INTRODUCTION

As a journal of libertarian socialism, Root & Branch intends to examine present-day social activity from a political viewpoint that focuses on the relationship of the working class to capitalist society and on social movements that may lead to a reordering of human affairs. The material we print will address these themes, both as they relate to the legacy of past-hitory and to the contemporary situation. While Root & Branch has strong opinions on the analysis of capitalism and on the forms of organization appropriate to the proletariat’s revolutionary task, we have no set program. We are interested in publishing material compatible with the idea that the control of society must pass into the hands of those who produce it, which for us means the self-determination of the working class. Since libertarian socialists disagree on how this may be achieved in practice, Root & Branch plans to present these debates with a combination of theoretical, historical, and factual information. Finally, since we are sympathetic to several mutually contradictory strands of radical social thought, Root & Branch hopes to present, criticize, debate, and elaborate those ideas (whether developed by Marx, council communists, anarchists, libertarians, or other socialists) that offer guidelines for analyzing the evermore dire circumstances facing us and suggest strategies for creating a revolutionary solution.

This issue contains three articles on unions, articles on Rosa Luxemburg’s Marxism and on the economic crisis of the 1970’s, and a review of Guy Routh’s The Origin of Economic Ideas.

During the 150 years of their existence, trade unions have played an ambiguous role in capitalist society. On the one hand, workers’ efforts to improve their lot have often centered around unions, which at times have proved quite successful in securing economic and political gains. On the other hand, unions have also proved to be a source of constant frustration by helping capitalists increase productivity, thwart strikes, and adjust workers to periodic layoffs. In addition to supporting reactionary political movements, the unions, regardless of their more or less militant origins, have become organizations beyond the control of workers.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) has been singled out by many historians as a federation that in its early years avoided many of the negative aspects of unionism. Only in the 1940’s, it is thought, did the CIO, under the direction of its conservative leaders, return to the fold of traditional unionism as American society found a legitimate place for industrial unions. Elizabeth Jones disputes this tacit periodization of the CIO’s history by liberal and radical historians alike. While the changing needs and moods of capitalists, workers, and the state eventually gave dominance to what has seemed to many radicals a minor theme in the 1930’s, the CIO’s later conservatism was evident from its conception. Tracing the development of the CIO-brand of "business unionism," she emphasizes the often ignored contradictions implied by the oxymoron, "revolutionary unionism."

Anton Pannekoek’s "Trade Unionism" is an edited version of his article that appeared originally in International Council Correspondence 2(2): 10-20, January 1936. We are reprinting it here because we think it provides a good summary of the purposes and roles of unions. Pannekoek outlines in general terms both the benefits of union activities and the inherent limitations on the extent of their operations. Also, since the radical critique of unionism has a long, but largely unknown history, we are reprinting Pannekoek as a representative of that tradition.

Picking up where Pannekoek left off, Don Johnson brings these issues into the 1970’s. In particular, he disputes some of the notions that leftists still have about "progressive unionism." As he puts it, "unions are businesses;" and, no matter how democratic they might become, their need to survive as organizations leads them in a conservative direction. He suggests an alternative model of workers’ organization, which could either grow or disappear depending on the needs of its members as they respond to the changing phases of capitalist development. Successes would no longer be defined in terms of survival, but in the ability of workers to generate and control their own organizational forms. American leftists have limited themselves almost exclusively to the forms of working-class organization that have proven successful in the industrialized countries since the last world war or to vanguard parties. As the economic crisis deepens, interest in the critique of unions may emerge as alternative forms of organization are sought.

Rosa Luxemburg was one of the few Marxists to perceive the breakdown of the European labor movement at the beginning of this century. Her views, consequently, put her in opposition to the practices of both the Social Democrats and the Bolsheviks. In "Rosa Luxemburg in Retrospect," Paul Mattick regards Luxemburg as the most outstanding Marxist theoretician of the old labor movement. Mattick divides her ideas into
three areas: economic theory, her views on nationalism, and her conception of political organization; and, while he disagrees on several specific points, he praises her attempt to uphold a left-wing internationalism against the more conciliatory ideas of the Social-Democrats and Bolsheviks alike. Because of this, her views, if not in detail, then in intention, are still of importance today.

