About This Issue

DB111 opens with an article that should interest readers who have felt called upon to march with supporters of the anti-war movement. This has always been a problem for revolutionaries. Does the revolutionary march in the "peace and justice" anti-war demonstrations even though by doing so he
implies that peace and justice can be realized under capitalism, or does the boycott such demonstrations of confidence in the devotion of our ruling class to the will of the people. I spent the Vietnam War years as a member of the Socialist Labor Party. Not only did the party forbid our participation in protests; we were not allowed to pass out the SLP’s leaflet close enough to a demonstration so that observers would think that we were a part of it. The article here from the New Unionist presents a revolutionary message to both our “peace and justice” friends in the demonstration and to onlookers.

Readers may remember the warm fuzzy feelings awakened at the time of the so-called “Battle of
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The Peace & Justice Movement
(From the November 2001 New Unionist – 1821 University Ave. W., # S-116, Saint Paul MN 55104)

For decades concerned and dedicated social activists have struggled against the evils of our society. Against militarism, unemployment, poverty, environmental destruction, police brutality, government corruption. Yet despite all the time and effort spent the problems remain. And in many cases and many places they have gotten worse.

It is therefore not surprising that many people become discouraged. If nothing seems to work, what's the sense in continuing to beat our heads against the wall?

In fact, it doesn't make any sense to continue the same kind of actions that have failed to produce results. But rather than give up hope, the answer is to examine the reasons for our failure and to discover alternative courses of action that can achieve the results we seek.

Attack the Cause, Not the Effects

Militarism is not the cause of war. Militarism and war are both the effects of an economic system that necessarily puts individuals, corporations and nations into a competitive struggle for survival and success.

The same production-for-profit economic system must create markets for its corporations to keep them profitable. Military spending provides guaranteed markets and profits for companies that would otherwise, go under, and would bring down the entire economy with them.

Similarly, pollution, downsizing, poverty and other problems are the effects of a system that must, under penalty of economic crisis and collapse, make the bottom line the highest priority.

The reason these problems remain and get worse, despite all efforts to ameliorate them, is that their common cause has not been attacked. Until the underlying cause - the profit system - is addressed, no actions against militarism, environmental destruction or any other pressing problem will have any lasting effect.

Speak Truth to the Powerless

Those in power have an overpowering self-interest not to see the immorality of their actions. Many sincerely believe they act out of the highest moral principle.

By producing weapons they protect freedom. By polluting the environment they save jobs. By eliminating welfare programs they promote personal responsibility and independence.

To see things otherwise would be to jeopardize their positions of power, wealth and influence, and deny their "right" to hold them.

Even if they could recognize the immorality of what they do, they would be unable to do anything significantly different.

A corporate CEO who made world peace, the environment and the welfare of his workers and consumers the highest consideration would greatly increase his company's costs of production. Unable to compete against other companies that put the bottom line first, his company would quickly go out of business - and be, along with all the other employees, would be out of a job.

A president or Congress that made these goals their highest priorities would be sabotaged by the economic decisions of private business and be unable to raise the money to get reelected.

The 90% population that is without capital, and without the political power capital bestows, may be ignorant, apathetic and gullible. But, as they are the ones who suffer from the decisions of the powerful, they are the ones who have an objective economic interest in changing the system.

Actually, most people are very aware of what the problems are because they are living them every day. They don't come out for protests,
demonstrations, civil disobedience, etc., not because they don’t care, but because they recognize that these types of actions alone won’t solve the problems.

Get to the Point:
The Point of Production

People’s apathy results from their sense of powerlessness. Yet “the people,” the working class - the 90% who work for the 1% who are the owning class - possess the potential power to revolutionize society. While their money gives the 1% economic/social power, the fact that our labor operates all the goods- and services-producing industries society depends on gives us the ultimate power - once we organize to realize it.

A successful movement for social change must

1) Inform and educate itself on the structure and operations of the system it is challenging;

2) Inform and educate the mass of the people on how the system causes the problems they suffer from;

3) Prepare and present a program of economic and political organization to empower the noncapital-owning majority.

Once the majority is informed and organized, democratic revolution - to eliminate for-profit production in favor of democratically-controlled production for human use - is possible. Short of that, as history has painfully demonstrated, minority action by self-appointed “vanguards” lead nowhere - except perhaps to a new form of oppression.

Luckily, we don’t have to reinvent the wheel. Analyses of capitalist economics and social structures, and a program describing what the goal of a new society looks like and how it can be achieved, already exist.

The New Union Party is committed to its task of bringing that analysis and program to the American working class. We invite you to join us in this most important of all activities.

(from p. 2)

Seattle "when we learned that John Sweeney of the AFL-CIO had enlisted in the environmental wing of the labor movement. Apparently Teamsters and Turtles are no longer marching arm-in-arm. The article by Alexis Buss, General Secretary-Treasurer of the IWW, makes it clear that the capitalist labor movement is back on the old track.

There was never any question about the reason for the Gulf War. It was Oi! Oi! Oi! Bin Laden and his gang have put a different face on the effort to make Afghanistan safe for the oil companies. This article from The People explains the haste with which American capital grabbed the opportunity to replace an unfriendly government in Afghanistan and ran with it.

The letter on the G20 meeting was published as an insert in the Canadian journal “Internationalist Notes” and is addressed to its readers. It conveys the left communist perspective of its authors with references to the need for “an International Working Class Party,” “instruments of transition.” But the ultimate goal differs in no way from that of other libertarian socialists: It sees “no need for social class, states, armies, or money....”

There is no way of knowing even roughly how many revolutionary libertarian socialists there are. One thing we can be sure of: though, the number of groups of people whose thinking fits into this category continues to grow. The Global Communist Group exists in the new terrain of cyberspace, and the number of people participating in its “Communism List” forum indicates a sizable membership if the number of contributors to the forum is any indication.

Along with efforts to form new groups we have an attempt to amalgamate. The main federation in the syndicalist wing of anarchism has been the International Workers Association (IWA) for well over a half century. Its glory days were the 1930s when some of its branches were a significant force in the

(to p. 14)
What happened to Teamsters & Turtles?
Arctic Drilling, the Labor Movement and the Environment

by ALEXIS BUSS

"They couldn't have done it without the unions," is the sentiment echoed across the environmental movement, as U.S. President George Bush's energy plan passed 240-189 in the House. Although few expect the plan to drill for domestic oil in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to pass the Senate (although with the potential for war around the corner, political dynamics are bound to change), many are left scratching their heads, wondering what the future will be for a fledgling environmentalist-labor coalition dubbed "Teamsters and Turtles" during 1999's, anti-WTO, protests in Seattle.

Media pundits had long labeled the ANWR, drilling plan as politically unviable because of the Democrats' control the Senate. A last-minute intervention by the Teamsters played a major part in pushing the plan through the House, and Teamster President James Hoffa plans to help target the Senate when the bill hits the floor in late September.

The Teamsters came aboard as a lobby group for the plan after a closed-door meeting in May with Vice President Dick Cheyney and Labor Secretary Elaine Chao. Leaders from over twenty labor organizations were present, mostly from construction and maritime. The AFL-CIO also endorsed the Bush plan late in the game, which came as an unexpected move as several power-hitters in the federation including the Service Employees International Union and the Communication Workers of America had stated their opposition to the scheme. (The AFL-CIO's 1993 convention passed a resolution that, in part, called on the country to explore ANWR for oil with safeguards to protect the environment.)

Bush's energy plan - supposedly instigated by the California energy crisis and unstable gasoline prices - calls for building almost 2,000 new power plants and 18,000 miles of fuel pipelines over the next two decades. The Bush team's figures indicated that each new power plant would create 1,000 construction jobs and 200 permanent jobs, while every 1,000 miles of pipeline would bring with it another 5,000 jobs. And there would be another job boom if nuclear power plants came back into the picture. All told, over 700,000 jobs would be created, according to a 1990 report of the Wharton Econometric Institute, paid for by the American Petroleum Institute. (Not to mention the plethora of jobs to be had cleaning up from environmental disasters, guarding radioactive wastes for tens of thousands of years, and such.)

Unions at the Cheyney meeting have joined a business-led coalition called "Job Power: Americans for Energy Employment." It's worth noting that Cheney earned more than $20 million last year as CEO of Halliburton, an oil-field services company that would benefit greatly, from loosening regulations on refineries and pipelines.

Steelworkers sought an agreement that steel used in construction would come exclusively from American plants, but no such commitment was made. This, of course, is prevented by international free trade agreements that multi-national corporations enforce with vigor. There was also no guarantee that the jobs created would go to union workers, who are a distinct minority of available workers for any major construction job as only around 20% of the industry is organized. However, the House of Representatives voted to allow the use of project labor agreements on such jobs, which can help unions
get a foothold in the work at the cost of strict no-strike pledges.

Bush's energy plan also included higher fuel-efficiency standards for SUVs and minivans, a provision vigorously lobbied against by the United Auto Workers, who argued that the policy would prefer foreign imports and, economically devastate American car manufacturers. As initially proposed, car manufacturers would need to average 27.5 miles per gallon by 2007. The auto companies say this would be too expensive, and with lobbying assistance from their friends in the UAW, that requirement was replaced by a "goal" for automakers to reduce gas consumption by 5 billion gallons between 2004 and 2010.

Polls indicate that most Americans favor energy conservation over building energy plants and drilling for fossil fuels in order to keep up with current energy usage levels. A recent Gallup poll shows 52 percent favor conservation while 36 percent lean toward the Bush plan to increase production.

"What the administration has announced is not an energy policy but an energy rip-off by big oil companies and utilities," said Andrew Stern, president of the SEIU. This sentiment appears to be echoed in a majority of American union households. According to a poll conducted by Hart-Teeter for NBC News and the Wall Street Journal in March 2001, more than 60 percent union members oppose President Bush's plan to allow oil and gas drilling in the Arctic Refuge. The poll shows that 62 percent of union members, compared to 56 percent of respondents in non-union households, oppose drilling in "protected areas, such as the Alaskan wilderness," and want to "keep these areas off limits and consider other solutions. The World Wildlife Fund insists that more jobs can be created by investing in renewable energy and energy efficiency than by ANWR drilling.

