationists emerged in 1957 as a movement of avant-garde artists. Their criticism of consumer-oriented conventional art led them to criticise consumerism in general, and hence to attack the basis of capitalism – the production of wealth as commodities. Having widened their perspectives, their revolutionary activity principally took the form of publicity-catching stunts and the production of a stream of pamphlets and journals. Among their pamphlets, Guy Debord's The Society of the Spectacle (1967) and Raoul Vaneigem's Traité de savoir-vivre à l'usage des jeunes générations (1967) (translated into English as The Revolution of Everyday Life) are key texts. When tens of thousands of students and workers erupted onto the streets of Paris in May 1968, many of their protests had been anticipated by the situationists. Situationists
Introduction

were involved in the May events, but they never claimed to be leading the mass demonstrations and occupations, whose value they judged to lie in their spontaneity. From the 1970s, with the onset of economic depression, the situationists went into decline and were reduced to individuals and small groups engaged in propaganda activity.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that many of the chapters devote attention to organisations which have long since disbanded or to the ideas of people who are long since dead. We do not apologise for this. The theories which inspired these organisations and which were formulated by these people are relevant to the predicament in which the world finds itself today. Capitalism has not changed in any fundamental way since their day, and neither has the non-market socialist alternative to capitalism which they articulated.

Besides, although organisations and individuals may come and go, non-market socialism came into existence not long after industrial capitalism was established and has had a persistent, if chequered, history which extends down to the present day. The continued existence of non-market socialism is partly attributable to the efforts of those working men and women who have been its partisans, but paradoxically it is due above all to the nature of capitalism itself. Capitalism necessarily entails an unceasing effort on the part of rival capitals throughout the world to maintain themselves by means of accumulation, and accumulation can only take place at the expense of the wage-working class. Unremitting exploitation and oppression of the wage-working class are built into capitalism, and can only be abolished by instituting a worldwide socialist society and hence destroying the implacable market forces which capitalism has unleashed. Thus it can confidently be said that as long as capitalism exists, the non-market socialist response to it will continually emerge within the working class.

Some people may be puzzled by the fact that we devote so much attention in this book to minority currents and less-than-famous individuals. How, it will be asked, can we neglect the mass movements of the past 100 years and their leaders?
Our response is to turn back the question to the questioners. Haven't the mass movements and their leaderships had their chances to right the wrongs of the world, by virtue of their attaining mass proportions? Conservatism, Liberalism, Social Democracy, Leninism . . . haven't they all had their share of power, and haven't they all proved totally ineffective in ri/thing the world of the problems which capitalism continually recreates? Other contenders for the privileges which accompany the administration of capitalism (nuclear disarmers, 'greens', feminists . . .) are waiting in the wings, and are having some success in turning themselves into mass movements because of the illusory attractiveness of their promises to reform the market system. Like previous attempts at reform, these latest efforts directed towards making the capitalist system function in a manner which gives priority to human interests are bound to fail. As long as the world market remains, human beings will be forced to dance to its tune. Market forces cannot be tamed; only eliminated. The very existence of humankind is now threatened by the rivalry and the fixation on profit which are inherent in the market system. Surely this is sufficient reason for setting aside preconceptions and prejudices and for considering the non-market socialists' case for abolishing the market on its intellectual and political merits.

As we have indicated, non-market socialism would necessarily be socialism on a world scale. In the society envisaged by non-market socialists, the people of the world would own the global means of production in common and would operate them communally for the benefit of humankind as a whole. Socialism in one country, or even one part of the world, is impossible. Since capitalism today is a global society which encompasses all parts of the world, the socialist alternative to capitalism must be equally global in its scope.

In view of the global nature of non-market socialism, it is appropriate that this book should be the result of an international effort by socialists who live in a number of countries. Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that all the contributors live in advanced, industrialised countries and that the focus of most chapters is primarily European. This is perhaps inevitable, given the facts that capitalism first developed in Europe and that, as a result, the non-market socialist response to capitalism also originated in Europe. The various currents of non-market socialism which are discussed in Chapters 3 to 7 all first emerged in Europe, although some of them have since spread to other continents.

Despite the European backgrounds of the various contributors, however, it is important to emphasise that the message of this book is not Euro-centrist. Non-market socialism is as relevant to the plight of those who are starving in Africa and other parts of the world as it is to the inhabitants of London or Paris. It is true that non-market socialists have generally seen the wage workers of those advanced, industrialised areas of the world which act as the power-houses of international capitalism (Europe, North America and Japan) as the force which is likely to initiate the revolutionary change from world capitalism to world socialism. Yet the establishment of non-market socialism could not be accomplished without the active cooperation of the majority of the population in those parts of the world which capitalism has consigned to underdevelopment. In contrast to the hopelessness and destitution which afflict the majority of the people in backward countries under world capitalism, the prospect of dignity and sufficiency which world socialism would open up for them would be overwhelmingly attractive. It is also worth mentioning that several of the non-market socialist principles which are identified in Chapter 2 closely resemble the principles of social cooperation found among hunter-gatherers and other supposedly 'backward' people. People in their social position would take much less convincing of the desirability of non-market socialism than would many of those in advanced countries who are currently steeped in the values and assumptions which capitalism encourages.

Non-market socialism would be a global solution to the global problems which have accompanied the rise of world capitalism.
Adding Some Clarity to Aaron Smeaton's Most Recent Remarks in DB #97

"We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage war. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers."

-from the Preamble of the IWW Constitution

Aaron Smeaton wrote in the "Discussion Bulletin" (DB)# 97 that I ignored his criticism of dual carding, which he sees as a form of "entryism". Apologies Aaron--this was not intentional. Just to set the record straight, the IWW doesn't promote "entryism" into the trade unions; but neither does the IWW exclude members of trade unions from its ranks. We allow class conscious members of AFL unions to "enter" the IWW, but, paraphrasing the old Moor, we are not attempting to lay hold of ready made business union machinery to wield it for our own purposes.

On the question of voting, A. Smeaton wrote: "Most workers don't vote in elections either, either because they don't really care or at some basic level they know that voting is meaningless. In this respect many workers have already figured out something that the IWW seems to have forgotten. That it takes two minutes to vote is true but these are two minutes that are best spent talking with other workers."

Just to be clear, the IWW neither endorses electoral programs nor abstention vis a vis elections. I personally find some political parties to be expressing much of what I would like to see happen e.g. the NUP and the SPGB. I realize that most of the voting I do results in merely adding one more voice to the battle over public opinion. I take the same view with my participation in street demonstrations. Still, I have no problem with voting or demonstrating for free available health care, to be paid for by expropriating some of the wealth ripped off from us at the point of production. In addition, I would have no problem with voting or demonstrating for the decriminalization of victimless crimes. In other words, I don't find the two minutes I spend on voting (which by the by, I do before the work day begins) or the hours I spend demonstrating and yes, speaking with my fellow workers each year to be meaningless. I do view abstention from these activities to be pointlessly absurd, at best or only adding to the nihilism of the couch potato syndrome, at worst.

A. Smeaton then pooh-poohs the solidarity work of contemporary Wobblies in Mexico by saying that my fellow workers are just being manipulated by a bunch of ex-Maoists, the EZLN. Comrade Smeaton asserts, "The struggle in Mexico is one that seeks to keep Mexicans involved in supporting a government and a system that is starving them by giving it the appearance of a multi-party democracy". This view constrasts sharply with the one expressed by Andrew Flood of the Irish Mexican Group and Workers Solidarity Movement in a letter to the editor of "Anarcho-Syndicalist Review" #26, dated Fall, 1999:

"The backbone of today's rebellion consists of over 30 regional peasant councils each of delegates from around 100 communities. Such delegates are subject to both mandate and recall and it would seem that these and the village level assemblies below them function in a manner that anarchists
would advocate and have not only supported but helped found in previous revolutions. Similar peasant assemblies and councils were created by anarchists in the course of the Russian and Spanish revolutions." (more info at: http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/councils.html)

To be clear though, the IWW doesn't form alliances with political parties or anti-political sects. If some Wobs are doing solidarity work with Mexican workers and peasants, I can assure Aaron that they disdain to conceal fundamental IWW principles, e.g. the need to abolish the wage system, from anyone, including any former Maoists who may be lurking in the ranks of the EZLN.

As to the direction of the struggle in Mexico, I think, at this point, we need to let some time pass before we see the ultimate result, just as we did, when Joe Hill was alive and according to A.S. there, "was a revolution going on in Mexico that was seeking the overthrow of the hated Porfirio."

Lastly, Aaron quotes me way out of context with regard to my views about the nature of co-ops thusly, ".co-ops have done away with the employer/employee relation." To clarify, what I wrote was, "The fact is though that most Wobs, at the moment, don't agree with this critique (to quote Smeaton's critique, "that cooperative job shops fall into the role of small businesses and foster a small business mentality in the IWW") AS IT APPLIES TO CO-OPS WHICH HAVE DONE AWAY WITH THE EMPLOYER/EMPLOYEE RELATION. (emphasis mine, MB).