Contrary to the expectations of the bourgeoisie and the economists during the 1950s and 1960s, the international market system now finds itself in a deep crisis, and every move to correct the problems only leads to a deepening of some other problem. The new optimism of the economists consists of their hoping that this bad situation will somehow stabilize itself, and not deteriorate further. This economic and moral dilemma of capitalism is described by Fred Moseley in his article, "The Obsolescence of Modern Economics." As Moseley illustrates with numerous quotes, the economists and state planners can only hope, at this point, that the market mechanism itself discovers a means to recovery. The "state of the profession" is so pathetic that the "invisible hand" is now being revived as a valid economic concept, since direct economic intervention by the state is incapable of restoring profitable conditions.

We hope that Root & Branch will prove to be a worthwhile contribution to political debate. Forthcoming issues will include articles on feminism, China, computers, and economic theory. We will consider any articles that are sent to us, so send what you are working on. Also, we welcome letters on the ideas in the articles and/or the politics put forth in the journal.

We have been raising funds through forums, parties, friends, and sales of past issues, but this hasn't covered our production costs (around $750 per issue). Therefore we are starting a sustainer's subscription for supporters who can pledge to give $10, $25, or more as each issue appears. If you cannot afford to contribute in this way, please encourage friends, or anyone for that matter, to subscribe. Regular subscriptions are $6 for four issues, $8 for foreign subscriptions, and $15 for institutions. Also, please encourage bookstores to carry us. Bulk orders of any size can be gotten directly from us or through the CARRIER PIGEON DISTRIBUTION NETWORK, 88 Fisher Ave., Boston, MA 02120. 
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INTRODUCTION

As a journal of libertarian socialism, Root & Branch intends to examine present-day social activity from a political viewpoint that emphasizes the relationship of the working class to capitalist society and on social movements that may lead to a revolutionary transformation of human affairs. The material we print addresses these themes, both as they relate to the legacy of past history and to the contemporary situation. While Root & Branch has strong opinions on the analysis of capitalism and on the forms of organization appropriate to the proletariat's revolutionary task, we have no set program. We are interested in publishing on topics with the idea that the control of society must be understood, as well as what produces it, which for us means the self-determination of the working class. Since libertarian socialist discourse on how this may be achieved is critical to practice, Root & Branch plans to present these debates with a combination of theoretical, historical, and factual information. Finally, since we are sympathetic to various mutually contradictory strands of radical social thought, Root & Branch hopes to present, criticize, debate, and elaborate these ideas. Antecedents developed by Marx, council communists, anarchists, libertarians, and other currents that offer guidelines for analyzing the evermore dire circumstances facing us and support strategies for creating a revolutionary situation.

This issue contains three articles on union, articles on Rosa Luxemburg's Marxist Origins of Economic Ideas and a review of Guy North's The Origin of Economic Ideas.

During the 150 years of their existence, trade unions have played a crucial role in capitalist society. On the one hand, workers' efforts to improve their lot have often centered around unions, which have achieved more successful in securing economic and political goals. On the other hand, unions have also proved to be a source of contradiction that often work against their own organization's aims. American leftists have limited themselves almost exclusively to the forms of work. In the U.S., unions have also proven successful in the industrialized country constructing the conscious, legal, and political apparatus. As the economic crisis deepens, the interest of the unions may emerge as an alternative form of organization of society.

Rosa Luxemburg was one of the few Marxists to perceive the breakdown of the European labor movement at the beginning of the 20th century. In the course of her work, she developed a series of ideas about the crisis of the political left. In this issue, we present an edited version of her article that appeared originally in International Council Correspondence in 1984. In this edition, we have added numerous quotes, the economists and state planners can only hope, at this point, that the economic mechanism of the market mechanism itself is developing a means to recovery. The "state of the profession" is now and, because of this, her conference, "The Obsolescence of Modern Economics," and a number of articles on the works of economists, and the economists and state planners can only hope, at this point, that the economic mechanism itself is developing a means to recovery.

We hope that Root & Branch will prove to be a worthwhile contribution to political debate. Furthermore, this issue will include articles on feminism, China, computers, and economic theory. We will consider any articles that are sent to us, whether we are working on. Also, we welcome letters on the impact of the article and/or the politics put forth in the journal.