The National Federation of Independent Unions, a coalition of non-AFL-CIO unions whose numbers add up to well over 100,000 members, believes that ANWR drilling would not solve the problem it is designed to fix. President Francis Chiappardi voiced his disagreement with the plan "to plunder the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to extract a supply of oil that would be available a decade, or more from now, and even then would last us a mere four to six months." NFIU, interestingly enough is affiliated with the AFL-CIO's Laborers Union, which strongly favors ANWR drilling.

Set aside in 1960, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a 1.5 million acre swath of land near the US-Canadian border north of the Arctic Circle. Although the energy plan, that passed the house says that no more than 2,000 acres of the plain will be disturbed for oil production, environmentalists say the limit is meaningless because the acres could be scattered across a broad area. Drilling is predicted to alter vast portions of the refuge.

According to an environmental impact statement by the U.S. Department of Interior, opening the area would require construction of hundreds of miles of roads, pipelines and air strips, drilling pads and other infrastructure to accommodate production. Riverbeds and streambeds would have to stripped for gravel for roads and air strips. Reasons to oppose drilling are numerous, ranging from arguments that say the oil in ANWR is not enough to make any significant impact on the domestic oil supply, to protecting the pristine habitat that is home to large populations of caribou, moose, wolves, grizzlies and polar bears, and migratory birds. The potential for oil spills is high—many people will remember the 19-million-gallon Exxon Valdez disaster—but smaller spills are commonplace and dangerous to the environment.

The attention lavished on labor to lobby for ANWR has been seen by many environmentalists; and unionists as a ploy by the Bush camp to bust-up the AFL-CIO's Democratic Party vote—getting machine.
Endorsements from labor now will strengthen Bush's position with union voters later - the same voters who were aggressively mobilized to support Gore (and other oil-baron Democratic politicians) in 2000. A wedge is most easily driven in the Federation by targeting the construction unions as they have historically been among the most conservative. The 500,000 member United Brotherhood of Carpenters recently left the AFL-CIO. At the time UBC Secretary-Treasurer Andris Sillins said, "The AFL-CIO has strayed to social and environmental issues that have nothing to do with getting better wages and working conditions for working people."

The Teamsters could have other reasons to get cozy with the Bush Administration. The IBT, who endorsed Reagan in 1980, want to be rid of the federal control of the union established 12 years ago to settle a racketeering lawsuit for mob ties. Hoffa says those days are over and the union is moving toward democratic control. His critics, including the Teamsters for a Democratic Union, say that corruption is still a problem and the union hasn't developed the resources needed to expand organizing efforts and increase membership. TDU's case has been bolstered by accusations that a top aide to Hoffa masterminded a sweetheart deal to undercut Teamsters members in Las Vegas by giving jobs to non-union workers.

When the AFL-CIO mobilized its members to march alongside environmental and other activist groups in Seattle - and again at protests against the World Bank in Washington, D.C., and the Summit of the Americas in Quebec City - many heralded it as the dawn of a new era of socially responsible unionism. While there was always reason to doubt the sincerity of the AFL-CIO piecemeal commitment to such a vision, many rank and file union members were eager for a unionism that addressed not only their immediate job concerns but also the long-term degradation of the planet on which we live and work and the immigration of our fellow workers around the globe.

However, the rank and file do not control the business unions, and AFL-CIO officials evidently have no problem mortgaging the future of the planet in exchange for promises to create a handful of jobs building the means for our own destruction.

The alliance was captured in the slogan, "Teamsters and Turtles, Together at Last." Are the Teamsters now offering a new slogan, "Turtle Soup, Anyone?"

Unions for Bush?

The International Association of Machinists has produced a jingoistic video featuring its president encouraging IAM members to support George Bush's Star Wars II program. Meanwhile, the Teamsters invited Bush to speak at Labor Day celebrations.

Bush spoke August 26 at a West Mifflin, Pennsylvania, USX plant, apparently invited because he has begun an "inquiry" into steel imports. "I support anybody that supports labor," said Howard Graham, 56, chairman of the trustees of Local 1219 of the United Steelworkers of America, during the event.

How Bush falls into that category is anyone's guess. However, one union member said he couldn't do much worse than the Democrat. "With all the money we gave him, Clinton didn't do much for us," said Frederick Nicholas, 90, a retired steelworker at the event. Hard to argue with that.

- from October 2001 Industrial Worker, P.O. Box 13476, Philadelphia, PA 19101
What Are the Real Reasons For the War in Afghanistan?

By Diane Secor

The Bush administration has told the American public to prepare for a long war on terrorism, ostensibly in response to the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. There seems to be a general consensus among the administration, most members of Congress and most of the U.S. media that the U.S. role in this war is a clear-cut case of self-defense and that violence is necessary to prevent more terrorist strikes on U.S. soil. For all intents and purposes, however, the "war on terrorism" is a war on Afghanistan, and there is substantial evidence indicating that an Afghan war was planned several months ago and that, in reality, this is another war over oil.

Last March, long before Sept. 11, Jane's International Security News reported on an agreement that had all the earmarks of a multinational coalition aimed at undermining the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. "India is believed to have joined Russia, the U.S.A. and Iran in a concerted front against Afghanistan's Taliban regime," Jane's reported. "India is believed to have supplied the Northern Alliance leader, Ahmed Shah Massoud, with high-altitude warfare equipment. Indian defense advisors, including air force helicopter technicians, are reportedly providing tactical advice in operations against the Taliban. Military sources indicated that Tajikistan and Uzbekistan are being used as bases to launch anti-Taliban operations by India and Russia."

In short, something resembling the multinational coalition so much in the news since Sept. 11 has been in place for at least six months. Furthermore, this pre-Septemer coalition also had a basic strategy in place to throw out the Taliban. This certainly calls into question the U.S. media's clear overall implication that it was only after Sept. 11 that a multinational force banded together and concluded that the Taliban had to be replaced.

The following statement from Jane's March 15 report is even more revealing: "Several recent meetings between the newly instituted Indo-U.S. and Indo-Russian joint working groups on terrorism led to this effort to tactically and logistically counter the Taliban. Intelligence sources in Delhi said that while India, Russia and Iran were leading the anti-Taliban campaign on the ground, Washington was giving the Northern Alliance information and logistic support."

Why does the United States want to overthrow the Taliban and put another Afghan regime in power? Why is Bush taking the risk of a larger regional war and possibly igniting future terrorist attacks against Americans? Zalmay Khalilzad may hold the key to unraveling this mystery.

According to a May 23 White House press release, Khalilzad was selected for the post of "special assistant to the president and senior director for Gulf, Southwest Asia and Other Regional Issues, National Security Council."

Khalilzad does have the political connections to get the job. Eli J. Lake, United Press International, on Jan. 18 reported that Khalilzad "who served under President Reagan's State Department and President Bush's Pentagon and influenced the last American adventure in [the] region when the CIA helped ship surface-to-air missiles to the mujahedden, the holy warriors who fought against the Soviets. Khalilzad now finds himself in a position to influence the next administration's policy for cleaning up the mess created by the mujahedden's struggle in the 1980s, as the man in charge of staffing the Pentagon for the Bush-Cheney transition team."
Interestingly, according to the Center for Strategic International Studies’ Washington Quarterly, Winter 2000, Khalilzad’s Afghan policy seemed to fit right in with the scenario outlined in the Jane’s report. He “argue[d] in no uncertain terms for supporting the Pashtun majority in Afghanistan to roll back the Taliban government and working ‘discreetly’ with Iran and Russia to destabilize the government in Kabul.”

However, as recently as 1999, Khalilzad favored some degree of “engagement,” as opposed to “destabilization” of the Taliban regime. In a white paper for the House International Relations Committee, he said that “U.S. policy toward Afghanistan should follow two parallel and complementary tracks, one of which extends a hand to the Taliban and the other of which prepares for a much tougher policy should the Taliban reject U.S. overtures.”

What accounts for Khalilzad’s change of heart? UPI also reported that he is “an analyst for the Rand Corp. and before that the chief consultant for Unocal, the oil company that sought to build a pipeline through Afghanistan.”

The U.S. Department of Energy’s Energy Information Administration (EIA) issued a September document on Afghanistan which noted the stormy relationship between the Taliban and Unocal affecting two pipelines that Unocal had planned to construct through Afghanistan:

A $2 billion Central Asian Gas Pipeline would have transported natural gas from Turkmenistan to Pakistan, then be linked with Pakistan’s natural gas grid at Sui.” In June 1998, the consortium consisted of these firms: “Unocal and Saudi Arabia’s Delta Oil held a combined 85 percent stake in Centigas, while Turkmenugras owned 5 percent. Other participants in the proposed project besides Delta Oil include the Crescent Group of Pakistan, Gazprom of Russia, Hyundai Engineering & Construction Co. of South Korea, Inpex and Itochu of Japan.”

"Besides the gas pipeline," the EIA added, “Unocal also had considered building a 1,000-mile, 1-million barrel-per-day ... capacity oil pipeline that would link Chardzhou, Turkmenistan to Pakistan’s Arabian Sea Coast via Afghanistan.

Since the Chardzhou refinery is already linked to Russia’s Western Siberian oil fields, this line could provide a possible alternative export route for regional oil production from the Caspian Sea.

The $2.5 billion pipeline is known as the Central Asian Oil Pipeline Project. For a variety of reasons, including high political risk and security concerns, however, financing for this project remains highly uncertain."

In January 1998, Unocal and the Taliban hammered out the gas pipeline agreement. But by the end of 1998, both of the pipeline deals collapsed and the Unocal consortium gave up on working with the Taliban regime. It then became increasingly clear that the Taliban were an obstacle to gas and oil flowing through Afghanistan. Not surprisingly, Khalilzad took a more “hard line” position on the Taliban.

If this story of another war over oil and natural gas deposits begins to sound like a “broken record,” it is because the history of capitalism is filled with these cases. In the pursuit of new markets and raw materials, the risks of war and terrorism acts are the rule, not the exception. Nationalistic fervor and an understandable tendency to panic when the trauma of terrorism hits so close to home often obscure these basic realities. But workers who are aware of the real causes of this war will not be hoodwinked.