He then attempts to pin this bastardized quote on to the dead horse of a failed co-op, known as North Farm to somehow demonstrate that the IWW has transformed itself into a small business administration.

To clarify, the IWW allows producers associated with co-ops to become members of the IWW. The IWW is not endorsing the a co-op road to revolution. As with members of the AFL, the IWW allows members of producer co-ops to join its ranks. The IWW will also allow a whole co-op to join its ranks, as long as there are no employers or employees in the that co-op i.e. that said co-op is a democratically, self-managed, producer-owned and -operated entity.

Communist greetings,

Mike Ballard <http://www.stanford.edu/~miballard>

(from p. 2)

sometimes refers to as “our political sector,” characterized in the DB’s page 2 standing notice as “a relatively unknown sector of political thought that places the great divide in the ‘left,’ not between anarchists and Marxists but between capitalism’s leftwing of vanguardists and social democrats and the real revolutionists of our era: the non-market anti-statist, libertarian socialists.”

I picked the book, Non-Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, off my shelf because I wanted to reread Adam Buick’s chapter on Bordigism. I also read John Crump’s introduction again, I realized that DB readers should also read it because the term “non-market” defines our differences from “the left,” the current term for the various social democratic, Leninist, liberal, and libertarian programs designed to make capitalism endurable by reforming this or that particular evil.

John Crump’s introduction defines non-market socialism briefly and the strands that make up what he calls the “thin red line” of groups the survived the reformist degradation of the meaning of

(to p. 11)
WHO NEEDS THE WTO?

In ancient times the word tyrant signified not simply a figure of oppressive authority, noted for extreme cruelty and injustice, but more precisely one who dared not appear in public without bodyguards. The vast interlocking tyrannies of our own time suggest that this strange period which flatters itself as "postmodern" might perhaps more aptly be called neo-ancient, and in any case qualifies as an example of barbarism at its goriest. Courtesy of the "free enterprise" system, the U.S. has created the most speed-on, billy-clubbed, tear-gassed, and locked-up society in the history of the world.

Today, however, it is not only top government officials, captains of industry, mobsters and religious potentates who surround themselves with cops and more cops (public and/or private), but also celebrities, stars of stage and screen, athletes, talk-show hosts and hostesses, radio personalities, brokers, bankers, gamblers, gurus, and all manner of high-profile nonentities. So inflated has the tyrants' network become in the past hundred years that our whole society is now afflicted with cops everywhere: in the street, of course, and the workplace, on the beach, and wherever young people and people of color assemble, but also in schools, in libraries, at concerts and other places of entertainment.

These reflections came to mind as we read media reports implying that, at the World Trade Organization’s highly publicized plot-and-plunderfest in Seattle this month, the number of cops, soldiers and paid informers may well exceed the combined total of WTO conference attendees and protestors.

It should not be overlooked that the WTO itself is a kind of cop, or rather a kind of tyrants’ watchdog—a symbolic hyperwatchdog at the portals of the new, improved, post-colonial, multicultural, genetically modified, low-fat imperialism. Organized in 1995 with specifically anti-labor motives in mind, the WTO has also manifested from the start a total contempt for even the most basic ecological concerns, and an obscenous eagerness to obey each and every command issued by the stagemangers of commodity fetishism.

It is in fact the avowed aim of the WTO to help coordinate U.S. capital's current scramble for Africa and Asia, as well as the restructuring of a freshly balkanized Europe, now conveniently dominated by the U.S.A.'s very own NATO. More generally, the WTO's task is to oversee U.S. capital's worldwide campaign to lower wages, destroy unions, restore sweatshop conditions, shield corporate polluters and wilderness-wreckers, facilitate the commercial annihilation of endangered species, and above all keep the profits soaring. Another important but more covert purpose of the WTO is to prepare the way for the globalization of slave labor.

The WTO's function, therefore, is not simply to maintain existing inequality but to expand it, indeed to globalize it—in other words, to make an already intolerable situation infinitely worse for everyone except billionaires.

For us, surrealists, the WTO represents everything loathsome and disgusting in this world, and inspires only our revulsion. Almost to the point of caricature, it epitomizes contemporary civilization's disastrous hatred of the Marvelous. The WTO not only exemplifies the fear of poetry and love, the fear of human freedom, and the fear of wild creatures and places—it also broadcasts those fears, exacerbates them, and merges them into the Great Fear that paralyzes such a large portion of the U.S. population today: the fear
of being "different," of being oneself, of being alive.

The WTO's stupid, boring, empty apologetics—its "booms," options, clout, profits, Prozac, diplomatic victories, accords, telecoms, Normal Trade Relations, "services," deals, tariffs, "futures," deficits, rapid growth, incentives, deregulation, ventures, market values, and "development" (i.e., covering the Earth with cement): all this truly makes us sick. (WTO rhetoric, like that of its confederates—the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and President Clinton himself—could serve as a manual for students of the devaluation of language.) Such words and phrases are no laughing matter, any more than the deeds they document. Sixty-five years ago, W. E. B. Du Bois described just what horror the strokes of a pen can bring: "Flames of jealous murder sweep the earth, while brains of little children smear the hills." Make no mistake, the WTO can sign no agreement which is not a death sentence. Its reason for being is to make learning and youth, poetry and desire, solidarity and joy, poverty and weakness, wildlife and old growth—indeed everything not serving the crimes of capital—into a capital crime.

Clearly, as a bureaucratic embodiment of Patriarchy, Capital, Statism, White Supremacy, Genocide, and Ecocide—in short, the globalization of all forms of misery and miserabilism—the WTO is a veritable emblem of the sum of all villainies today.

Is there really anything to argue about here? Isn't it frightfully obvious that the WTO is a thoroughgoing abomination? That its whole agenda boils down to domination and devastation? That we'd all be much better off without it?

Here, then, are three simple, straightforward, reasonable demands:

Abolish the WTO!

Defend the Marvelous, 
by any means necessary!

Free Mumia Abu-Jamal!

The Surrealist Movement
in the United States
22 November 1999
P.O. Box 6424, Evanston, IL 60204;
E-mail: Beasley@mcs.com

(from p. 9)

socialism over the past century or more of political evolution. The book, published in 1987, was reviewed in DB31, September 1988. At that time I wrote, "it would be accurate, I think, to call this the most important book yet published on the politics of our end of the political spectrum." Unfortunately I understand that the book is now out of print.

Next Mike Ballard corrects what he sees as Aaron Smeaton's misconceptions about the IWW, among them its position on the ELZN, the Zapatistas. I suspect that some readers besides Smeaton and me are suspicious of the motives and methods of Subcommandante Marcos and his lieutenants. They have the odor of a new ruling class—poised to become the Sandinistas, the Bolsheviks—of Chiapas. That is, in "Non-Market Socialism" but have no organizational presence nor recent publications to my knowledge.

"What Is Makhaevism?" will familiarize DB readers with one of the less well-known branches of anarchism. I came upon them first about 15 years ago in a pamphlet by the anarchist popularizer Max Nomad. The 22-page pamphlet, White Collars & Horned Hands, published by Black Cat Press in (to p. 16)
WHAT IS 'MAKHAEVISM'?

WHEN the Short Course history of the Communist party was published in Pravda in 1938, it was accompanied by a decree which emphasized the role of the intelligentsia in the construction of Soviet society. The decree bitterly condemned the 'Makhaevist' belief that the intellectuals —party officials, factory and farm managers, army officers, technical specialists, scientists— were an alien breed of self-seeking men who had nothing in common with the worker at the bench or the peasant behind the plough. This hostile attitude towards the intelligentsia, declared the decree, was 'savage, hooligan and dangerous to the Soviet State'.

A number of Pravda readers, puzzled by the strange expression 'Makhaevism', wrote to the editors asking them to explain it. (Some readers, it seems, confused 'Makhaevism' with 'Machism', the philosophy of the Austrian physicist Ernst Mach, which Lenin had severely criticized thirty years earlier.) In a scathing polemic, Pravda replied that 'Makhaevism' was a crude theory which slandered the intelligentsia by branding them as the new exploiters of the workers and peasants; its adherents were 'aliens, degenerates, and enemies', whose slogan was 'Down with the intelligentsia'. Vehemently denying that the intelligentsia constituted a new class of oppressors, Pravda asserted that the intellectuals and the toiling masses were 'of one bone and one flesh'. Yet Pravda's barrage of vituperation merely thickened the mist of confusion surrounding the term 'Makhaevism', which, by the 1930s, had become little more than a convenient epithet for intellectual-baiting. But what, in fact, was 'Makhaevism'? Who was its originator, and what influence did he have during his lifetime?