We have been raising funds through forums, parties, friends, and sales of past issues, but this hasn't covered our production costs. If you would like to contribute in some way, please send us a donation. Also, we welcome letters on the impact of the article and/or the politics put forth in the journal.
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THE OBsolescence of MODERN Economics

The U.S. economy is now going through its most serious crisis since the disastrous days of the Great Depression. The "recession" of 1973-75 was the most severe decline in production and employment since the early 1930's. Economists now refer to this most recent recession as "the Great Depression." Furthermore, the "recovery" from the Great Recession has been the slowest of the post-war period. As a result, unemployment remains significantly higher than the 4% rate that is usually considered "full employment." The most optimistic economists forecast that the rate of unemployment will decline 1/2 a year until we finally reach the promised land of four percent in 1986. But these are mere guesses at best. Most economists are not so optimistic. The majority are counting the months to the next recession (which will begin in late 1978 or early 1979) which will send the official unemployment rates back up to the 6-9% range and possibly even into double digits.

The situation in Europe is, if anything, worse than the U.S. The European economy already appears to be in the early stages of another recession. Unemployment in Europe increased last year, in contrast to declining rates in the U.S., and is expected to rise still further in 1978. The only question is by how much. A feature article in The New York Times Magazine (4/2/78) entitled "The Trouble with Europe," reported recently that:

"Europeans have a sense of being at the beginning of a snowball slide....there is a spreading sense of crisis....People are disillusioned and preoccupied. The notion of progress, once so stirring, now rings hollow."

The problem of unemployment among young people was the main topic of conversation at the economic summit meeting last May (1977) in London. This meeting of the leaders of the seven largest capitalist nations took place soon after the riots of unemployed young people in several major cities in Italy in March of last year. These events were a highly visible reminder of the "explosive" nature of the current situation. President Valery Giscard d’Estaing of France called upon his fellow leaders to "beat back the ideological challenge of pervasive and persistent unemployment."

The New York Times (5/9/77) described the concern of the leaders as follows:

"The lack of jobs and the frustrations of recession have elected these politicians to the menace a loss of prosperity would be to existing political systems. That is why they put such special emphasis on the unemployment of youth, which they feel threatens to create a whole new generation tending toward restless discontent and perhaps ultimately toward angry irresponsibility."

What is to be done to recover the optimism, the confidence, the lost sense of security in a period in which people were able to take their improving well-being for granted?

Another feature of the current economic crisis, and one which distinguishes this crisis from previous periods of prolonged high unemployment, is that prices are rising at the same time. The rate of price increases in the U.S. has slowed somewhat from the double-digit days of 1973-74, but has remained "stuck" at around 6%. Moreover, most economists are forecasting that inflation has already "bottomed out" at this historically high level and is likely to accelerate in the coming year. Jimmy Carter's plans for "voluntary restraint" notwithstanding, the price index for "voluntary restraint" is likely to accelerate in the coming year. Parliamentary News (5/7/78) began a recent "Special Report" on the inflation with the warning:

"Anyone who is not at least mildly perturbed about the inflation outlook for the U.S. does not recognize the seriousness of the situation.

********

This kind of serious economic crisis was not supposed to happen anymore. Throughout the more prosperous days of the 50's and 60's, economists claimed that they had made a great discovery which had solved the problem of economic crises. Economists proclaimed to all who would listen (including a generation of undergraduates who had no choice) that the "business cycle has been rendered obsolete." Great Depressions, they assured us, were a thing of the past. The discovery of modern economics was that government, and not market forces, were the cause of business cycles. Economists then claimed that the government could intervene to prevent depressions, and that economists could find a way to ensure a perpetual state of full employment.

The alleged discovery of modern economics was that the payment of government economic policies to eliminate whatever unemployment might occur. Whenever unemployment threatened, the government could simply spend more money—or reduce taxes so that consumers would have more money to spend. At the same time, the Federal Reserve Board could print more money to pay for the budget deficits resulting from the expansionary fiscal policy. In effect, the discretionary modern economic was to print more money and spend it, in one way or another.

Economists argued that the chief loss of these fiscal and monetary policies would maintain a high and steady level of demand, which would eliminate the periods of depression that had in the past threatened the existence of capitalist economies. The ability of the government to regulate and control economic activity had ushered in a new era of permanent prosperity, the economists promised, which would make capitalism secure, once and for all.