— from The People, November, 2001

The People,
PO Box 218
Mountain View, CA 94042
Comrades,

On the 17th of November 2001, the G20 will hold its annual meeting in Ottawa in an overall situation of world economic crisis and war. This body, created on September 25th 1999 by the G7, gathers the Ministers of Finance and the Central Bank governors of 19 "strategic nations", representatives of the European Union as well as the administrators of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. If we are to believe its press releases, the G20 was founded to "promote a greater participation in the discussion of international financial matters of countries that, by their size or their strategical importance, play a crucial role in the world economy". In fact, the G20 was created in reaction to major events in the intensification of the crisis of the capitalist mode of production. The groundwork leading to its birth are well known: the beginning of the Mexican crisis in December 1994, the first signs of the Asian financial crisis in July 1997, the collapse of the US Long Term Capital Management Fund in September 1998, the start of the financial crisis in Brazil and Argentina a few months later and finally, the Russian financial crisis of the summer of 1999. This weekend's meeting is of great importance to the ruling class because, we can only note that the "greater participation in the discussion" has been of no help to the world economic situation. In Canada, the country is already in recession and has been well before the September 11th catastrophe. In terms of annual rhythm, the gross domestic product was down by one percent in July by reason of a sharp drop in manufacturing production, a strong decline in exports and a downturn in consumer spending. It's the same thing all over the world. Anxiety is high as unemployment numbers rise, "growth" is lagging and the signs of economic and financial destabilization multiply.

Of course, in the aviation sector, the 11th of September did not help by temporarily discouraging a part of the customer base. But this industry was already in crisis and tens of thousands of layoffs were to be expected. This explains in part the extent of the disaster: more than 100,000 jobs lost in the space of a few weeks in North America alone. But from the beginning of the year, it is by whole tumbrils that millions of workers have been condemned to unemployment in every sector and on every continent. The international institutions and banks, though they plead for calm, keep on revising downwards their predictions of economic growth. Company's profits are crumbling. Financial markets panic or soar in reaction to the slightest rumour or the most recent interest rate cut; and these rates keep on being slashed. Capitalism isn't going so well and, as is its custom, it is about to have us pay for its condition dearly.

A dangerous situation

The falling rate of profit, first analysed by Marx, intensifies the crisis of valorization of capital and encourages the need to compete between firms as well as countries and blocs of countries. This creates a dangerous overall situation and explains the G20 meeting agenda. On the one hand, participating countries will continue to agree as thick as thieves on everything that can harm us and help them revive their profits. This means: cuts in social expenses, deregulations, and all other measures permitting them to hike our exploitation rate. On the other hand, behind the club-like atmosphere and largely consensual declarations, the reshuffling of the cards leading to the creation of new imperialist blocs on the basis of a growing split of the ex-NATO components will accelerate. It's in this context that will be discussed the so-called plan to fight the financing of terrorism. Beyond the hand shaking and the diplomatic smiles at the meeting's end, it must be clear that we will be far away from the unified world government, which is
supposed to be the hallmark of globalization. (1) Because the only other way of reviving profits (other than an increase in the rate of exploitation) is imperialist war. And that’s why the reality of the soothing speeches of the ministers and specialists as well as the diplomatic banquets of the coming weekend in Ottawa are intrinsically linked to the bloody battles in the mountains of Afghanistan and to the other armed conflicts across the planet. One way or another it’s a question of blood, sweat and tears ... a question of business!

After having mobilized us around our supposed national interests at its Economic Summits and other class collaborationist traps, the ruling class is now trying to trap us with even more dangerous ideological campaigns within the context of an open-ended war against an unidentified enemy, with no guarantee of where, when and against whom the struggle will be ended. Afghanistan is no more than an excuse for the conquests of economic and geo-strategic interests. Afghanistan is but the beginning, the premonitory sacrifice of still greater slaughters to come. Knowing this, how can we trust the union and community organisations that make a life out of collaborating with a system that generates war, exploitation and misery worldwide? How can we trust the pacifist organisations that offer only laughable symbolic actions to protest very real human tragedies? How can we go along with the leftist groups who in the past have been the best supporters of state-capitalist dictatorships in the ex-USSR, China, Serbia and elsewhere; who were the critical supporters of all that was unsupportable?

Comrades,

Hope lies elsewhere. Hope rests on the side of the international working class. Hope is in the revival of its initiative and the creation of its own instruments of struggle. It is conditional to the active and determined opposition of our class to all cutbacks and war policies that capitalism strives to impose on us. Hope is also conditional to the organisation of revolutionaries, of true internationalists. Against the rotten careerist wannabes who want to “reconstruct a Party of the Left”, internationalist communists call on the building of a real International Working Class Party. Not a party which will hover above and aside of our class and its struggles, nor a party which will govern in our place, but a party that will carry the revolutionary program in the midst of our class and will struggle against all compromise with this rotten system. We need a party who will struggle for workers’ rule, directly exercised through its councils (soviets), as instruments of transition to a truly human society. This future society, which will have no need for social classes, frontiers, states, armies or money is called communism and it has nothing to do with the state-capitalisms so dear to the Capitalist Left (social-democrats, Stalinists, Maoists or Trotskyites). In this spirit, we support the International Bureau for the Revolutionary Party (IBRP) and we call on all workers to help us in our fight to get rid of this sick society which now generates only exploitation, oppression, pollution and war. Join us!

Against imperialist strikes, we strike!

No war but class war!

Internationalist Notes, November 15th, 2001, supplement to #6.

Contact: R.S., CP 173, Succ. “C”, Montreal, Canada, H2L 4K 1 or <lighter@generation.net>
IBRP: cwo@ibrp.org or www.ibrp.org

(1) Globalization is a trendy word in the journalistic, political and academic milieu. However, we prefer to use the term imperialism. Imperialism is characterized by absolute domination of finance capital and also
by its capacity to distribute throughout the entire planet the different stages of the process of production. Because finance capital is fractioned, this leads to rivalries between the States and the formation of new alliances. Thus imperialism means war.

The Global Communist Group

[The term “Communist Think-Tank” expresses the mission that members of the Global Communist Group (GCG) see themselves engaged in. Their task would seem to be monumental since they regard the century or more since the deaths of Marx and Engels as a hiatus in the development of “communist theory.” Their on-line group intends to fill this need. The GCG exists as a web site. With no published journals and thus no postal address, its internal organization, membership strength, and location exist only in cyberspace. Their Global Communist Programme suggests—despite denials—that they have adopted the basic formulations of Leninism and that the “plain communist” GCG is remarkably similar to such “left communist” groups as the International Communist Current (ICC) and the International Bureau for a revolutionary Party (IBRP). All this isn’t to disparage the insights one finds in some of the essays in the “Communism List,” two of which appeared in DB110. The two pages below contain a very small part of the 38-page GCG Programme available on the internet at <http://homepage.circom.net/~bcprepared/FIST%20Programme.htm>.

The Communist Think-Tank

The Global Communist Group Web Site

WHAT WE ARE

The Global Communist Group is a group dedicated to the development of communist theory and politics. This means that it is not a Leninist organisation. Nor does it subscribe to any of Leninism’s other forms such as its Stalinism and Trotskyism. It is not anarchist. It is not left nor right. It is just communist. Our group continues to be significantly influenced by the doctrines and politics of Karl Marx. However, it is not a marxist group but plain communist.

Our position is that no revolutionary communist movement exists today globally, regionally or nationally. Revolutionary communist theory and politics has not essentially superseded the level attained by Karl Marx. Consequently revolutionary theory and politics is in urgent need of development beyond the level reached in the latter part of the 19th century. This means that a revolutionary communist intelligentsia must be established to reexamine and develop communist theory and politics. It is just this that the Global Communist Group seeks to achieve.

The web site will contain the work of the Global Communist Group. It is hoped that this web site will be improved and developed over time.

A comprehensive account as to what we stand for is contained in our communist programme, the Global Communist Programme available on this site. Should you wish to seek further information or engage in discussion with the group contact Karl Carlile at the following email address: dsodc@circom.net. We also have our Communism List a forum for the discussion of theoretical and political matters. To join
you can make your request to the moderator at communism-admin@lista.ecpautake 4

* * *

THE GLOBAL COMMUNIST GROUP PROGRAMME

1. Introduction
2. The crisis of proletarian leadership
3. Stalinism and Neo-Colonialism
4. A programme of communist demands
5. Women and the working class
6. Racial oppression
7. Expropriation and nationalisation
8. The national question in the neo-colonies
9. Agrarian revolution in the neo-colonies
10. Strategy and tactics in the neo-colonies
11. The working class and the guerrilla strategy
12. Bourgeois democracy and democratic demands
13. The trade unions
14. Workers' control and workplace committees
15. From picket line defence to the workers militia
16. For the break up of the armed might of the state
17. The insurrection
18. For a revolutionary communist international

The Programme of the Global Communist Group

Given the global character of capitalism it is necessary for communists to build a world's revolutionary party. Our objective is the creation of a new world party of communist revolution. To build such a party a communist programme is indispensible. The goal of the communist party is the revolutionary destruction of capitalism and its replacement with a world communist federal community.

As revolutionary communists we are not anarchists nor Leninists. Neither are we Leninists of the Stalinist or Trotskyist variety. We- are just communists. We actively support the need for a communist programme and communist party.

1. Introduction

The communist programme is central to communist politics. The programme is an expression of the essence of communist struggle. It is the form by which theory and concrete practice give expression to their integrated unity. Communism has an inherent programmatic character.

The communist programme consists of a set of aims together with, an outline and elaboration of the means by which these aims can be achieved. All communist programmes, independently of any particular conjuncture in which they are lodged, have as their goal the establishment of communist
relations. The programmatic means cannot be inconsistent with the ultimate aim of achieving communist relations of production. Strategic and tactical action can never compromise principled communist politics. Various principled tactics such as workplace committees, the united front, strikes and picketing, workers' councils and workers' militias are deployed under many different circumstances as a means to promote and develop mass mobilization on a principled revolutionary basis. The communist programme embodies the strategic goals of communism. It focuses on the practical tasks flowing from these fundamental principles based on the concrete historical conditions that obtain in capitalist society at any given time. It embodies the strategy and tactics to achieve the general goals and does not separate these questions off from programmatic aims.