Jan Wacław Machajski was born in 1866 in Busk, a small town of some two thousand inhabitants, situated near the city of Kielce in Russian Poland. He was the son of an indigent clerk, who died when Machajski was a child, leaving a large and destitute family. Machajski attended the gimnazyia in Kielce and helped support his brothers and sisters by tutoring the schoolmates who boarded in his mother's apartment. He began his revolutionary career in 1888 in the student circles of Warsaw University, where he had enrolled in the faculties of natural science and medicine. Two or three years later, while attending the University of Zurich, he abandoned his first political philosophy (a blend of socialism and Polish nationalism) for the revolutionary internationalism of Marx and Engels. Machajski was arrested in May 1892, for smuggling revolutionary proclamations from Switzerland into the industrial city of Lodz, which was then, in the throes of a general strike. In 1903, after a dozen years in prison and Siberian exile, he escaped to western Europe, where he remained until the outbreak of the 1905 revolution.

During his long term of banishment in the Siberian settlement of Vilyuiisk (in Yakutsk province), Machajski made an intensive study of socialist literature and came to the conclusion that the Social Democrats did not really champion the cause of the manual workers, but that of a new class of 'mental workers' engendered by the rise of industrialism. Marxism, he maintained in his major work, Umschweer rabechi, reflected the interests of this new class, which hoped to ride to power on the shoulders of the manual workers. In a so-called 'socialist' society, he declared, private capitalists would merely be replaced by a new aristocracy of administrators, technical experts, and politicians; the manual labourers would be enslaved anew by a ruling minority whose capital, so to speak, was education.

In evolving his anti-Marxist theories, Machajski was strongly influenced by Mikhail Bakunin and by the economists of the 1890s. A generation before the appearance of Umschweer rabechi, Bakunin had denounced Marx and his followers as narrow intellectuals who, living in an unreal world of dusty books and thick journals, understood nothing of human suffering. Although Bakunin believed that intellectuals would play an important part in the revolutionary struggle, he warned that his Marxist rivals had an insatiable lust for power. In 1872, four years before his death, Bakunin speculated on the shape the Marxist 'dictatorship of the proletariat' would assume if ever inaugurated:

"That would be the rule of scientific intellect, the most autocratic, the most despotic, the most arrogant, and the most insolent of all regimes. There will be a new class, a new hierarchy of genuine or sham savants, and the world
will be divided into a dominant minority in the name of science, and an immense ignorant majority."

In one of his most important works, Gosudarstvennost i anarkhiya, published the following year, Bakunin elaborated upon this dire prophecy in a most striking passage:

"According to the theory of Mr. Marx, the people not only must not destroy [the state] but must strengthen it and place it at the complete disposal of their benefactors, guardians, and teachers the leaders of the Communist party, namely Mr. Marx and his friends, who will proceed to liberate [mankind] in their own way. They will concentrate the reigns of government in a strong hand, because the ignorant people require an exceedingly firm guardianship; they will establish a single state bank, concentrating in its hands all commercial, industrial, agricultural, and even scientific production, and then divide the masses into two armies—industrial and agricultural—under the direct command of state engineers, who will constitute a new privileged scientific-political estate."

According to Bakunin, the followers of Karl Marx and of Auguste Comte as well were 'priests of science', ordained in a new privileged church of the mind and superior education. They disdainfully informed the common man: 'You know nothing, you understand nothing, you are a blockhead, and a man of intelligence must put a saddle and bridle on you and lead you'.

Bakunin maintained that education was as great an instrument of domination as private property. So long as learning was preempted by a minority of the population, he wrote in 1869 in an essay entitled Integral Instruction, it could effectively be used to exploit the majority. 'The one who knows more', he wrote, 'will naturally dominate the one who knows less.' Even if the landowners and capitalists were eliminated, there was a danger that the world 'would be divided once again into a mass of slaves and a small number of rulers, the former working for the latter as they do today'. Bakunin's answer was to wrest education from the monopolistic grasp of the privileged classes and make it available equally to everyone; like capital, education must cease to be 'the patrimony of one or of several classes and become 'the common property of all'. An integrated education in science and handicrafts (but not in the jejune abstractions of religion, metaphysics and sociology) would enable all citizens to engage in both manual and mental pursuits, thereby eliminating a major source of inequality. 'Everyone must work, and everyone must be educated', Bakunin averred, so that in the good society of the future there would be 'neither workers nor scientists, but only men'.

The gulf between the educated classes and the 'dark people' of Russia was broader than anywhere else in Europe. During the 1870s, when the young Populist students from Petersburg and Moscow went to the people in the countryside, they ran into an invisible barrier that separated them from the ignorant narod. Their pitiful failure to communicate with the rural folk led some disillusioned Populists to abandon the education which they thought was dividing them from the masses. Others wondered whether the education gap could be bridged at all, whether the Populist philosopher Nikolai Mikhailovski was not right when he observed that the literate few must 'inevitably enslave' the toiling majority.

Nor was the situation really improved when the peasants came to the city to work in the factories, for they brought their suspicion of the intellectuals with them. One labourer in St. Petersburg complained that 'the intelligentsia had usurped the position of the workers'. It was all right to accept books from the students, he said, but when they begin to teach you nonsense you must knock them down. 'They should be made to understand that the workers' cause ought to be placed entirely in the hands of the workers themselves.' Although these remarks were aimed at the Populist Chaikovski circle in the 1870s, the same attitude persisted in succeeding decades towards both the Populists and the Marxists, who were competing for the allegiance of the emerging class of industrial workers. In 1883, Georgi Plekhanov, the 'father' of Russian Social Democracy, felt constrained to pledge that the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat would be 'as far removed from the dictatorship of a group of razonchists revolutionists as heaven is from earth'. He assured the workers that Marx's disciples were selfless men, whose mission was to raise the class-consciousness of the proletariat so that it could become 'an independent figure in the arena of historical life, and not pass eternally from one guardian to another'.


Notwithstanding repeated reassurances of this sort, many factory workers eschewed the doctrinaire revolutionism of Plekhanov and his associates and bent their efforts to the task of economic and educational self-improvement. They began to manifest a tendency (in which they were joined by a number of sympathetic intellectuals) which later acquired the label of 'economism'. The average Russian workman was more interested in raising his material level than in agitating for political objectives; he was wary of the revolutionary slogans floated by party leaders who seemed bent on pushing him into political adventures that might satisfy their own ambitions while leaving the situation of the workers essentially unchanged. Political programmes, wrote a leading spokesman of the 'economist' point of view, 'are suitable for intellectuals going "to the people"', but not for the workers themselves... And it is the defence of the workers' interests... that is the whole content of the labour movement'. The intelligentsia, he added, quoting Marx's celebrated preamble to the bylaws of the First International, tended to forget that 'the liberation of the working class must be the task of the workers themselves'.

Underlying the anti-intellectualism of the 'economists' was the conviction that the intelligentsia looked upon the working class simply as the means to a higher goal, as an abstract mass predestined to carry out the immutable will of history. According to the 'economist', the intellectuals, instead of bringing their knowledge to bear on the concrete problems of factory life, were inclined to lose themselves in ideologies that had no relation to the, true needs of the workers. Emboldened by the Petersburg textile strikes of 1896 and 1897, which were organized and directed by local workmen, the 'economists' urged the Russian labouring class to remain self-sufficient and reject the leadership of self-centred professional agitators. As one bench worker in the capital wrote in an 'economist' journal in 1897, 'the improvement of our working conditions depends on ourselves alone'.

The anti-political and anti-intellectual arguments of Bakunin and the economists' made an indelible impression on Machajski. While in Siberia, he came to believe that the radical intelligentsia aimed not at the achievement of a classless society, but merely to establish itself as a privileged stratum. It was no wonder that Marxism, rather than advocating an immediate revolt against the capitalist system, postponed its 'collapse until a future time when economic conditions had sufficiently 'matured'. With the further development of capitalism and its increasingly sophisticated technology, the 'mental workers' would grow strong enough to establish their own rule. Even if the new technocracy were then to abolish private ownership of the means of production, Machajski said, the 'professional intelligentsia' would still maintain its position of mastery by taking over the management of production and by establishing a monopoly over the special knowledge needed to operate a complex industrial economy. The managers, engineers and political office-holders would use their Marxist ideology as a new religious opiate to becloud the minds of the labouring masses, perpetuating their ignorance and servitude.

Machajski suspected every left-wing competitor of seeking to establish a social system in which the intellectuals would be the ruling class. He even accused the anarchists of Kropotkin's Khleb i voly group of taking a 'gradualist' approach to revolution no better than that of the Social Democrats, for they expected the coming revolution in Russia not to go further than the French revolution of 1789 or 1848. In Kropotkin's projected anarchist commune, Machajski held, 'only the possessors of civilization and knowledge' would enjoy true freedom. The 'social revolution' of the anarchists, he insisted, was not really meant to be a purely 'workers' uprising', but was in fact to be a revolution in the 'interests of the intellectuals'. The anarchists were 'the same socialists as all the others, only more passionate ones'.