Paul Samuelson, dean of economists in the U.S., likened the discovery of modern economics to the life-saving discoveries of modern medicine. Just as modern medicine had discovered the cure for smallpox and polio, Samuelson suggested, modern economics had discovered the cure for the economic disease of depression.

Unfortunately, there was one undesirable side-effect of this fiscal and monetary medicine which soon became apparent: if the medicine were applied in sufficient doses to bring the economy close to full employment, inflation would usually accompany the achievement of economic nirvana. Charles Schultze, Carter's chief economist, has expressed the problem as follows:

The problem is that every time we push the rate of unemployment toward acceptably low levels, by whatever means, we set off a new inflation. NYST. 7/18/76

The explanation of this inflationary side-effect of modern economics, in brief, goes something like this: when the government tries to "push" the economy toward full employment by spending more money or by reducing taxes so that consumers would have more money to spend, at the same time, the Federal Reserve Board could print more money to pay for the budget deficits resulting from the expansionary fiscal policy. In effect, the discretionary modern economic was to print more money and spend it, in one way or another.

The businessmen, of course, refuse to play the game by these textbook rules. They experience the government stimulus as an
The fear is that high unemployment rates will trigger severe political upheavals...

More recently, Business Week complained about the "superfluous atmosphere" of the latest meeting of the American Economic Association and criticized the economists for their failure to come up with any new remedies for the business cycle.

The sessions of the ADA bitterly degenerated into an all-out shouting match as the economists identified inflation with recessions. There were even some new ideas for proceeding with the nation's most pressing economic task: pushing inflation down and unemployment up at the same time.

The New York Times is also upset about what it has called the "bankruptcy of modern economic theory." In a recent editorial (9/24/77) entitled "Paralyzed Economists, Stagnant Economy," the Times lamented:

A decade ago if unemployment were frozen at a high rate and the economy appeared headed for a slowdown, a democratic president surely would have called for major economic stimulus - a tax cut, a spending increase, or both. But not now, in the era of the "soporific atmosphere" of the latest recession. Economists are paralysed, and inflation is again threatening the prospects of the business cycle.

The Professional Economists, who never were apparent in recent years. The following excerpts are a small part of this discussion.

In March, 1976, Business Week ran a feature article under the heading: "Inflation: Fiscal Policies Don't Work." The article began as follows:

Despite encouraging news about the strength of the recovery, one critical problem stubbornly persists. Now that the economy has turned up, inflation still will stick at a very high level: at least 5% through 1985. In Europe, economists are beginning to anticipate that unemployment will not drop back to the rates of the early 1970's anytime in this decade. In the western world, something has changed radically in political economics. Economists and politicians now agree that the traditional modes of attacking inflationary economics -by government spending or increasing the money supply will not end high unemployment. These conventional policies will only create a spurt of additional inflation in economies that are already high in inflation for much the same reason the medicine of modern economics.

For anyone interested in a more thorough analysis of all this, the best starting point is the writings of Wray, especially Mark, and Keynes. The Limits of the Mixed Economy. (available through the New American Library) before the "limits of the mixed economy" became so painfully obvious. Wray argues that those limits would be reached, after which capitalism would fall once more into a period of depression. Well, here we are.
meager accomplishments of past attempts to reduce unemployment.

More recently, the Times used even stronger language. The Times, the title of the material was: "The Crisis: A Wake-up Call for Humphrey-Hawkins"—perhaps inspired by ex-President Ford's remark that the proposal of a quick return to full employment was a "false illusion." The editorial argued that this bill would legitimate wishful thinking... The bill would not create new jobs; it would merely legislate a good intention... The niddle no one can answer is how to use government economic policies to drive unemployment down to the promised land of 4 percent without triggering a severe inflation, and, perhaps, an accompanying recession.

The Humphrey-Hawkins Bill does not resolve that issue. It dodges it by proclaiming a promise that no one knows how to keep: let the goal be set at 4 percent, and then figure out how to meet it. If not, the goal can always be changed. The bill would play a cruel hoax on the hard-core unemployed, holding before them the promise—but not the reality—of a job.

Hollow promises were also the main events at the London summit meeting last May. The seven leaders acknowledged the unprecedented numbers of people unemployed in the advanced capitalist countries and pledged to create jobs for them. And yet no one there suggested any new policies as a means of accomplishing this task.