2. The minimum-maximum programme

(from p. 4)

labor movements of Spain, France, Sweden and parts of Latin America. Repression resulting from Franco's victory in Spain and fascism elsewhere as well as internal divisions and the like have reduced its numbers. This issue of the DSB carries the manifesto of a newly organized syndicalist international which we obtained from the Summer 2001 ASR, the Anarcho-Syndicalist Review. The introduction by Mike Hargis, an IWW member, is critical of the premise for its organization. He questions the viability of this attempt to unite those elements that organize workers in unions and those that are essentially propaganda groups. My criticism lies in a different direction. It is the reformist orientation I see in the Manifesto's item 6.4, which seems to pledge Libertarian International Solidarity (LIS), the new federation, to participation in reform struggles.

Kephas Mulenga's thinking about the "essence of socialism" is more strongly influenced by the socialist program of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, it seems to me, than by the realities of capitalism as it manifests itself in Zambia, although of course the "essence" capitalism is the same worldwide. Dave Zink has reviewed a book, the contributors to which seem to have no difficulty in recognizing the cause of modern social problem, nor are they reluctant to name the enemy. They see the role of the political state in a capitalist society, the class divisions, the effects of technological improvements even the potential solution—everything except strategy. Does anyone believe that building a mass Labor Party will advance the revolution any further than the British Labor Party has?

As usual we end with some notes, announcements, and short reviews.

Finances

As a general rule, just when the economy is inflicting greater pain on our class and they are most likely to be open to revolutionary ideas, the financial resources begin to dry up as workers have less to contribute to revolutionary groups. For the DSB we can add to this truism significant increases in the cost of postage. The annual non-profit bulk mailing fee we pay has gone up $25 to $125. In addition there have been increases in the cost of foreign postage. And just to cap the climax, our new neograbbank has announced that the fee for each transaction involving non-U.S. currency, whether cash or check, will be $20. My advice to non-U.S. subscribers is to buy dollars and mail cash. So far we have never lost such a remittance.

Contributions: Phillip Colligan $22; Joe Tupper $20 (for the abolition of capitalism); Milt Herder $10; C.P. Otero $3; Pat Eyitchison $14; Joshua Freeze $10; Martin Comack $2. Total $81.00 Thank you, comrades.

(to p. 23)
Birth of an international libertarian network

A Libertarian Manifesto for the 21st Century

INTRODUCTION BY MIKE HARGIS

An international meeting of libertarian organizations met March 31 and April 1 in Madrid, Spain, sponsored by the libertarian-syndicalist General Confederation of Labor (CGT-E). Other groups taking part included: Libertarian Socialist Organization (OSL, Argentina), Anarchist Federation of Uruguay (FAU), Gaucha Anarchist Federation, (FAG, Brazil), Ricardo Flores Magon Popular Indigenous Council of Oaxaca (CIPO, Mexico), Libertarian Alternative (AL, Spain), Libertarian Alternative (AL, France), Libertarian Socialist Organization (OSL, Switzerland), Organization of Revolutionary Anarchists Solidarity (ORA-S, Czech Republic), The Kettle (Greece), Swedish Workers Centralorganization (SAC), Union of Base Confederations (Unicobas, Italy), National Confederation of Labor (CNT, France, ex-IWA), and Libertarian Communist Alternative (ABCT, Lebanon).

Organizations that could not attend but sent messages of solidarity included the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), New England Federation of Anarchist-Communists (NEFAC, USA and Canada), the Siberian Confederation of Labor (SKT), Anarchist Union (AS, India), Workers Solidarity Movement (WSM, Ireland), Italian Syndicalist Union (USI, ex-IWA), and Anarchist Federation (France).

The outcome of this meeting was: 1) The formation of an international libertarian network called Libertarian International Solidarity (LIS). 2) A decision to mobilize against the World Bank meeting in Barcelona in June (the meeting was subsequently cancelled due to fears of massive demonstrations, and moved to cyberspace) and the European Summit in Göteborg, Sweden. 3) LIS to support, financially and politically, projects proposed by the FAU and FAG to form libertarian centers, establish a press and develop a recycling cooperative. LIS will take up campaigns every six months around ongoing projects. 4) LIS to launch a website and a listserv for the exchange of information over the Internet. The server will be created jointly by CGT-E, SAC and AL-France. 5) LIS will hold an intercontinental libertarian congress in France in 2003, the organizing committee of which will consist of AL-France, with the help of the CGT-E and SAC, and promoted in Latin America by FAU. 6) Finally, the meeting adopted a declaration, "What Type of Anarchism for the 21st Century?" (below).

While this new network assures that it does not intend to replace existing federations, such as the International of Anarchist Federations or the International Workers Association, the IWA views its formation as part of what it sees as a longstanding effort by CGT-E and SAC to establish a rival, reformist international. However, the LIS is clearly not a syndicalist international. It's clear from its make-up that the "political" tendency predominates. Most of the political organizations are "Platformists" in orientation and tend to favor a strategy of working within the reformist unions. The syndicalist groups, on the other hand, presumably favor independent revolutionary unionism. How long these two tendencies can co-exist within the same network is anybody's guess.

The "movement" for greater international co-ordination of both libertarian political and syndical organizations has been manifest for some time. The conference held in Ruesstia, Spain, in 1995, organized by AL-France and attended by many of the same groups, the arduous Euromarches against contingent labor and exclusion, the I99 Conference in San Francisco in 1998, and the "Autre Futur" gathering over May Day 2000 in Paris hosted by the CNT-Vignoletes were all part of this process. The IWA has, unfortunately, viewed this "movement" as hostile to their interests. Unfortunately, this latest effort
will only bring about cooperation among one "faction" of the international anarchist movement. There is still a long way to go.

**Final declaration of the International Libertarian Conference in Madrid**

The men and women from different parts of the world who have come here to Madrid to these Libertarian Workshops in order to think about, propose and defend a society in which freedom, justice, equality and solidarity allow us to live in peace with other human beings, with the Earth, would like to make public our conviction that it is possible to build a different type of world, and different worlds. We call on all libertarian men and women in the world to organize, to intertwine an international network which will foment social antagonism against capitalist globalization, to braid resistance, to link those thousands of subversive threads which give form to the resplendent tapistry of social revolution.

By libertarian we mean:

* Direct action as a criteria and method in labor and social conflicts so that the people affected decide, over and take responsibility for their struggles.

* A clear declaration in favor of anti-capitalism, anti-authoritarianism and the fight against all types of domination (patriarchy, fascism, ...) in all day-by-day social and cultural aspects.

* Applying self-management in internal and external organizational work, understanding this as promoting the rotation of posts, training people in posts, recall, transparency, the responsibility and capacity of all to decide in a structure which is both horizontal and federalist, anti-hierarchical and without vanguards which accumulate and monopolize power.

1.1: Supporting the revolution is not limited to fighting for desirable radical changes, but rather daring to effectively prepare a means of breaking away from the capitalist system. For those who do not wish to limit their actions to mere propaganda, the need to revolutionize this world implies determining the conditions from which we can accumulate sufficient strength to make the revolutionary processes thinkable and politically and strategically possible. Putting the revolution on our agenda means building a process of political work, a relation of strength, giving a strategic dimension to social antagonism, forging alliances and becoming capable of being a guiding force in the process of social struggles.

1.2: In the face of a full frontal neo-liberal offensive, defending revolutions in these present times might seem unreal, especially in a historical context such as the present one marked by a lengthy resistance to globalization which has lasted more than a quarter of a century. Nevertheless, neither are the reformist proposals defended by the left in general realistic or plausible. Social-Democracy has turned into Social-Liberalism. Between reality and desire there is only one path open i To follow it we need a strategy created through critical thinking, reflection and action, the libertarian will of millions of people to live in dignity, with autonomy inside their communities, being the protagonists when decisions need to be made. Cooking up the strategy, encouraging subversive acts, bringing reality closer to wishes, dreams and needs are all tasks which call for libertarian coordination and organization.

1.3: In this new millennium, aiming at the heart of the State, storming the Winter Palace, or setting an exact date for the revolution is not possible. The 20th Century has given us tragic proof of how many mistakes and barbarities can be committed in the name of the Revolution. We withhold the possibility of transformation, of revolutionizing society, whilst leaving it clear that, in the first place - and despite what some interested parties might think and publish - history is not already decided: history is wrought by human beings. In the second place, we reject the idea that nothing can be done, that the forces that steer social change are out of reach of human hands. Lastly, we affirm that we are not willing to delegate to anybody the leading role of the exploited and the oppressed, the majority of society, in the flow of history.
1.4: If the century we have just left has taught us anything, it is to reject naive optimism and blind faith in the progress of humanity. Everything can get worse; there is nothing that can completely guarantee a favorable result in the evolution of society. The imposition of social structures based even more on inequality and social exclusion is possible. From this perspective, distant from any type of historical determinism, revolution becomes a vital necessity, and it must be built day by day in many spheres of freedom.

1.5: As libertarians we all drink from the same revolutionary spring of water: direct action, self-management, federalism, mutual aid and internationalism. Nevertheless, the different flavors and currents of this spring have caused on too many occasions factionalism, divergence and separation. We do not wish to see who has got the clearest or purest water, we believe that they are all right and wrong, pure and impure. Wise winemakers mix different types of grapes to produce the best wines, each type of grape provides something. We propose that we do the same and propose a toast for what unites us: the vital need for a libertarian revolution.

2.1: The myth of development is a painful inheritance that the 20th century has bequeathed us. An ideological construction of those in power to prolong in their benefit all the mythology built around Progress, which served capitalist interests so well from the beginning of the first industrial revolution until WWII. The continuation of this myth through ‘development’ has inevitably led to the globalization of the economy, a process which has already caused thousands of traumatic shiftings of production centers throughout the world and, in consequence, has established enormous areas where workers are hyper-exploited in indescribable working and environmental conditions.

2.2: Human development, considered as the overall increase of its well-being, is not compatible with the capitalist setup of society and production. Despite what worldwide capitalist rulers try to convince us, this development relies neither compulsorily nor solely on the replacement of traditional production processes by technological ones. Scientific progress must no longer be useful to capitalist development alone, which means to the benefits of a handful of people. On the contrary it must now be useful to everyone. It should ensure independence and autonomy of all peoples, and overall solidarity.