What then was to be done to avoid this new enslavement? In Machajski's view, as long as inequality of income persisted and the instruments of production remained the private property of a capitalist minority, and as long as scientific and technical knowledge remained the 'property' of an intellectual minority, the multitudes would continue to toil for a privileged few. Machajski's solution assigned a key role to a secret organization of revolutionaries called the Workers' Conspiracy (Rabochii zagovor), similar to Bakunin's 'secret society' of revolutionary conspirators. Presumably, Machajski himself was to be at the head. The mission of the Workers' Conspiracy was to stimulate the workers into 'direct action'-strikes, demonstrations, and the like—against the capitalists with the immediate object of economic improvements and jobs for the unemployed. The 'direct action' of the workers was to culminate in a general strike which, in turn, would trigger off a world-wide uprising, ushering in an era of equal income and educational opportunity. In the end, the pernicious distinction between
manual and mental labour would be obliterated, together with all class divisions.

Machajski's theories provoked passionate discussions within the various groups of Russian radicals. In Siberia, where Machajski had photographed the first part of Umsveny rabochi in 1898, his critique of Social Democracy 'had a great effect upon the exiles', as Trotsky, who was among them, recalled in his autobiography. By 1901, copies of Umsveny rabochi were circulating in Odessa, where Makhaveism was beginning to attract a following. In 1905, a small group of Makhayevsky calling itself the Workers' Conspiracy, was formed in St. Petersburg. Despite Machajski's criticism of the anarchists, a number of them were drawn to his creed. For a time, Olga Taratuta and Vladimir Striga, leading members of the largest anarchist organization in Russia, the Black Banner (Chernoye znamya) group, were associated with a society in Odessa known as the Intransigents (Neprimirimyi), which included both anarchists and Makhayevsky and the principal anarchist circle in Petersburg, Without Authority (Beznachalnye), contained a few disciples of Machajski. If some anarchist writers took Machajski to task for seeing everything as a clever plot of the intelligentsia, more than a few, as one of Kropotkin's followers admitted, found in the doctrines of 'Makhaveism' a 'fresh and vivifying spirit in contrast to the stilling atmosphere of the socialist parties, saturated with political chicanery'.

The foremost Anarcho-Syndicalist in Russia in 1905, Daniil Novomirski, clearly echoed Machajski's suspicions of the 'mental workers':

"Which class does contemporary socialism serve in fact and not in words? We answer at once and without beating about the bush: Socialism is not the expression of the interests of the working class, but of the so-called rassnochlinstvo, or declass intelligentsia. The Social Democratic party, said Novomirski, was infested with political crooks... new exploiters, new deceivers of the people'. The long social revolution would prove to be a farce he warned, should it fail to annihilate, together with the state and private property yet a third enemy of human liberty: 'That new sworn enemy of ours is the monopoly of knowledge; its bearer is the intelligentsia'. Although Novomirski believed that a 'conscious minority' of farsighted 'pathfinders' was needed to stir the labouring masses into action, he admonished the workers not to look for outsiders to save them. Selfless men simply did not exist - 'not in the dark clouds of the empty sky, nor in the luxurious palaces of the tsars, nor in the chambers of the wealthy, nor in any parliament.'

Machajski's views influenced another ultra-radical group born of the revolution of 1905, the SR-Maximalists. In fact, the chief animator of 'Makhaveism' next to Machajski himself, a man who barely acknowledged his master's existence, was a Maximalist named Yevgeni Vustinovich Lozinski. In his most important book, What, after all, is the Intelligentsia?, Lozinski paraphrased the central idea of Machajski's philosophy: 'Socializing the means of production liberates the intelligentsia form its subjugation by the capitalist state, but does not liberate labour; it leads to the reinforcement of class slavery, to the strengthening of the workers' bondage!'

Similar echoes of Machajski's writings were to be found in numerous pamphlets and articles by anarchists, Maximalists, and other extreme left-wing sectarian. But with the stern repressions of Stolypin in the years following the revolution of 1905, these echoes rapidly faded away and the men who produced them disappeared into prison or exile. Machajski himself, who had returned to Russia in 1905, was compelled to flee again two years later.

Russian radicalism, at a low ebb during the next decade, quickly revived with the outbreak of the February revolution. Although neither the Workers' Conspiracy nor any other organization of Makhayevsky reappeared in 1917, the spirit of Makhaveism was much in evidence within the labour movement. As in 1905, Machajski's influence was particularly strong among the anarchists and Maximalists. In September 1917, for example, in phrases evoking Bakunin and Machajski, an anarchist workman exhorted the delegates at a conference of Petrograd factory committees to launch an immediate general strike. There were no 'laws of history' to hold the people back; he declared, no predetermined revolutionary stages, as the Social Democrats maintained. Marx's disciples—both Mensheviks and Bolsheviks—were deceiving the working class with 'promises of God's reign on earth hundreds of years from now'. There was no reason to wait, he cried. The workers must take direct action—not after
more centuries of painful historical development, but right now! 'Hail the uprising of the slaves and the equality of income!' At a factory committee gathering the following month, another anarchist speaker opposed the approaching Constituent Assembly on the grounds that it was certain to be monopolized by 'capitalists and intellectuals'. 'The intellectuals', he warned, 'in no case can represent the interests of the workers. They know how to twist us around their fingers, and they will betray us. The workers, he thundered, can triumph only through 'direct combat' with their oppressors.

When Machajski returned to Russia in 1917, he made no effort to channel these sentiments into a coherent movement. His heyday had passed with the revolution of 1905, and now he was prematurely old and tired. After the October revolution, he obtained a non-political job with the Soviet government, serving as a technical editor for Narodnoye khozyaistvo (later Sotsialisticheskoye khozyaistvo), the organ of the Supreme Economic Council. He remained, however, sharply critical of Marxism and its adherents. In the summer of 1918, he published a single issue of a journal called Rabochaya revolutsiya, in which he censured the Bolshevists for failing to order the total expropriation of the bourgeoisie or to improve the economic situation of the working class. After the February revolution, wrote Machajski, the workers had received a rise in wages and an eight-hour day, but after October, their material level had been raised 'not one whit'. The Bolshevik insurrection, he continued, was nothing but 'a counterrevolution of the intellectuals'. Political power had been seized by the disciples of Marx, 'the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia ... the possessors of the knowledge necessary for the organization and administration of the whole life of the country'. And the Marxists, in accordance with their prophet's religious gospel of economic determination, had chosen to preserve the bourgeois order, obliging themselves only 'to prepare' the manual workers for their future paradise. Machajski enjoined the working class to press the Soviet government, to expropriate the factories, equalize incomes and educational opportunity, and provide jobs for the unemployed. Yet, as dissatisfied as he was with the new regime, Machajski grudgingly accepted it, at least for the time being. Any attempt to overthrow the government, he said, would benefit only the Whites, who were a worse evil than the Bolshevists.

Machajski remained at his editorial post until his death from a heart attack in February 1926, at the age of sixty

PAUL Avrich Queens College, New York
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Canada, is now out of print, I'm sure. Nomad's books, mostly published in the Fifties, sought to enlighten left-leaning readers about the revolutionary movement. I had forgotten about the pamphlet until I obtained an academic study of this anarchist faction, whose primary difference from other revolutionaries was a deep hostility to the educated leadership of the social democratic parties as they existed at the turn of the century along with a conviction that after the revolution the new leadership would constitute a ruling class that would replace the capitalists as our master. Then a few months ago I found this article on the CAN website just waiting for inclusion in the DB. You can also get it from the Collective Action Network website at <www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/2379>

John Spritzter has chosen a title for first of his two essays from the January/February New Democracy and published here, one that is as likely to raise the hackles of most DB readers as his second is to win our approval. Published in New Democracy as their contribution to the celebration of the Manifesto's sesquicentennial, the essay attempts to indict Marx and Engels for their failure to take into account the working class values as the engine that will bring the revolution. The second, on the anti-capitalism of 1890s populism quotes newspaper accounts of the economic misery of western farmers which seems to contradict the New Dem recipe for revolutionary apple pie which calls for

(to p. 22)
Nineteen ninety-eight was the 150th anniversary of the first publication of the "Communist Manifesto" by Karl Marx and Friedreich Engels. Reading the Manifesto is a good way to decide what you think of Marxism for two reasons. First, it's only 46 pages long. Second, though written early in Marx's life, it was repeatedly reissued by the authors. It is fair to say the Manifesto represents beliefs Marx and Engels held throughout their lives.

The great appeal of the Manifesto lies in the famous ending of the first section: "What the bourgeoisie [the capitalist or owner class] therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

The Manifesto offers hope. It purports to be a scientific basis for hope that capitalism can be defeated. It describes economic laws that supposedly operate independent of human will and make proletariat (working class) victory inevitable. Despite the fact that Communism has been discredited, Marxism still has profound influence in the world because it seems to offer hope for change. The problem with the Manifesto is that it points to a false hope, which has been the downfall of all social movements guided by Marxism.

The Marxist source of hope in economic laws is attractive mainly to those who do not see the revolutionary significance of ordinary peoples' lives and struggles. The Manifesto says nothing of the values of working people, either peasants or industrial workers. Instead Marx and Engels, with their "materialist" view of history, see economic development as the basis of progress and capitalism as a historically progressive force. They judge various classes not in terms of human relations or values but by whether they represent further economic development. The Manifesto believes peasants to be a backward class and declares that the bourgeoisie, by driving peasants off the land and increasing the urban population as compared with the rural, has "rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life." Similarly, the Manifesto sees the ruling elites, not the working class, as the source of enlightened ideas: "entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat...These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress."