Prime Minister Callaghan sounded a familiar theme when he pointed out that "no one quite knows any more why the economic ills of our countries so insensibly respond to the same old medicine, nor how to prescribe correctly for simultaneous ailments that used to be opposite."

The New York Times, as you remember, asked in an article entitled "Ford's Remark:"

What is to be done to recover the optimism, the momentum, the lost sense of security in which people were able to take their improving well-being for granted?

The Times answered:

Nobody has been able to devise a simple overall formula. So the leaders have taken to guessing, experimenting with one measure at a time, hoping that a new system of stability will eventually evolve... There are no guarantees that the effort will work...

The leaders are fighting a losing battle. In my opinion, we are in the initial stages of yet another worldwide capitalist depression, which no amount of government tinkering will be able to avoid. It is still too early to say much about the length and severity of this depression, but there is no reason to believe that it will be any less severe than the last one. It could be worse. (More on this in coming issues.)

Like all capitalist depressions, this depression will eventually be characterized by widespread bankruptcies of firms and drastic reductions in the living standards of most of us. While economists and politicians grope for ways to avoid this outcome without disturbing the ownership and control of the world's productive resources by a small percentage of the population, the rest of us will probably have to devise more drastic solutions of our own.

F.M.

The story of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) has generally been seen as American Leftists as one of glorious struggles, as that of a revolutionary movement that might have been, and large, liberal historians have celebrated the CIO as the harbinger of enlightened labor relations. Most radicals, while decrying this modernized form of exploitation, have glossed over important aspects of the history that conflict with their political analyses and hopes. Would-be organizers of various persuasions have been quick to blame CIO leaders for its decline in militancy. Social democrats have either claimed the CIO as an evolutionary advance toward socialism or berated its failure to develop independent political action along the lines of European labor parties. While leftists have accused the Communist Party (CP) of destroying radical initiatives in the CIO, other historians have deplored the CP's adherence to the Soviet Union, which they think deepened militancy during the war and hampered the trade-union work of dedicated Socialists. By 1937, after a decade of decisive decline, the American Federation of Labor (AFL) had lost most of its money and much of its membership, which it had fallen by half to include only 5.2% of the total (or 11.3% of the workforce). If the AFL faced the depression with resignation and no effective strategy as its monopoly on skilled labor-power was undermined by rising unemployment, which left 24.9% of workers jobless and most union members without regular work. Despite its traditional opposition to government interference, a policy that marked pre-depression production relations and the laissez-faire ideology of the Gompersians, the AFL did go as far as to support a Congressional thirty-hours bill, which aimed to spread employment by reducing work weeks. Since this bill was vehemently opposed by business and viewed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins proposed a compromise plan that called for a 35-hour week.

THE CIO:
FROM REFORM TO REACTION

The Great Depression
Since the CIO emerged in response to the unprecedented depression conditions, the failure of previous political combinations to solve the Great Depression to their advantage should be examined not only to situate the CIO in its historical context, but also to provide a basis for comparison with the futile attempts of capitalists, governments, unions, etc. to halt the economic ills of our countries. The CIO appears to have been a form of defensive line to the American labor movement's response to the first world war, a period which was marked by rising unemployment, which left 24.9% of workers jobless and most union members without regular work. Despite its traditional opposition to government interference, a policy that marked pre-depression production relations and the laissez-faire ideology of the Gompersians, the AFL did go as far as to support a Congressional thirty-hours bill, which aimed to spread employment by reducing work weeks. Since this bill was vehemently opposed by business and viewed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins proposed a compromise plan that called for a 35-hour week.

For more information, please visit [www.thecio.org](http://www.thecio.org).
The AFL's passive strategy was opposed by the leaders of the industrial unions, whose representatives feared that the Sharpe and Coal mining industries had been threatened by a musician slump during the "non-contentious" years. The newly organized Amalgamated Clothing Workers (ACW) and the United Mine Workers (UMW) were early advocates of state intervention to save the miners, particularly through the promotion of unionization, which the depression was threatening with extinction. Owing his success to the war, both unions during the first world war (under the protection of the War Labor Board's collective bargaining policy in the Uniform business), the miners championed national economic planning as the solution to this equally serious national emergency. They urged the government to intervene through public policy or unionism, and to extend state intervention and coal mining industries as was done during the war. To avoid what had been experienced during the emergency, they called for a public policy of regulation and public control. In the United States, this policy was described as "neither laissez-faire nor unionism," according to the idea that public policy would solve problems by regulating wages and profit. However, the miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment. This policy would not eliminate the inherent instability of the economy. The miners' unionism would not eliminate the inherent instability of the economy.