2.3: To ensure the acceptance of the development policies, both the capitalist as well as the so-called socialist bloc had the brightness of the new myth at their disposal, reflected in the American way of life on the one hand, and through the exaltation of productivity as a liberating force in the so-called socialist countries. This was helped by the enthusiastic collaboration of governments and national financial elites, which acted as local agencies facilitating in their respective territories the programs developed by the international institutions and the large transnational corporations, which reserved for themselves the right to impose whatever modifications (prices of raw material and other goods, tariff barriers, commerce regulations, cutbacks of all types, etc.) to favor the spread of these new forms of production, making traditional ones non-viable. The era of development spread throughout the world in the '50s and '60s, dividing the world into underdeveloped, developing and developed countries, and creating a hierarchy under the orders of the new myths, rejecting those which did not accept these changes.

2.4: The oil crisis (a natural resource in decline), the collapse of the model of productive and technological competitiveness, and the drop in profits due to the social struggles and progressive extenuation of the "third world countries" caused by the continual plunder they face, indicate that after decades of application, development is unmasked as a statue with clay feet. The desire for general well-being, the leveling of differences between countries, are just dreams which hide the painful inheritance of development.

The myth of shared development, largely spread by the capitalist media, allows capitalists to make a large number of people accept their rules, at least passively. But the economical and ecological crisis makes this lie crumble apart. Against capitalist development we propose social development, in equal-
ity, shared worldwide, lasting and compliant with the ecological balance. We support the overall increase in production insofar as it aims to cover the real needs and requirements of people from the south or the north, but not in its claims to increase the profits of the shareholders. Setting up such a production process requires collective control over the decisions. Economic, social and cultural development is only a tragic lie if no self-managed and federalist democracy comes with it. True development is a hoax if not everyone can take part in collective decisions.

2.5: The age of development caused a cruel widening of the inequalities between the inhabitants and peoples of the world to extremes never before known in history. Development has shown its manifest inability to spread wealth throughout the world and is unable to even cover the minimal requirements of the majority of the population. The problems of housing, access to drinking water, basic requirements of energy sources are no more worrying than the lack of food. Advances in health and education have run to a standstill and half of the world population is piled up in slums around unsustainable metropolises and megacities, living in total dependence on external vital provisions which neither the remaining stocks of natural resources nor the global economic system can sustain. The process of resettling the population in cities is carried out by coercion, fanned by the destruction of local cultures, by wars and conflicts and by the increasing abandonment faced by the peasant population.

2.6: The response of the power holders to the failure of development started in the '80s with a new international organization and division of labor, and with the introduction of new technologies in the productive system to renew competitiveness, and the increase of monetary regulation of human activities. Privatization and liberalization were the answers: globalization of the economy and the preeminence of this over politics, culture, ecology and social issues.

2.7: Development and its continuity in the form of economic globalization have, over the last two decades, brought us an increase in social duality and the planet-wide ecological crisis. All of this increases the banal consumerism of the majority of the population of the North while in the so-called South scarcity and hunger take hold of its inhabitants and mortgage the future of generations to come.

2.8: We support local action. We support what the community can master, following an intergenerational ethic able to ensure a habitable world for our children. We reject productivism, whose consequences deny the possibility of a future, because it is focused on the immediate profits of the capitalist rulers. The struggles of social ecology must inspire our actions in order to synchronize social struggles and lasting development. However, we think local autonomy is not enough. In order to ensure a fair world where everyone stands together, regardless of place of birth or residence, we must link local autonomy and worldwide coordination through the principles of self-managed federalism.

3.1: Globalization of the economy, free trade areas and world government are the three pillars that the so-called information society or era is strongly built upon. The globalization of the economy is based on a new international division and organization of labor, in the development and application of information technologies in order to make worldwide production decentralized, flexible and less local, at the same time building a spider web of business networks, interconnected and related to each other whilst simultaneously breaking the working class into thousands of small pieces, hyper-exploiting the new generations of workers: young workers, women, immigrants, children. This is not an apparition of the past, of the 19th century, but rather the real nightmare of the 21st century.

Globalized exploitation is particularly aimed at immigrants. With their rights taken away, and without roots of identity, this group is easily exploited. They are used to divide workers, creating a fictitious group of competitors which racism generates and creates itself around.

The sans papiers, [undocumented workers] are a docile and bendable workforce for the bosses. Separating the rights of nationality for freedom of circulation and residence is a way of checkmating
capitalism.

Fascism is becoming an ever faster growing reality. Its influence in politics (and in our minds) is a real danger for the values which we defend.

Both private and state capitalism need an increasingly stricter control over the population in order to maintain and increase their benefits. To this end they are establishing a penal state influenced by the extreme right and adopted by Social Democracy (when its interests are in danger).

3.2: The most worshiped idol in the temple of economy is free trade areas, which legions of fanatical economists are erecting as the fundamentalist totem of economic globalization. However, the use of competition as a way of regulating the economy is marked by a series of depredations, backed up with the use of arms. Competitiveness in international markets is complemented by greater productivity, and this is increased by mastering and directing the technological innovations, endangering workers' lives. This is how it has been over the last twenty years and this is the present and future policies of capital. What we can expect from free trade areas and international competition is an even further concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the transnational corporations and governments that support them.

3.3: World capitalism has its institutions to favor the spread of globalization: the IMF, World Bank, WTO, G8, etc. At the same rate as the social, ecological and economic consequences of globalization advance, there are more and more voices that call out in favor of more control, in favor of a worldwide government. Encouraging any type of world government, arising from the current political situation, will only lead to legitimizing the driving forces of capitalism, accelerating the consolidation of political structures which are totally out of the control of the inhabitants and peoples of the world. The use of force, the wars fought by UN peacekeeping troops, coupled with the direct subsidies by transnational companies to the UN reveals the plot of the tragedy: a world government using NATO armed forces as gendarmes, while dressing them up as humanitarian forces, with soldiers paid by the UN with funds from transnational corporations.

3.4: Neither a state nor a world government, the only government acceptable is the self management of society from local collectives coordinated regionally and worldwide, that of a libertarian community or municipality, in which decisions are made from the bottom up and in which federalism is the formula for cooperation. No to competition and free trade areas. Yes to mutual aid and solidarity amongst peoples; we reject globalization and dependence in favor of autonomy to put fate in our own hands. These are not brush strokes to a pretty picture of the society we hold in our hearts: ends and means are one and the same in the libertarian strategy. These are shovelfuls to the site we are building day by day through social resistance - at the same time as we fight against and pull down the power of capital we must also construct the libertarian alternative, step by step, minute by minute.

4.1 Throughout history other types of exploitation have grown from patriarchy and the exploitation of women. In such a system of domination of men over women, the patriarchy remains the dominant model that assures the double exploitation of women, at work and in the home. Capitalism benefits from the patriarchal family organization in instituting a strict separation between the private and the public; and the more precisely between so-called 'reproductive' work (of women), that has the particularity of being free, and the so-called 'productive' work (mostly male), that is paid. This hierarchization of social activities is an effect of male domination - it is because the social relations between women and men are unequal that their respective domestic and professional activities are not of the same economic or social value.

4.2 Today, in the context of privatization, of monetary regulation of all human activities, home-work
is considered as 'local service' that was and remains again attributed to women. Capitalism has discovered a veritable gold mine for continuing to acquire profits at the expense of the exploitation of young women and female immigrants.

4.3 Still if women have succeeded, principally in the so-called industrial countries, in moving into paid labor, they remain principally confined to jobs that are part-time and paid less than men. It is the response to the needs of flexibility of capitalism and which permits the continuation of exploitation of women in the domestic sphere.

4.4 One response of libertarians to patriarchal domination is to obtain a shortening and equalization of working time and of wages for men and women; an indispensable condition for creating a real sharing of work, housework included.

4.5 The formal equality conquered in most industrial countries has neither overcome, nor reduced the patriarchal domination. It has changed forms, notably by the diversification of family models. Women remain victims of violence, on a daily basis, in the family sphere or as an arm of war

4.6 For libertarians, the consequences of patriarchal domination have not ended. For men and for women, we demand equal liberty and mastery of reproduction, the possession of our bodies, the freedom of choice in the different facets of our whole lives, the right to different forms of sexuality (homosexual, bisexual, transsexual, etc.), the right to be different. We take the power to be ourselves, the self-determination of our identity. This permits the resolution of the habitual tension between the individual and the collective and so will permit a development of community and solidarity.

5. 1: Direct action, propaganda by deeds, is a sign of identity of libertarianism that has its roots in the beginnings of revolutionary syndicalism. Today direct action is part of the strategy of the redistribution of wealth through social reappropriation. Making demands is no longer enough; we must socially reappropriate the wealth that has been stolen by the powerful. Direct action must be self-managed by the people who carry it out. We oppose authoritarian so-called revolutionary activists, we claim no messianic role over oppressed peoples, and we encourage and support self-management of struggles. Anarchists are themselves involved in these struggles, but we are not the only ones.

5.2: The wealth generated by a society is not only the fruit of capitalist entrepreneurs (who take the largest slice) and of their payroll of workers (who get the smallest slice). Wealth is generated socially and includes the participation of unpaid workers who, through their jobs of reproduction, training or simply lowering of labor costs (women, students, the unemployed ...) get, in the best of cases, the crumbs - dependence on a husband or parents or the pittance of an unemployment benefit - or, at worst, empty hands.

5.3: From each according to his ability and to each according to his need: this is the communist and libertarian sharing of wealth that we have historically defended and fought for. A sufficient social income for all people who lack income or patrimony could be a main calling point around which we can unite and join forces in this battle of social antagonism for a fairer sharing of wealth. But until we manage to implant a social salary or income, people still have real needs to meet and must fight for survival.

5.4: Direct action in the form of social reappropriation of wealth is carried out by squatting houses, by participating in collective meals with food that has been obtained for free, by assuring your health through associating and cooperating towards healthy eating, avoiding mad cows, chickens with dioxins, vegetables with toxins and transgenic foodstuffs. Direct action as a libertarian strategy and practice allows us to immediately satisfy our needs, builds alternatives to capitalist domination, and is the best propaganda by deeds to mobilize the majority of society to fight for and achieve a real sharing of wealth.

6. 1: In the libertarian tradition, revolutionary syndicalism has been important (with its roots in the First International) in the fight against capital in Europe and America. From the onset of the 20th century until the beginning of the Second World
War, revolutionary syndicalism and anarcho-syndicalism have been the central point of the major organizational initiatives of anarchist groups and organizations. Organizing workers into unions - autonomous from political parties, owners and the state, ideologically independent, but with a firm belief in social revolution - was the first major task of anarchism in the first decades of the last century.