The Manifesto finds the source of revolution in these "economic laws." Revolution against capitalism to create a new, more humane social order will come when the capitalist system breaks down and it becomes clear that the bourgeoisie is "unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within its slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him." The problem with the capitalist class, in this view, is simply that it has outgrown its usefulness. Capitalist relations of ownership have become "fetters" on the productive forces which capitalism has itself created.

The Manifesto is blind to the conflict of values in society—solidarity versus competition, equality versus inequality—or to the fact that working people have values opposed to the values of capitalism. The Manifesto sees workers merely in terms of their material interests: "The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority."
The reasons that the Manifesto places its hope on the industrial working class have nothing to do with the values of working people. The first reason given is simply that "the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product." Industrial workers are important because their numbers increase under capitalism. The second reason is that "The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air." Workers do not liberate human society as a conscious goal but as an inevitable by-product of their own uprising.

The real basis for hope lies not in some forces beyond human control, but in the fact that the working people of the world as individuals and as a class do not have only material interests which contradict capitalism; they also have goals and values which embody a different morality and a different view of human life from the capitalists, and they struggle to shape society with these values. Revolution is possible because the values of equality and solidarity and democracy by which ordinary people try to shape the world are revolutionary; the real force driving history is not technological or economic development but the struggle of ordinary people to create human society as they believe it should be. This was true before the rise of capitalism and the growth of an industrial working class and it is true now. The struggles of slaves against slave owners, peasants against feudal lords, workers against capitalists, and even workers against Communist governments are essentially the same. Success is possible, but not inevitable. Peoples' confidence in each other and in their values is what chiefly determines the outcome, not any laws of history that stand above flesh-and-blood human beings. There is progress in history, but that progress comes not from economic development but from the increasing self-knowledge and self-confidence of the working people who create human society.

Is it any wonder many workers feel insulted by the Marxist attitude towards them? Marxists think they have to "educate" workers to see that solidarity "is in their interest," assuming that working people place no more particular value on solidarity than as a useful way to get some material benefit. Marxist governments are dictatorial because they believe they have to mold workers to be more humane—and also make them work harder.

Marxism has failed because the hope it offered was false. We need to rebuild the revolutionary movement on a completely different footing, one that derives hope from understanding what people really care about and strive for in their lives.

---
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REVOLUTION: AS AMERICAN AS APPLE PIE
by John Spritzler

A common stereotype of Americans is that we believe in rugged individualism and competition, and want nothing to do with radical notions of social change. And the most rugged individualist, conservative Americans were supposedly farmers from places like Nebraska and Kansas back before the turn of the century.

An excellent book, *The Populist Response to Industrial America*, by Norman Pollack (Harvard University Press, 1962) puts quite a different light on this topic. Pollack dug into libraries in Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Wisconsin to see what the newspapers serving farm communities were saying during the 1890’s. He found that people in these communities saw capitalism as an attack on their values.

The Farmers Alliance of Lincoln, Nebraska wrote, “The plutocracy of to-day is the logical result of the individual freedom which we have always considered the pride of our system...The tendency of the competitive system is to antagonize and disassociate men...The survival of the fittest is a satanic creed...A stage must be reached in which each will be for all and all for each. The welfare of the individual must be the object and end of all effort...Competition is only another name for war...[W]ithout a complete eradication of this system the people cannot for once hope for relief of a permanent character.” Three years later, under its new name, Alliance-Independent, it wrote, “A reigning plutocracy with the masses enslaved, is the natural development and end of individualism...The only possible permanent democracy is the democracy of unselfish socialism.”

A Walnut Grove, Minnesota paper wrote, “The calamities that have heretofore and that now are upon us—as a nation—are but the measure or indicator of the extent that the standard of political and economic equality has been departed from in the practice of the competitive system.”

The *Platte County Argus* described the “so-called great men” who rose to the top in the competition for the survival of the fittest as “moral cowards and public plunderers [who have] reversed the code of morals and stand up like hypocrites of olden times and thank god they are not like other men are...”

The *Topeka Advocate* wrote, “Look at the multitudes who have been but recently thrown out of employment, and whose families have been destitute in consequence...it is cruel, it is inhuman, to attribute these conditions to laziness, drunkenness and incompetency. They are the natural product of a false and vicious system by which the few grow rich beyond all human need, and the many are doomed to eternal poverty and want...Remember that tramps are men, and that they are a natural product of our social system. There must be discovered some way to deal with them consistently with these facts. Can it be done without a revolution of our system? We think not.”

In calling for revolution against the plutocrats, we in New Democracy are not turning our backs on the historic values of ordinary Americans. We are rediscovering them.
All Industrial Unionists Now?

In the opening years of this century industrial unionism—the idea that all the workers in the same industry should be in a single union—was raised as a radical demand. Today it is being embraced by the leaders of the existing unions. How come?

I recently attended a student union meeting about a fast food franchise employing students at ridiculously low wage rates over the night shift. The union "officials" had been optimistic, they felt they could get a result on this one, they felt it was a strong issue; so, predictably, the meeting was inquorate [without a quorum—fg]. It was, at least, the biggest inquorate meeting for some while, but, it was inquorate nonetheless. The usual debates about student apathy began once more.

I was reminded, somewhat, of my old man, confidently telling me that "grass roots democracy is impossible," and then regaling me with his story about his time as a union rep at ICI. "Out I would come," he'd say, "after negotiating complex things with the management, and all the mates'd ask was 'Well, man, did we get the pay rise?'" As I sat there, surveying the empty wilderness of the meeting hall, I thought, sadly, that he was right.

It's an unfortunate fact that the officials of most unions believe exactly as he did. Certainly it's implied in the way they behave. We could take, for example, an interesting piece in the June issue of Labour Research about a growing demand for industrial unionism within the TUC. Industrial unionism, a familiar concept from the radical fringe across the Atlantic (specifically the Industrial Workers of the World [IWW] and various "DeLeonist" factions there), is the idea that instead of "craft" or "trade" unions, representing workers of a particular skill/type, we have one union representing everyone in a specific industry (thus a Chemical Workers Union, or a Steel Workers Union), and thus avoid all the infighting and protectionism of one union poaching members from another in the same workplace, or demanding that a specific job be done by a specific union. Real solidarity.

It could be a sign of hope, a cause for inspiration, that workers are setting aside their factional disputes, and deciding to stand solidly together, in common interest against the capitalist foe. Except, it's not. As it turns out, the call for industrial unions comes from the top of the TUC, General Secretary John Monks himself.

At the inaugural conference of the new banking union UNIFi (how appropriate) Monks described what he would like to see happen to unions in the 21st century. By 2010, he reckons, industrial unionism should be brought about, by merging more unions with a common interest in different sectors. The truth of the matter, however, is not a sudden conversion of union leaders to radical revolutionary unionism (oh, how that would please the Leftists, and how sorely disappoint), but rather a response to a number of pragmatic concerns facing the union movement.

Competing for members

The first, it appears, is that the TUC is anxious to avoid disputes being caused by the new union recognition laws instituted by the Labour Party as a reward for union electoral and financial support. According to Labour Research this presents the threat of "a new wave of competition between unions intent on gaining recognition" (emphasis added). To avoid that competition, the TUC wants to change its internal structures in order to have the "active
prompting of mergers by the TUC to create fewer unions . . . in key sectors like public services, education, transport . . . ."

Once again the glorious leaders charge forth with presumptuousness, believing they actually are in charge, and that they can do as they say. However, obstacles await them. As the article further notes, "a substantial proportion of merger activity between 1988 and 1995 was purely expansionist, to compensate for declining memberships and finances" (emphasis added). Even where an "industrial" model has been followed, such as in the creation of UNISON (1,248,670 members), caveats remain. Most UNISON members are in local government (750,000), however "substantial numbers of manual workers in local government are organised by the general unions TGWU [881,625 members] and GMB [750,000]." This presents the almost insurmountable problem, acknowledged by the TUC that "some unions currently straddle two or more . . . sectors . . . . It would be neither possible, nor desirable, to seek mass transfers of existing members." Of course, the leadership of each union has a vested interest in getting members. Members mean money—UNISON made £1 million "surplus" in 1997 and the T&GWU £11.2 millions. The UNISON General Secretary (Rodney Bickerstaff) took home a salary of £68,840 +£19,129 "benefits". Labour Research called that a "relatively modest" salary, and, indeed, it is, compared with similar positions in business—which is a fair comparison, because unions today are effectively a business, selling good labour relations. The emphasised sections in the quotes show this: when business is bad, firms merge to reduce running costs and open up markets; similarly, unions are competing for members and have a great deal in terms of money, investment and infrastructure to protect.

Again, the leaders of the unions are as much not in charge as our beloved masters in Whitehall, and for the same reason—their plans are subject to the market, a market beyond their control.