Since the first world war, the textile manufacturers had augmented their economic attack on the cheap labor supply by applying competitive pressure on their Southern competitors by seeking legislation to establish a national minimum wage, to increase child labor and women's wages, and to promote unionization. In the recovery programs of prominent members of the War Industries Board (WIB) and the National War Labor Board, which had included payroll deductions for unionization, the miners had united with the Southern workers and labor movement in support of this legislation.

It is possible to understand the miners' unionism as an attempt to shift the income of the working class to its benefit. As so many workers did not know the dangers of unionism, they tended to be swayed by the idea that unionism would save them by the government's intervention. The miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment.

Although the miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment, it was not without its problems. The miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment. It was not without its problems. The miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment. The miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment. The miners' unionism was based on the notion of a balanced economy with public investment.
In defeating these electrical and steel company unions, industrial unionists established precedents on the anti-union zones of basic industry.

Most large corporations, however, managed to avoid mass picketing—now by defining strikes as illegal union organization or the strike as illegal union organization. In the fall of 1933, later

With the army immediately to quell labor, the long-suffering textile strike had finally run its course.

The situation in San Francisco is not properly described by the phrase "harassment of the unions." In progress there is an insurrection, a Communist-inspired and led revolt against the government in San Francisco's districts but it is the possible ruin of the Pacific Coast's entire waterfront.
of the Republican skippers, who, in his judg-
ment, was too lenient. But the evi-
dence of the nation was too vast for a disa-
poin tment. Private police forces of the
nation were thus outraged by the
pressures of the situation. As with the
NIRA, a coalition of mutually conflicting
interests produced legislation whose application
would have to be interpreted by a
judicial body. The NIRA's rationale of business self-
regulation to eliminate unfair competition was
soon supplanted by arguments that counteracted
the imbalance in the economy caused by the
disproportionate power of concentrated
industry. Calling for "industrial democracy" to supple-
cement political democracy, many Democrats from
industrial regions sought labor support and
promoted unions as sources of new breed of
union leaders, who would defend workers'
national interests and democratic rights in the
job against the abuses of corporate totalitarian
rule.

Passage of the Act was facilitated by its
ubiquity and the certainty of its applica-
tion. To secure the NIRA's approval, Wagner
vaguely left to the NIRA's discretion the juris-
diction of bargaining units (i.e., the specific
definition of "bargaining unit") and the
right to vote for NIRA-certified bargaining
agents for a one-year period (i.e., after
their election). Since the Supreme Court had
declared the NIRA unconstitutional in
1935, the Wagner Act in anticipa-
tion of judicial enforcement. Because neither business
nor labor had anticipated the Wagner Act's
effect on collective bargaining units, the
law passed without the vehement opposition
that was to develop later.

While signaling to liberals a need for
"industrial democracy" and collective bargaining
machinery, the Wagner Act also led the
South to the development of the CIO and its encourage-
ment by the NIRA's positive endorsement
of the labor unions. The law passed without the
veto threat that was to develop later. In
June 1935, the NIRA's favorable report on
the Wagner Act finally outlawed employers'
interference with workers' rights to organize.

The Wagner Act and the Rise of the CIO

Aid fresh memories of the summer's violent
strikes, the more liberal Democratic Congress
that had voted to extend the Wagner Act
was faced with the prospect of a
nonviolent election in 1934. The
National Labor Relations Act
and the 1934 Railway
Labor Act amendments,
in his order to cut relief
and require the
union to "bargain in
good faith" for admittance to the union the cautious craft-union bosses, he contended
the situation. As with the new breed of
union officials, previous attempts to organize
junior statesmen, who would defend workers'
national interests and democratic rights in the
job against the abuses of corporate totalitarian
rule.