6.2: Although we cannot talk of one single type of anarchism, as the varieties of anarchism were and are numerous, revolutionary syndicalism was the workers' masterpiece that allowed millions of workers through the world, from France and Spain to Sweden and Mexico, to join and fight for their emancipation. Coinciding with the second industrial revolution and of the new workplace organization, anarcho-syndicalism headed the struggle and aspirations of a new proletariat reacting to new forms of production and in the process of professional specialization. [commercial rights and laws, plus w??]

6.3: After the second world war, the hidden social pact that the implantation of the welfare state implied, (with its social security, collective negotiation laws, unemployment benefits), helped institutional trade unions, mostly Social-Democrats, to push revolutionary syndicalism into a corner and almost completely wipe it out in all countries. The capitalist crisis of the '70s and the resulting new organization of work, as well as the drift towards globalization of the economy and the social changes which took place in the first few decades of the information era and up until the new century in which we have entered have not counted with the presence of organized revolutionary syndicalism. Its presence is generally marginal in almost all parts of the planet.

6.4: But the same has not occurred with anarchist ideas. All the new social movements re-launched from the '60s onwards - ecology, feminism, anti-militarism, etc. - have been a reflowering of libertarian flowers. Social antagonism against domination through sex, race, sexual inclinations and so on, has used direct action; calling it civil or military disobedience; federalism and affinity groups have used it to organize, and mutual aid, calling it cooperation and solidarity. It is for that reason that the groups and organizations that identify themselves as anarchist or libertarian have, over the last few decades, dedicated their efforts to participate in the social struggle of these movements, undertaken in cities and urban areas.

6.5: Class struggle still exists. It is a essential part of the fight towards the emancipation of humanity. It is important to bear in mind that the relationship between the owners of the means of production/capital and the workers is unchanged. Although class struggle in the daily life, identity and conscience of the workers is no longer looked upon as the leading struggle, the domination of capitalism over the society and the exploitation of human labor is a major deciding oppression, but it is not the only target of the anarchist fight. We will work to make class struggle converge with other struggles against alienation, patriarchal and moral order, racism, nationalism or religious integration. Nowadays struggles have several identities, several shapes. They rely on various ways to organize. There cannot be any domination of one way over another in the struggles.

6.6: On the other hand, syndicalism has not been able to renew and reorganize itself to meet the new organization of the workforce that has been imposed over the last few decades. What's more, the general tendency has been towards a greater fragmenting of the working class broken up into fixed, precarious, submerged employment, self-employed, part-time, unemployed, etc. This and the reduction of the field of action of labor rights and laws in favor of an ever-increasing tendency towards individual negotiation to the detriment of collective negotiation, limits and reduces the role of syndicalism. In this situation it must urgently change its strategies and organizational structures or be destined to disappear, limiting itself to the institutional role assigned to it by companies and governments.

6.7: Libertarianism should currently strive towards encouraging convergence, the interaction of social movements -including the workers' movement - in a solid social movement antagonistic to capital and its present true face: economic globalization and all other types of domination. This antagonistic social movement does not have, nor should it have, a single organizational expression. It is plural, based on
current reality, coming and acting together in the same territory, recreating a common territorial identity, composed of many single identities.

6.8: Local territorial organization is the 21st century's equivalent to what revolutionary syndicalism was in the first part of the 20th century. Economic globalization is a flux of information and capital flowing at the same rate, with no reference to local concerns. Needs and social struggles are locally rooted, in the neighborhood or town. This is where we must work to challenge capitalist domination and exploitation by building libertarian alternatives outside of official local institutions. In this way, different identities can work together because we are supporting a common territorial identity under direct democracy interconnected through networks with other towns.

6.9: In a world where social resistance strengthens our libertarian ideas, anarchist groups and organizations have got a lot to learn and a lot to give. The libertarian strategy should be that of strengthening the antagonist social movement through interaction with social movements, the workers' movement, the unemployed, the excluded, indigenous movements, discriminated groups, ecologists and feminists, promoting direct action as a way towards social reappropriation of wealth and as a form of propaganda by deed, as an exercise in direct democracy, participatory and federalist, without delegation or intermediaries, constructing on a community level in each territory and as an alternative to the authoritarian institutions.

7.1: Libertarianism and anarchism have been and are internationalist. In times of world globalization of the economy, our need to be able to interconnect in every corner of the planet where a libertarian person or group is struggling grows even greater.

7.2: Libertarian groups and organizations have historically organized themselves by affinities and have created or constituted societies, mutualist societies, trade unions and ateneos [cultural centers] to defend, promote and foment demands, education, alternative culture or different life-styles for specific goals, always with social emancipation as their aim.

7.3: Today we support, as a first step, the constitution of a worldwide libertarian network in which all affinity groups which so desire will find their space, open to libertarian organizations, associations, ateneos, unions and other libertarian groups. This network will serve to spread mutual aid, solidarity in struggles, as a source of information and debate for the libertarian world, will organize the international meetings, will set up training schools, video conferences, Internet and all types of tools available to join together strategies which will the libertarian idea to be introduced into and to guide the diverse social struggles.

7.4: Secondly, we support setting up libertarian organizations in diverse territorial scopes, local, regional, national, etc., based on the organizational tradition of each place. Libertarian organizations which use federalism as a structure to unite, the diverse affinity groups, whose main goal is the interaction of the different social movements in the struggles, creating direct/ rank-and-file/grassroots territorial identities, organizational connections and common networks.

7.5: Thirdly, but not least, we feel the vital need to group ourselves by affinity. An affinity group is, by nature, small and in which many things are shared, in which we see each other face to face to debate, to have a good time, and to form the first sphere of community, which makes people social beings, from which we can collectively contribute toward other groups in the local area and region a bit of identity.

We want to gather by affinity, which means in groups which enable debating and thinking together, face to face. Affinity groups are groups for struggle, as well as groups to share and to be able to have fun. The local group is the foundation of democracy where decisions are made.

7.6: Out of exploitation, domination, alienation, material and symbolic violence, domination and violence are the leading actors. Exploitation is a category of violence and not the opposite. Our fight is a battle against power, against domination, against all powers. In this common struggle we call on
libertarian men and women, affinity groups, organizations, associations, collectives, trade unions and networks to build an international libertarian network.

We stand for the abolition of salaries and for the carrying out of a libertarian society.

* * * * *

"We do not make war; war is always made for the purposes of someone else, and fought out between the brethren who are poor in spirit. We make revolution for the benefit of all human beings and against the cliques who are hangovers from parasitism and self-centredness. And as we are making revolution, not one square metre of reconquered ground must be subtracted from the process of transformation, despite the frog-like croaking of those whose lack of spirit and mettle inclines them to dabble in the stagnant waters of politicking."

-Editorial from *Acracia (Lleida)*, 1936-7

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALANCE</th>
<th>October 26, 2001 (Per bank statement)</th>
<th>$192.65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECEIPTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$81.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs and Sales</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISBURSEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$127.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$36.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Due</td>
<td>$3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual b. mailing fee</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$299.63</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE</td>
<td>December 29, 2001</td>
<td>$47.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fraternally submitted,
Frank Girard

(from p. 30)

course of history, these terms are no longer defined in the same way on the plane of the composition of classes, the economic and political organization of production, and of social organization, or the manner in which the law of value infiltrates the most private domains of human activity and thinking."

Other articles include "Toward new forms of class struggle," "The end of statist containment of the working class," and "The globalization of capital and the transformation of the state." The final two-page article is titled "A discussion network has been organized." It's an interesting article which unfortunately does not give readers the internet address. A four-issue sub is L3.50/$5.00 surface mail; L5/$8 air (please send checks made out to "cash" to AM, PO Box 40231, Staten Island, NY 10304 USA.

-fg
The essence of socialism

Socialism will solve the antagonism between civil society and the state. The political state as defender of sectional interests of the ruling class will disappear. The essence of socialism is to eradicate the existing production relations which are based on commodity exchange, the use of money, and trade. The hoax of a market mechanism will be abolished once and for good. Dialectical Marxism and Scientific Socialism aims at creating a stateless and equal society through self-realisation by the workers and toilers to free themselves from the yoke of capital.

The teachings of dialectical Marxism do not envisage that violent military insurrections are the first stage in the creation of Socialism. Socialism will not start from above. Neither can it be imposed but will be the outcome of the existing antagonisms within capitalist society.

Inflation, unemployment and labour unrest are social vices predominant in every capitalist nation. Under capitalism the inherent antagonisms between capital and labour is truly exemplified in the perpetual existence of crises. Exploitation depicts a state of complete alienation: the negation of the workers from the fruits of their labour. Under capitalism the social institutions of producing and distributing goods are wholly owned by the wealthy capitalist class.

Under socialism these social institutions are vested in the whole population and are utilised for the purpose of meeting the needs of every individual member of society. The socialist premises of Karl Marx’s dialectical materialism can only be realised when political and economic relations existing under capitalism have been abolished by the communal ownership of economic institutions.

After the working class have taken over the management and ownership of every form of economic and entrepreneur activity from the capitalist and ruling class and have dispensed with ownership and dissolved the bureaucratic methods of civil society, the vacuum of economies of scale which had been preserved under scarcity conditions by the capitalist producers will be instantaneously filled. There will occur a general improvement in people’s living standards under socialism because goods will no longer be restricted by prices but shall be produced for targeted consumers relative to the demand or needs.

The establishment of a "communist" state in Russia by the Bolsheviks supposedly on the principles of Marxist dialectics brought Marxism into disrepute. Leninism posed a great threat to Marxism during the epoch of imperialism especially among those philosophical circles in which dialectical materialism was held in esteem.

The social and economic conditions under which the Russian revolution took place were not conducive to the realisation of a socialist revolution. That is to say that the historical conditions for socialism were non-existent in Russia at the time. The "dictatorship of the
proletariat" as was then conceived by Lenin and the Bolsheviks was a far cry from what was propounded by Marx. Whereas to Karl Marx's own interpretation the "dictatorship of the proletariat" entailed universal working class activity, to Lenin and the Bolsheviks it meant a totalitarian regime under a dictator. Lenin emphasised it very strongly that a state run on military precision was what Russia needed most.