Many leftists refuse to recognise this. Preferring to keep their dreams of leadership burning, they think it’s all a matter of the wrong people being in charge (generic Trotskyist quote, to be heard at almost any meeting: "The failure of the revolution in [insert country] in [insert year] was due to the lack of an adequate revolutionary leadership"). If pressure could be brought to bear, or the right people put in charge, then, oh then, the mass will to revolution of the working class can be unleashed.

**The unions we deserve**

This is complete nonsense of course. The working class gets the unions, and the leadership it deserves. Just as, according to Marx, a King is only a King because he is obeyed, so too are union leaders only union leaders because they are followed. To imagine they lead is to imbue them with mystical powers within themselves, and set up a phantasm of leadership that exactly mirror images the same phantasm our masters believe. So long as the workers themselves are content to deal with such a union system, and its leaders, then such a union system and its leaders will remain, and will have to react to the expectations of the members.

The way to industrial unions, or socialist unions, or whatever, is not through the leadership of the unions. The unions will always reflect the nature of their memberships, and until their membership change, they will not change. So long as workers accept unions as another form of business, giving them insurance, then unions will have to behave like a business offering insurance, competing for members. Unions are neither inherently reactionary, nor inherently revolutionary; they are simply a means to an end for their membership.

The only way to change unions is not through seizing or pressurising the leadership, but through making sure that they have a committed membership, a socialist membership. And
that is where the Socialist Party can come in, through making socialists, through that and that alone—making people committed heart and soul to working class interests, democracy and the establishment of socialism. Anything else is just abstractions and formalisms.

My father was, I’m happy to say, refuted by that student union meeting. Among those that did show, a great debate ensued during the discussion of the sports facilities. People questioned the officials closely and carefully, determined to make sure that they knew what exactly was happening with their valued sports facilities. When folks have a strong emotional and practical commitment, they can make grass roots democracy work. It’s up to us to encourage that commitment.

PIK SMEET

Socialist Standard, September 1999, 52 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7UN

(from p. 16)

outrage over capitalism’s violation of standards of human decency.

The Socialist Labor Party of America, especially after the rise of the CIO always used the term “socialist” industrial unionism to describe its program; the IWW was content with “revolutionary industrial unionism” to make the distinction between the capitalist industrial unionism and socialist industrial unionism. In fact, one of the DeLeonist Socialist Labour Party of Great Britain’s last publishing efforts was a pamphlet by this name. I think Pik Smeet should be assigned to read it. The purpose of socialist industrial unions is to provide an arena for making socialists and a structure for building it, on-the-job training so to speak.

Recent page one headlines in the Communist Party’s People’s Weekly World have been celebrating the victory over the WTO organizers in Seattle: “PROTESTS SINK WTO.” The page-one article in the December New Unionist analyzes free trade and global capitalism and considers the reality of the victory. Next New Democracy comes in for some harsh criticism from Aaron Smeaton of the U.S.-based , communist left publication Internationalist Notes. J. F. Ahrens seems to have taken the path as many of us who are dissatisfied with the leaflets available from the organizations we belong to. In my case the problem was the SLP’s insistence on using language suitable for workers with the reading level of a Ph.D. in political economy. To remedy the problem we write our own. Ahrens’ uses good straightforward language, but I think there is a difficulty with the title of this one. As usual we end with some notes, announcements, and short reviews.

Finances

The long list of disbursements below tells the story. All thoughts of declaring a dividend or having a big New Years party at PO Box 1564 have evaporated. But actually things aren’t that bad; we are still in the black after paying the annual bulk mailing fee. The main trouble is the cost of postage. Two hundred of the 300 copies we print are mailed to U.S. subscribers under our bulk mailing privilege at a cost of 23 cents each. The cost has been going up like a skyrocket. For some reason the cost of postage outside the U.S. has remained fairly stable for several years, but I think we can look forward to a jump there soon.

Contributions: Alan Bradshaw $20; Milton Herder $14; Joe Tupper (for the abolition of capitalism) $20; Charles Davis $2; Harry Cleaver $7. Total $63. Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE October 31, 1999 (Per bank statement) $463.97 (to p. 28)
ONE WORLD – BUT WHO BENEFITS?

Should Labor Oppose Globalization?

Certainly, the global economy hasn’t improved the living and working conditions of most of the world’s workers. And for many millions, including a good number in the United States, the worldwide shifts in capital, markets and employment have brought marked deterioration in their lives.

But the reason for the problems is not the global economy in and of itself.

At least in theory, a single world economy should improve conditions for all people. With global trade everyone gains access to all the products and services being produced in every country. Not just everyday material timings, but ideas, art and culture spread throughout the world can thereby help enrich the spiritual lives of all.

By coming into contact with different peoples and cultures we learn that people everywhere share much the same hopes and aspirations, a realization that should help promote international understanding, cooperation and peace.

So why isn’t it working out this way? Because, the same competitive and exploitative principles that guide any national capitalist economy have merely been transferred to the global arena.

Corporation X, located in Anytown, USA, is in business to make money. To make money it has to be able to sell its products, which means it has to keep its prices down to where consumers can afford them and in line with what its competitors are charging.

But in order to bring its prices down and still make a profit Corporation X has to reduce the cost of producing each product. This means—you guessed it—reducing what it pays for labor.

Of course, the workers who are selling their labor to Corporation X don’t see it that way. They don’t want to be paid less—they need to be paid more!

So there is a built-in conflict of interest between capital—the company—on the one hand, and labor—the employees—on the other. And the bottom line is that, while it isn’t always possible for the company to just arbitrarily cut wages and jobs, Corporation X is always on the lookout for ways to pay less for labor.

One major way is through the development of automated production technologies, as well as improved transportation and communication systems. As a result of these it is now possible for Corporation X to operate as easily in Nogales, Mexico as it is in Anytown, USA. It also so happens that the prevailing wage and benefits in Mexico are one-tenth what they are in the U.S. Need we say more?

But wait, you say, doesn’t Corporation X have an obligation to its Anytown workers, whose hard work and loyalty over the years built the company?

Maybe so. And maybe the major owners and top executives of Corporation X are all churchgoing, God-fearing, patriotic Americans who really want to do right by their employees and keep the company in the U.S.

But on the other side of town sits Corporation Y, making the same product as Corporation X, its competitor. Corporation Y has had a tough time keeping up with Corporation X, and it often looked as if it might go under.

Now, however, Mexico is offering it salvation. It can move down there and cut its labor costs by 90%. Then it can cut its prices to win market share from Corporation X, while still actually increasing its profit margin on each sale.

Corporation X, of course, still has the choice open to it: move to Mexico or stay in the U.S.
Except now the choice has become, move to Mexico or go out of business. Which, in its position, would you choose?

But just a minute, you say. What if we passed a law to prevent both Corporation X and Y from moving to Mexico? That way neither could get a competitive advantage and jobs would stay in the U.S.

Assuming it would be possible to get such a law through Congress against the money and political clout of Corporate America (a big, big assumption, but let's go with it), this would in no way affect Japanese, German or Chinese companies, which aren't bound by U.S. laws. They'd see the opportunity to take markets from U.S. companies by themselves moving to Mexico. Chinese companies wouldn't even have to move—their labor at home is even cheaper than in Mexico!

Okay, okay, you say, so then we'd pass other laws keeping them from selling their cheaper products in our market, or raising tariffs on them to cancel out their cost advantage.

But if Japanese, German and Chinese products are shut out of the U.S. market by government action, the governments of Japan, Germany and China will retaliate by shutting U.S.-made products out of their markets. The millions of workers here now producing goods for export will lose their jobs. They then won't have the money to buy the products made by workers producing for the domestic market, who will in turn lose their jobs. The country will be worse off than before, the way protectionism helped make the depression of the 1930s into the Great Depression.

The hard, cold fact is that the economic laws of capitalism can't be repealed by the political laws of Congress. In fact, political institutions always follow the economic demands of the social system, and that applies to international institutions as well.

Which is why it's pointless for the AFL-CIO to demand the WTO adopt labor protection standards in its rules of international trade. As has been pointed out by others, these would be seen by third-world countries merely as pretexts to block the sale of their exports.

Such measures indeed would do nothing to protect third world workers, and as disguised protectionist measures couldn't in the long run protect American workers either. The WTO exists to promote free trade. Demanding it adopt restrictive labor codes is the same as demanding the Catholic Church include acceptance of atheism in its catechism.

Just as wrongheaded is the notion that the WTO can be deterred from its mission by blocking traffic for a few hours in Seattle. All such "militant" tactics accomplish is to irritate people trying to get home from work. Yet those are the very people who need to be won over to the idea of a new democratically owned and managed economy, a system that can operate in a way that realizes the potential good in globalization.

Make no mistake: the global economy is here to stay. The only question, is whether it continues to operate for the benefit of the few under capitalism, or the benefit of all under an international cooperative association of the world's working producers.

There is no sense in exhausting our energies on a hopeless crusade to keep the tide from coming in. Marshalling our resources to instead build a political party capable of bringing the message of a new system to the people is the task of the hour.