We Socialists have long been advocating that what was established in Russia by Lenin was not socialism. We have postulated our assumptions on the fact that historical conditions which give rise to socialism did not obtain in Russia at the time. Russia was not ripe for socialism.

KEPHAS MULENGA (Zambia).

(from p. 32)
calls Dyer's lack of "a clear critique of capitalism." Throughout the book, capitalism is constantly fragmented into "shareholder interest," "profit motives," and "corporate power." This fragmentation cripples the radical potential of the book...." The reviewer has put his finger on what I find so frustrating about Z Magazine and other "radical" (as opposed to revolutionary) magazines and books: Their unwillingness to name the enemy. Other reviews include "Two Prison Anthologies," "Theory of the Anti-Globalization Movement," and "The Panther Insurgency." All this in addition to a non-review, "An Anti-Authoritarian Response to the War Efforts" by Marina Sitrin and Chuck Morse. Annual subscription (2 issues): $7 in the U.S. and $10 elsewhere. From 2620 Second Avenue #4B, San Diego, CA 92103.

AK Press Distribution 2002 Catalog appears in a 183-page edition. At its current rate of growth we can expect that within a few years it will to rival the Sears and Roebuck catalogs of my youth. Besides what has now become an impressive list of AK publications--most of them related in some way to anarchism--readers are offered a gigantic selection of other radical non-fiction classified under 23 headings including Black Panther, Fascism/Anti-Fascism, Armed Struggle, Left Communist, Russian Revolution, Outlaws, Pirates, Bandits, Prisoners, Secret State, and Avant Garde/Surrealism. Among the authors we find eight books by Howard Zinn, four by Martin Glaberman, 43 (!!!) By Noam Chomsky, and six by the EZLN. Headling the "Left Communism" list of authors is this introductory comment: "Left-Communist, Council Communist, Ultra-Left, Autonomist, Libertarian Socialist... call it what you will, these are the real heirs and executors of the Marxist legacy. Drawing on the young Marx of the Grundrisse and the theory and practice of workers' councils from the Russian Revolution to Hungary '56, this vibrant virus of the working class has endured while Leninists and party builders everywhere are being consigned to the dustbin of history." Like the comment, the author list itself is the stuff about which questions arise. Victor Serge is there as is Rosa Luxemburg, Pannekoek, Marx, CLR James, Andy Anderson, and Barrot; but who are Anthony Bogue, Werner Bonefeld, Della Costa, and Terry Eagleton; And where are dozens of others I can think of?

Stanley's Exploits, or, Civilising Africa is the latest in the pamphlet series published by the Kate Sharpley Library. First published around 1890--I gather from the publishing history, which gives the date of the second edition as 1891--D.J. Nicoll's pamphlet proved an unvarnished picture of one US/ Britain's 19th century superheros--a picture derived entirely from Stanley's own words as recorded in books and (to p. 30)
"When John Henry was a little baby,  
  Sitting on his mama’s knee,  
  He reached down, picked up a hammer and he said, "Ma,  
  This hammer’s gonna be the death of me, Lord.  
  This hammer’s gonna be the death of me."

Times change, and the tools of production change. Welcome to the dawn of the new millennium! Those of us fortunate enough to still have a job share our worksites with computers or some other high-tech gizmo. There are occasions when I would love to pick up a hammer and use it on my electronic cube-mate but, realistically, it looks like high-technology is here to stay. Proliferating, in fact.

What does "high-tech" mean to us as citizens and workers in a corporate-dominated society? Cutting Edge explores not only the new workplace, but the new world that is being created. We have already passed the threshold into a future of dizzying opportunities and potentially horrendous pitfalls. This anthology brings together 16 different writers: professors of economics and sociology, computer programmers, software engineers, and social activists.

This book does not present an anti-technology viewpoint. The message of this book is that modern technology has tremendous potential and, if used wisely, could help lay the foundations for a higher, better civilization. For the first time in history, the dream of ending material scarcity is within reach.

But first, the bad news.

What is a robot? Forget about C-3PO, R2D2, and other science-fiction for now. A robot is any mechanical device built to perform a variety of tasks under automatic control, programmable by software. The "robot revolution" is not only driving workers from the assembly line, intellectual work is also becoming "de-skilled." New software programs are taking much of the art out of architecture. Micro-surgeries requiring incredible precision can now be performed by robots.

This is not just part of another business cycle. This is a radical transformation which will be as far-reaching as the Industrial Revolution. In 1970, there were less than a thousand robots in operation around the world. By 1982, there were more than 30,000. According to the U.N. Economic Commission, the world robot population by the end of 1997 was 747,100. Coinciding with this logarithmic growth, increasing numbers of workers - including professionals - are either being transformed into over-worked appendages of machines, or released from employment altogether.

The phrase "Dark Factories" - where the lights are rarely turned on, because no humans work the production lines - describes the emerging industrial site.

If large-scale replacement of labor by robots continues - and all indications are that it will continue - then where will the new jobs for the displaced come from? In her Cutting Edge essay "How Will North America Work in the 21st Century?", Sally Lerner asks:
"A typical response to unemployment is retraining for those made redundant by layoffs and closings. The contemporary puzzle is "retraining for what?".

Young people are among those most impacted by these changes. The fastest-growing sectors of the economy offer "McJobs" at the bottom of the pay scale. At the end of 1999, the four fastest growing job categories are cashiers, janitors, sales clerks, waiters, and waitresses. This is the meaning of technology-under (and "under" is the correct preposition) capitalism. As this continues, American cities will increasingly take on a Calcutta-like appearance. Sally Lerner writes:

"Downward mobility, together with long-term unemployment for increasing numbers of individuals and families, will be reflected in decreased purchasing power and material standards of living, as well as in eroded self-esteem, family breakdown, rising crime rates, and all of the other well-documented consequences of unemployment and underemployment. On this path lies the resort to some form of authoritarianism."

What is referred to in the book as a "new class" is coming into existence - the low-wage, part-time, or unemployed, the homeless, the destitute and malnourished. This includes the structurally or permanently unemployed - the "throwaway" workers whose labor is no longer needed by capital. These people have slim or no hope of ever again finding jobs with good pay and benefits. (I would not refer to this group as a "new class" - it is an integral part of the working class. You and I will quite likely be joining it.) This caste is being born out of the "downsizing" caused by application of electronics to production under capitalism.

At the other end of this growing polarization is a class of immensely rich global investors who dominate the world economy and dictate terms to national governments. To increase their profits, this group lobbies to channel public funds into the hands of private investors, pressuring to privatize social security, for example. Speculators are in a head-to-head confrontation with the growing "new class" of the poor.

While corporate welfare bums feed at the public trough more greedily than ever, the "welfare state" is being whittled away for low-income Americans. What's behind the destruction of the "social safety net"? Nelson Peery, in his essay on "The Birth of a Modern Proletariat" explains:

"The major task of government is to create the structural programs and policies that allow the economy to function... When industry needed literate workers, the public school system was expanded. When the army needed healthy young men to fight the wars brought on by industrial expansion, nutrition programs were initiated, including a school lunch program... Government became "big government" in order to serve the needs of industry as it became "big industry". "[Electronics and robotics] changed the game. Not only were larger sections of the working class superfluous to production, but the new mode of high-tech production no longer needed a reserve army of the unemployed... As industry gave way to the new electronic means of production, it downsized. The government necessarily had to follow suit."

No capitalist is going to support labor he will probably never need. If high-tech is left in the hands of the corporate ruling class, a situation comparable to Hitler's Germany could develop. We're already reading and hearing talk about "excess population". Will you be seen as part of this group? There is potential for unprecedented surveillance, loss of privacy, and social control. The new bio-technology - including
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geneic screening and enhancement - offers the prospect of a eugenic agenda once thought to have been discredited with the fall of fascism. Will capitalist ethics give rise to a genetically engineered class system?

Factories where thousands of workers are concentrated are nearly a thing of the past. If the trend continues, there will soon be few, if any, remaining in America. The World Trade Organization, backed by free trade agreements, is speeding up the export of manufacturing jobs to countries with oppressive regimes maintained by Western governments on behalf of transnational corporations. Capital-intensive agriculture is forcing third-world peasantry off the land and into burgeoning cities, where labor is cheaper than replacing it with machines. Workers from all countries are being drawn into the same shrinking market for labor power, placing strong downward pressure on wages and working conditions, in a global race to the bottom. The splitting of the workforce, and the rapid mobility of capital, has diminished labor's capability, based on workplace organizing, to stand up to the dictates of capital. This means that we need to adopt new strategies for organizing workers, especially workers in places like Mexico and Guatemala.

What happens to workers displaced by automation? Either they join the ranks of the chronically un- or under-employed, or they find another job with lower pay and benefits and longer hours. Either way, their buying power is significantly lowered. Robots do not earn a wage - they can build cars, but cannot buy them. You don't need to be a Nobel laureate in economics to see that, sooner or later, this is bound to pose major dilemmas to corporate decision-makers. To make a profit, its not enough to produce a commodity, you must also sell it. The mass markets that keep capitalism going will shrink as fewer people are able to buy those products.

Historically, the forces of production (tools, skills, organizational abilities, etc.) develop faster than the systemic social relationships (ownership, control, etc.). Eventually, the productive forces outrun the relations in which they developed and come into conflict with them. They no longer make sense within the existing social-economic structure. We appear to be entering one of these transition periods. Technology replacing labor spells the end of capitalism as we know it. The problem of our times is not production, but distribution. If there are no wages, there will be no money to buy necessities. How Will wageless production be distributed?

A society that denies a large portion of the citizenry secure access to basic goods, services, and human dignity harbors a time bomb, ticking away. As more people join the ranks of the jobless, they will increasingly come to see that distribution according to need makes more sense than distribution according to the ability to pay. Electronics makes such a system possible, but it can never materialize within capitalism.

With these threats looming, it seems like we ought to be witnessing mass popular resistance. Why aren't we? One reason is the sorry state of the mass media - corporate-influenced "public" radio and TV as well as commercial broadcasting. Progressive voices are rarely heard. The entire spectrum of opinion is presented - from conservative all the way to the far right! The resulting distorted picture routinely misleads millions. Corporate media has become an "opiate," working to keep us asleep at the wheel.