New Unionist, December 1999 (1821 University Ave. W. #5116, St Paul, MN 55104)
New Democracyism

The following is a response to a submission to *Discussion Bulletin* by New Democracy.

New Democracy's statement of principles has offered us another serving of platitudes. To illustrate the vague nature in which these principles are worded I have taken the liberty to rewrite this statement as follows:

1 - We are for revolution to create a real Communism (libertarian socialism or whatever). We call on people everywhere to end elite rule and to create real communism based on shared principles of solidarity and equality. Communism means ordinary people shaping all of society with their shared values. It means people together freely deciding their goals and how they will cooperate to achieve them. This includes transforming goals, organization, and control of work to create an economy where the productive wealth of society is used to meet the human needs of all.

Thus what has accomplished in this platform is hardly more than a substitution of words, the program itself is hardly any different than those statements from organizations that spring from a Marxist background. Production for human need and not for profit is so quintessentially Marxist that it hardly bears mentioning. Is this perhaps a hint of Marxist heritage of New Democracy? Say it is not so.

Why this substitution, why call the ruling class the ruling elite? The idea behind New Democracy is hardly a new one. The desire of organizations of the left to place as much distance between themselves and anything that seems too "Marxist" or revolutionary has been a source of conflict among every major organization on the left in the US since the end of the nineteenth century. The Socialist Labor Party sought to rid itself of groups of militant armed workers.

Later, the Communist Party in its infancy could not cope with being an illegal party and subsequently initiated a series of political front parties, seeking any attempt to gain their coveted acceptance and legality.

However the problems with New Democracy do not end there. In issue 87 of *Discussion Bulletin* Dave Stratman states on page 3 that:

"Though the enemies we confront are powerful, the chief obstacles to our success have been internal problems within the labor reform movement. It is within our power to solve them."

This statement seems to hold out the false illusion of being able to transform the unions. Since the turn of the century this has been attempted, from the tactic of boring (yawn) from within the union to the idea of creating a new union. Every attempt at altering the relationship of unions to the ruling class has failed, from the CNT in Spain to the Teamsters for a Democratic Union of the US today. Good intentions of reformers will not alter the trajectory of an institution that serves the ruling class.

In the same article he writes on the subject of the Detroit Newspaper strike that:

"This strike may seem to be just a "reform" struggle for a better contract. Infact it is an implicitly revolutionary struggle over what values should shape society."
This error is quite common and is found frequently among those vulgar leftists who often seek to elevate one struggle to epic proportions when indeed it is a struggle to gain a better contract and little else. Within the unions or outside of the unions the task of revolutionary movements in the workplace is the same - to always seek out the most militant workers, to encourage and aid them in the defense of their own class interests.

Again in the same article he intentionally misrepresents Marx in an attempt to achieve a shortcut to avoid any attempt at understanding Marx, history of revolutionary movements or their historical context. Stratman states that:

"Marx aimed to create a "science of revolution" based on supposed laws of economics and history which operate independent of human intentions."

First, Marx did believe that people, social classes, make history collectively. That history was not simply the product of powerful men. Marx also believed that capitalism for the first time in human history allowed an exploited class to collectively change its fate. Finally, these "supposed laws of economics" include such things as the general tendency for the rate of profit to fall. This tendency, which Marx expressed in the third volume of Capital is real and not a supposition. This was not to be understood as an eternal constant but as a general tendency. Of all the various methods the capitalists have employed to avoid this general tendency for the rate of profit to fall, from austerity to world war to the expansion of debt, it is a problem that always comes back to haunt them.

In issue 96 of Discussion Bulletin in his article "Why is the U.S. Bombing Yugoslavia?" Stratman writes that:

"Milosevic is really the U.S.-IMF man in Belgrade."

He comes to this conclusion presumably from the belief that if the Milosevic government instituted IMF austerity measures in exchange for loans previous to the bombing and the U.S. state through NATO has not succeeded in removing Milosevic from power, Milosevic must therefore be the U.S. man in power in this region. Furthermore, he does not consider any of strategic regional goals of the imperialist powers that have divided up ex-Yugoslavia or consider that there must be something beyond greater Serbia at stake in the region. The proximity of neighboring Turkey and beyond that the oil of the Caspian Sea must provide a more compelling reason for a permanent military presence of NATO armies in Kosovo. Oil flowing to Europe through both Russia and Turkey has made every state from the Caucasus to the Black Sea of supreme interest to the various forces of imperialism.

In number 94 of Discussion Bulletin, Stratman writing in his article "You'll Never Be Good Enough: Schooling and Social Control" states that:

"At the heart of the educational system, there is a conflict over its goals."

Yet there is no conflict over goals, no matter how hard educators and parents struggle to make schools better, the capitalist religion of the bottom line ultimately prevails. This critique of opposing goals and value systems echoes through the writings of New Democracy. The ruling class is in a race to the bottom and this is portrayed as a conflict of values.
More recently, in issue 97 of Discussion Bulletin, he writes of Kamunist Kranti’s activity in Faridabad criticizing them for suffering from a “Marxist conception of human beings.” Whatever Kamunist Kranti might be criticized for, they have apparently succeeded in gaining some kind of foothold in the factories of Faridabad. What comes across is not so much a critique of their views but a patronizing chiding for being too “Marxist”.

In the final sentence of point three of the New Democracy Statement of Principles it is stated that:

“The basis of a new society is a new, positive view of people.”

How is a positive view of people supposed to shake the power of the ruling class? Such phrases are meaningless. After such sweet sentiments readers might have to brush their teeth. The real basis for rebuilding a revolutionary movement has to lie in an analysis of the failings and successes of previous revolutionary movements.

Point 5 follows with the statement that:

“Class struggle is a struggle over what values should shape society, what goals it should pursue, and who should control it.”

On the contrary class struggle today is driven by necessity, the ruling class needs to accumulate profit and workers struggle to keep their heads above water. A revolution is not built on hope, if that were indeed the case previous attempts at revolutions would have succeeded.

There has been a great deal of criticism of the statements of New Democracy and Dave Stratman since Discussion Bulletin first started publishing these writings. Yet Stratman, to my knowledge, has not once answered anyone’s criticism* This is because instead of a political movement, instead of debate and conflict, he seeks to evangelize and convert people to a movement that is more religious than political. In a rather undemocratic manner, it seems as if New Democracy is not seeking to organize revolutionaries but is looking for sheep to lead.

There is a revolutionary alternative, there always has been, it is found in those groups who were courageous enough to fight all forms of capitalism and capitalist ideology. A part of this revolutionary alternative can be found among the political heirs of the Italian Communist Left. It is not worth ignoring the historical experience of revolutionaries and workers for the sake of a handful of nice sounding words about democracy and values.

ASm

Communist Workers Organization P. O. Box 388 Sheffield S39YX UK

Los Angeles Worker’s Voice P. O. Box 57483 Los Angeles, CA 90051

Notes Internationalistes do C. P. 266, Succ, “C” Montré’al QC, Canada H214K1

Internationalist Notes P. O. Box 1531 Eau Claire, WI 54702
Our Basic Positions

1. The aim of the working class is to establish a stateless, classless moneyless society without exploitation, national frontiers or standing armies and in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all (Marx) Communism.

2. Such a society will need a revolutionary state for its introduction. This state will be run by workers' councils, consisting of instantly recallable delegates from every section of the working class. Their rule is called the dictatorship of the proletariat because it cannot exist without the forcible overthrow and keeping down of the capitalist class worldwide.

3. The first stage in this is the political organization of class-conscious workers and their eventual union into an international political party for the promotion of world revolution.

4. The Russian October Revolution of 1917 remains a brilliant inspiration for us. It showed that workers could overthrow the capitalist class. Only the isolation and decimation of the Russian working class destroyed their revolutionary vision of 1917. What was set up in Russia in the 1920's and after was not communism but centrally planned state capitalism. There have as yet been no communist states anywhere in the world.

5. The International Bureau for the Revolutionary Party was founded by the heirs of the Italian Left who tried to fight the political degeneration of the Russian Revolution and the Comintern in the 1920's. We are continuing the task which the Russian Revolution promised but failed to achieve - the fight to free the workers of the world and for the establishment of communism. Join us.

(from p. 22)
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Frank Girard
BUREAUCRATS AT WORK

(NOT NECESSARILY EVIL)

Socialists are people who want to solve the social problems that the capitalist system produces. There are basically two kinds of socialists: - REFORM SOCIALISTS who want to patch up an obsolete capitalist system: - and REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS who want a new and different social system that has never been tried but could be. There are also: - ANTI-SOCIALISTS who lack an understanding of both socialism and capitalism. something to be expected and they show it.

Unfortunately, some revolutionary socialists have the problem of how to introduce a socialist society and every one who tries should avoid all political leaders because their ideas and methods are either fruitless or lead to violence and bloodshed. Where there are political leaders there are sheep and sheep are meant to be shorn. People who know their way about don't need directions.

Believe it or not - Capitalism has made socialism possible. It has developed a technology that can produce an abundance for all. It also developed a working class (about 90 percent of the population) that is mostly educated and can run a social system from top to bottom without the aid of a ruling class. The capitalist class has become redundant, useless and parasitical and capitalism has no real future. The franchise was legislate long ago by capitalist necessity and the vote if used wisely by the working class can turn a crazy political world into a sane one, but the vote to be effective must have the concept of social ownership to back it up. and must also act against capitalist interests.

The capitalist minority class owns and controls the means of life (Industries, natural resources, goods and services etc.). It is able to have and hold all this because it has the political powers of parliament, bureaucratic governments, and the back-up of a state apparatus that includes the armed forces, law courts, police and the media. If the working class wants to free itself from the shackles of capitalism it must capture the Capitalist Parliament and turn it into a socialist instrument that will work only in the interest of workers.

The Socialist Party is the tool of the working class and is organized by a majority of socialist workers who determine what the Party does. It must win political power by parliamentary means democratically and then by a bureaucratic, political act dispossess the capitalist class to transfer the means of life from private ownership to society as a whole. This is the only time in history where the working class can win something on their own from a ruling class that has no real interest in the welfare of society as a whole. Workers and capitalists have opposing economic and political interests. They cannot and will not learn from each other. The competitive edge of the class struggle goes ever on and pits Capitalist against Worker, Capitalist against Capitalist and Worker against Worker. That's the nature of the capitalist system.

The Socialist Parliaments cannot appear on the social scene until AFTER the Socialist Party has gained political control of the Capitalist Parliament (by means of the ballot) and has dismantled the capitalist class. The Socialist Party cannot introduce a socialist Society. Only a majority of the working class as socialists can bring this about. However, a Socialist Party can and does make this possible because it is the political part of the process that's needed on the road to socialism. Furthermore, Socialist Parliaments cannot be fully operative until all powers of oppression have
been converted into agents of emancipation or dissolved by the Socialist Party. When the coast is
clear and safe, Socialist Workers' Parliaments can begin to create a socialist society and develop freely
on local, regional and global levels, - that's the real democratic way where each individual can
contribute-according to ability and take according to need from the store-house of products from a
Socialist Society.

This, of course, means the end of the Socialist Party. It will have served its mission and will be
replaced by delegated Socialist Parliaments that carry on the social production and distribution of
goods and services for use and not for profit. "Imagine not having to pay for what you have helped to
produce for free".

This will be the most important political change in human history. It makes possible a different fuller
life style mutually arrived at and WITHOUT the obscene extremes of poverty and riches, peace and
war, exploiter and exploited and the other man-made insecurities of life today. This is probably what
many people in the world have been unconsciously looking for - The opportunity to live in a safer and
better World.

THAT IS IF AND WHEN THEY SO DECIDE

Vancouver B.C. 1999

J. F. Ahrens

NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

Makhno, London WC1N 3XX. In their introduction the authors of this pamphlet (28 pages plus
wraps) explain their purpose: "This is a text which, we hope, faces in two directions. On the one hand
we hope that it will be read by people interested in animal liberation who want to consider why animal
exploitation exists as well as how. On the other hand by those who define themselves as anarchists or
communists who either dismiss animal liberation altogether or personally sympathise with it but don't
see how it relates to their broader political stance." "Capitalism and Class Society," the first of the
two parts, explores social evolution from primitive communism to the present time as it relates to
humans and their relationship with other animals. Among the headings are "Domestication nad
recounts the slaughterhouse beginnings of the division of labor in industry. In the second part,
"Communism," the authors make what I think is the most excellent point-one that applies to so many
of current practices that thoughtful people abhor like environmental degradation, species
extermination, not to mention poverty, war, and crime—that basic to the problem is the system itself.
In the case of animal liberation they put it this way: "With the abolition of capitalism, the vested
interests of the animal industry would no longer exist: there would be no corporate propaganda for
meat. The origins of animal products would no longer be disguised..." As the descendent of French
and English Canadian farmers who ate salt pork, "side meat, as they called it" every day of their lives,
I don't have a dietary prejudice in favor of the pamphlet, but I do admire the way it connects the evil to
the evil system and enforces the idea that abolition to capitalism is the solution. The price of the
Taking Care of Business: Samuel Gompers, George Meany, Lane Kirkland, and the Tragedy of American Labor. In the "Acknowledgments" that open this indictment of union leadership over the past 120 years Paul Buhle, the author, cites his brief membership in the Socialist Labor Party, "a small party made up mainly of self-educated working people [which] has long since lost its historic role by 1963. But leader Daniel DeLeon's penetrating critique of "labor fakirs" had a real resonance and led to a syndicalist or Wobbly but distinctly non-Leninist way of looking at labor." As the title suggests, the bulk of the 315 pages relate the history of U.S. unionism in terms of its leaders beginning with Samuel Gompers, De Leon's antagonist. Gompers' career, which spanned five decades, set the pattern that would mark U.S. unionism until the present time. As editor of the SLP's People during the 25 of those years, De Leon was Gompers' major critic. The SLP led the efforts in the early 90s to solve the problem of union betrayal and corruption by trying to replace the leadership of the AF of L and later that of the Knights of Labor. Both attempts failed, as has every union reform since. The problem is not corruptible leaders, but rather a corrupt economic system that ensures union corruption. Buhle does an excellent job of tracing the disastrous effects of business-oriented unionism, including the various radical subspecies, but there is a dimension he neglects to consider, one that allows him to express optimism about Sweeney and the newest generation of labor reformers. This book demands a full-length review and will get it in the next issue. In the meantime those interested in a radical history of the U.S labor movement could not do better than to read it. $18 from Monthly Review Press, 122 West 27th Street, New York, NY 10011

Books for an Endangered Planet from Charles H. Kerr is the most recent catalog of the cooperative publishing company that nearly a century ago published the first English language edition of volumes II and III of Capital and continued as the primary publisher of socialist literature during the two golden decades, 1900-1920, of the upswing of the Socialist Party. After WWI it became a target for the Palmer raids. The decline of the Debsian Socialist Party and the rise of the CP deprived it of its eminence in radical publishing. It has continued under changing management up to the present time. No one who loves old radical books and pamphlets can help loving the Kerr Company despite some of its more forgettable publications. The present management has close political ties with the IWW and a keen appreciation of labor history. Included in the catalog are such recent publications as Labor Struggles in the Deep South & Other Writings, Covington Hall; State Capitalism & World Revolution and History of Pan African Revolt, C.L.R. James; Progress Without People, David Noble; The Headfaking Industry, John Keracher, The Haymarket Scrapbook, David Roediger and Franklin Rosemont, Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology and many others I'd like to mention just to tell readers they are available. But look for yourselves. Write to Charles H. Kerr Publishing Company, 1740 West Greenleaf Ave., Chicago, IL 60626 for a free copy.

An Interview with Paul Mattick Jr./Entretien avec Paul Mattick Jr in New York, November 17, 1991. A bi-lingual edition from 'Echanges et Mouvement, BP 241, 75866 Paris Cedex 18, France. Conducted by Hannu Reime, this interview with the son of Paul Mattick Sr., probably the best known of the second generation of Dutch/German council communists, covers "the activism and viewpoints" held by his father. The introduction goes on to say that "... considering the present worldwide evolution of the economy, the ideas of Paul Mattick Senior are more relevant than ever. They can
provide the guidelines for an understanding of what we have seen literally explode in the last few years.” Much of PM Senior’s thinking—like that of DB readers—falls far outside that of the conventional left. For example, the idea that the Bolsheviks were a revolutionary manifestation of social democracy. Another example: the Bolsheviks were the first revolutionary party to be liquidated by its leadership. The interviewer leads PM Jr. into an examination and explanation of the basic ideas of council communism on a number of fronts. PM Senior, a German refugee from Nazism, became the spokesman for what amounted to the council communists in exile and edited the English journal of the group in the late thirties. The pamphlet’s English and French texts are printed on facing pages, of which there are thirty-five. 10 Francs (about $2) plus $1 to cover postage, from the Paris address.

Aufheben: Revolutionary Perspectives, Number 8, Autumn 1999. Aufheben seems to have settled into a regular annual publication. The two major articles in this 44-page issue carry on Aufheben’s interest in the USSR and the deterioration of social democracy. “What Was the USSR? Part III: Left Communism and the Russian Revolution” continues the analysis of the Soviet Union, the first two parts of which examined the Trotskyist explanations for the course taken by Russia since 1917, most of which derive from Trotsky’s conclusion that the USSR was a “deformed workers’ state.” This examination begins with the left communist opposition in bolshevik Russia and sees the most significant branch in the Workers’ Group led by Miasnikov. It goes on to consider the differences between the Italian left communists, the modern Bordigists and the Dutch-German grouping, whose modern descendants are the council communists. Aufheben sells for L3 (about $4.50). Write to them at Brighton & Hove Unemployed Workers Centre, 4 Crestway Parade, Hollingdean, Brighton BN1 7BL, England. <aufheben99@yahoo.co.uk> Most of the articles can be read at <http://lists.village.virginia.EDU/~spoon/auf.html#auf1edit.htm>