Another retarding factor is the Left's pre-occupation with identity and cultural politics to the exclusion of class-conscious politics. This plays right into the elite's divide-and-conquer strategy. So far, it looks like
the Left is blowing it badly.

Despite all this (here's where the good news starts), perceptions are changing. The Gallup poll asks the question: "Is there a class struggle in this society?". In 1961 56% of those polled said yes, and in 1996 81% said yes. Students, feminists, trade unionists, environmentalists have their own goals. But increasingly, they see that they are up against a common enemy.

The Los Angeles rebellion of 1992 was a glimpse of coming struggles. Portrayed by the "mainstream" (corporation-owned) media as a simple race riot, it was actually something far more significant. Nick Witteford, in the essay "Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism", writes:

"...the uprising was in fact a multicultural anti-poverty revolt involving Latinos, blacks, and whites in a community whose sources of industrial employment had been gutted through automation and global relocation. The 'rioters' were drawn from the ranks of the un- and under-employed... They thus represent precisely the fate with which capital menaces all its laborers in the era of the workerless factory."

"Historically, capital has legitimated itself as the source of wealth and societal organization, as the power that "keeps things going", while workers' strength has lain in the ability to stop production, to "bring things to a halt". Now this pattern reverses itself. High-tech capital stands as the agent of austerity and dismantling, and... labor, appearing in the form of new alliances, emerges as the constructive force sustaining the community against disintegration."

As corporations replace labor with machinery, workers will increasingly be compelled to take over the machinery and carry on production outside of the corporate system.

Released from its capitalist shackles, technology can be used to address needs instead of creating profit for a few. This will mean a vast reduction of boring and hazardous work and in the number of hours people would be required to work to have good income and benefits. Andre Gorz writes:

"This is unlikely to exceed twenty thousand hours in a lifetime... much less in an egalitarian society opting for a less competitive, more relaxed way of life. This represents 10 year's full-time work, or 20 year's part-time work, or - a more likely choice - 40 years of intermittent work, part-time alternating with periods for holidays, or for unpaid autonomous activity, community work, etc. ".

Remember how that contest on, the railroad between John Henry the steel-driving man, and the manpower-replacing steel-driving machine turned out? John Henry won, but the strain brought on a fatal heart attack. Our relationship with high technology is similar. Under existing power structures, high-tech will exacerbate the poverty and misery under which most people live. The same technology could provide a decent life to everyone. The problem is that it is now in the wrong hands. It could help end poverty and hunger - if the working class controlled it.

Techno-phobia is an understandable reaction to the daunting changes we are facing. But yielding to it will only further weaken us.

How will the Left deal with all this? The new situation clearly calls for dramatic innovation in organizing
and building solidarity between potential allies. We must put sectarianism aside. Since much of the struggle is shifting away from the economic front to the political, we need to go straight for capitalism's jugular. A popular, inclusive, class-based party is crucial at this stage. That means building a mass Labor Party.

The stakes are high. Radical change is coming. In whose interests will it be? The choice between tyranny and democracy has never been more clear. Will we stand by and allow the oligarchy to further enrich and empower themselves by corrupting the environment and our quality of life? If we do allow it, then we deserve every lethal consequence of our inaction. We need to set our sights on taking control of the technology and using it to transform society in the interests of humanity and for the health of the biosphere, not the corporations. Capitalism - not technology - is our enemy.

This brief review can only scratch the surface of this book. Cutting Edge shows how seemingly unconnected developments are related, helps de-mystify "future shock", and points the way forward to a better future.

I'll close with another quote from Nelson Peery:

"Humanity has never failed to make reality from the possibilities created by each great advance in the means of production. We stand at the end of prehistory. There is no alternative to stepping across that nodal line and seizing tomorrow."

--David Zink

(from p. 25)

Articles he wrote: "I may mention here that whenever I produce any evidence against Mr. Stanley, it is always taken from his own works and his own words." Stanley, who was an American journalist, had inherited the mantle of The African explorer Dr. Livingstone. His explorations resembled military expeditions, and he seemed to glory in his role as tactician and killer of natives who chose to resist his encroachments on their territory. Seventeen pages from $3 from Kate Sharpley Library, BM Hurricane, London WC1N 3XX, U.K. or Kate Sharpley Library, PMB 820, 2425 Channing Way, Berkeley, CA 94704.

Internationalist Perspective – No. 38 Summer 2001. IP is the journal of a longstanding breakaway group from the International Communist Current, appearing twice a year. This 25-page issue begins with an article "In What World Do We Live...":

"Depending on whether there is a question mark (?) Or an exclamation mark (!) at its end, the above phrase captures two major characteristics of the present period: the need to provide ourselves with new theoretical tools to comprehend the present world, and our disquiet with respect to the perspectives offered by capitalism today. The new century that has just begun is marked by both continuity and by profound transformations: the continuity of a system riven by its own immediate economic contradictions, and which is creating the conditions for its own replacement; the transformation of a society which, just as every living organism, changes, evolves, and adapts, in order to survive. The world such as it was defined after two world wars is dead, and if crisis, exploitation, and capitalist barbarism under all its forms continues to mark the

(to p. 23)
NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

ASR - Anarch-Syndicalist Review is the quarterly journal of a group of mostly IWW members with an anarcho-syndicalist bent. Besides the nine-page Libertarian manifesto which appears elsewhere in this DB, readers of number 32, the summer 2001 issue of ASR will find a good mix of what can best be described as theoretical articles and current anarcho-syndicalist news. Among them is a lengthy interview with a French activist, a veteran of the ultra-left ideological wars of the last few decades, who unburdens herself on such subjects as council communism, Paul Mattick, the Leninist left, the Greens, as well as the inchoate anti-WTO movement and other manifestations of contemporary radicalism. "The Peanut Butter Principle or Why Don't We Anarchists Stick Together" discusses the oxymoron of the anarchist organization--actually one not limited to anarchists but characteristic of all voluntary political groups in my experience. In "Nationalism or Freedom" Jon Bekken questions the thinking of an anarchist critic of ASR's internationalism and the idea that workers have no country. Reviews have always been a strong point of the ASR. This issue considers new histories of Cuban anarchism and the Spanish anarchist movement as well as a book by Eric Chester on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. And much more - 37 pages, single copy $4, four-issue sub $15, from PO Box 2824, Champaign, IL 61825.

Language, Mind and Society: Chomsky and His Critics is a 73-page journal "published by a group of Northern anarchists and academics." Planned originally as an issue of The Raven, which I understand is a sort of anarchist theoretical journal published by Freedom, the British anarchist weekly, it was denied publication by Freedom Press. An additional subtitle "An 'Alternative' RAVEN" refers to its independent publication, which resulted from the decision by Freedom Press not to publish it, allegedly because of its anti-Chomsky material. A five-page "Editorial Introduction: Chomsky's Critics: Orwellian Undertones in Fierce Debate on Language and Politics" lays the groundwork for much of the contents. Besides the consideration of Chomsky's linguistic and political thinking, much of this issue deals with the reasons for Freedom Press's action. A two-page letter by Chomsky refusing to comment on an article slated for inclusion in the collection is cited in a three page "Editorial Afterword: The Irresponsibility of Intellectuals," which asserts that Chomsky used his influence to convinced one of the contributors to the collection to withdraw his article and Freedom Press to refuse it publication. Of the three major articles dealing with Chomsky, the first examines his political views and strikes me as at least neutral toward Chomsky if not positive. The next deals with his linguistic theories and raises questions about their validity without any negative implications about his honesty. It was the last, "What Is Chomskyism?: Or, Chomsky against Chomsky," which is clearly hostile and elicited the response from Chomsky that supposedly scotched Freedom Press's publication of the issue. L3 ($5) from B. Bamford, 46 Kingsland Road, Rochdale, OL11 3HQ, England.

Processed World 2001 20th Anniversary Special Edition is the first issue in seven years. The central idea of the 23 articles in this 112-page issue is "The Greatest Speedup in History," by which PW means "the radical reconfiguration of everyday life over the past generation..." "The great speedup encompasses much more than the greater number of hours we work, both as paid wage workers and as free humans grasping for freedom and fulfillment. The dramatic intensification of work, ostensible because computers have made us so much more productive, is one example. The expansion of buying and selling into more hours of the day (the 24-hour supermarket being visible example)..." A playful situationist quality pervades PW—a mixture of lampoons and serious analyses of the nature of capitalism.
at the turn of the millennium. Among the articles are "Farce or Figleaf: The Promise of Leisure in the Computer Age," "Distanted Education: Fast Times at Ronald McDonald U.," "The Disappeared of Silicon Valley," "My Life in the Search Engine," "Radical Politics: Assuming We Refuse, Let's Refuse to Assume." $10 from 41 Sutter Street #1829, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Communism is the Central Organ in English of the Internationalist Communist Group, one of many "internationalist" groups that trace their political lineage to the left wing of the pre-WWI Italian Socialist Party. In 1921 the left wing under the leadership of Amadeo Bordiga proclaimed itself a Communist Party and became a part of the Third International. Then in 1926 because of what the leaders regarded as the International's betrayal of fundamental revolutionary principles the leftwing of the Italian CP was expelled from the International. Besides the ICG, other groups familiar to readers, like the International Communist Current and the International Bureau for a Revolutionary Party trace their origins to the "Italian Left." Issue 12 of Communism, July 2001, (28 pages) contains articles on war, (The Invariance of the Revolutionary Position on War: The Meaning of Revolutionary Defeatism," "Bangladesh, pacifism, and the era of concentration camps in England. ICG also publishes central organs in French, German, Arabic, Spanish, Hungarian, Kurdish, and Portuguese. It is on the net at <http://www.seucities.com/paris/6368/>

The New Formulation: An Anti Authoritarian Review of Books is the new biannual publication of a group of anarchists identified with such organizations as the Institute of Anarchist Studies, the Social Ecology Project, and the Direct Action Network. The 46 half-standard pages of issue number one, November 2001 describes it purpose as follows: "to help clarify the distinctness of an anarchist approach to social affairs, to provide a forum for the integration of new works into the anarchist project, and to give authors struggling to redefine the tradition a setting in which to share their research and reflections." Books are paired for review. In "The Police/Prison Edifice" Parenti's Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis is reviewed along with Joel Dyer's The Perpetual Prisoner Machine: How America Profits from Crime. I can't resist including a statement by the reviewer speaking of what he... (to p. 25)