For the Wagner Act, the Roosevelt administra-
tion decided to extend the Wagner Act's
scope to include all bargaining units and
matters related to labor disputes. However, in
his order to cut relief sharply just before the 1934
recession, and in his ambiguous statements during
the election, he showed himself less than the
producer of the things labor was demanding than a
cynical politician, interested in a program that would have
mass appeal and popularity. He showed it again in viewing the
NIRA from 1934 to 1935, still maintaining that the semi-
skilled workers had been too easily replaced, too isolated and
organized in independent local unions previously unionized. He
warned that not only the 25
American Federation of
Labor but also the CIO's survival was at stake.

The failure of the American Federation of
Labor to organize the mass-production industries creates a
handicap to the unions. The industries closest to them--the
metal, steel, and cotton textile industries--were demanding
organizing, and the CIO found itself trying to remain within
under its shrinking share of
workers. John L. Lewis criticized the TWW on
the ground that not only the UMW but also the
CIO's survival was at stake. The
failure of the American Federation of
Labor to organize the mass-production industries creates a
handicap to the unions. The industries closest to them--the
metal, steel, and cotton textile industries--were demanding
organizing, and the CIO found itself trying to remain within
under its shrinking share of
workers. John L. Lewis criticized the TWW on
the ground that not only the UMW but also the
CIO's survival was at stake.
Radio Workers (URS), Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), and the Hamtramck Union (HURU).

Two weak unions—the Associated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers (AI) and the SWOC—formed the basis of the new two main projects—the Steel Workers Organizing Committee (SWOC) and the Textile Workers Organizing Committee (TWOC), led by Sidney of the CIO. Although the CIO provided organizational assistance in developing unions in the mass-production industries, most of its more organized organizing... resistant to unionism.

The rubber workers were now and enthusiastic unionists. The sitdown technique works, and they use it as soon as an issue arises. Their officers are urging them to stop production without first resorting to the usual grievances at the attention of the union and the company (through etc.) procedures. When the rubber workers became more experienced and more disciplined unionists, the sitdowns over petty issues will undoubtedly disappear.

As the pressure mounted, a wave for public opinion announced on 1 February his intent to push legislation to amend the Wagner Act by making the Sitdown Strike a federal law. The sitdowns at} the} Flint} Fisher plant were not the only sitdowns to be organized... the CIO's greatest strike.

By the end of January 1937, about a dozen more sitdowns and conventional strikes coupled with picketing... successful bargaining agent for seventeen steel plants, and a five-cents-per-hour increase to all 159,000 US Steel workers.

Meanwhile, impressed by the CIO's show of force, US Steel moved to expand the limited relations they had established with industrial unionists. When Gerow's... of the company and... recognizing the Steelworkers' strike as legitimate.

The 1937 strike wave yielded recognition of CIO and SWOC unions in numerous plants. The momentum of victorious bargaining agents' September 1937, the United Steelworkers of America was...
Feeling the harder edges of the coming economic downturn by May 1937, Little Steel refused to recognize the SWOC and undermined its organizing efforts by working conditions of the ill-fated steel agreement. The SWOC was biding its time in preparation before attempting to make a deal with the anti-union Little Steel firm. This strategy of accumulating power before a showdown backfired as Republic Steel took the offensive by looking out workers to the Roosevelt administration. In Massillon, Ohio, where the SWOC was particularly strong, the SWOC on May 25 automatically responded to this provocation by calling out its members at Republic Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube. While organizing its drivers had been partially successful, lacking the strategic advantage of factory occupations, strikers faced streetbrawling and vigilante attacks on grocers, which resulted in ten dead and ninety wounded at Republic Steel’s Memorial Day Massacre in Chicago and two more killed in Youngstown, as SWOC’s surprise, two-thirds of the poorly organized workers at Bethlehem Steel’s Cambria Works in Johnstown, Pa., seemed by walking out on June 11. But rather than appeal to all steel-workers with similar抗战 strikes, or call a general CIO strike, or even allow local protests, the SWOC demonstrated its power by making it clear that it would not escalate by depending on government mediation rather than workers’ willingness to strike. They showed what was possible in the balance of power shifted. While the governor of Pennsylvania had sent the National Guard to the troubled Cambria Steel, he was to rescind his martial law decree after observing the strikers’ self-discipline and the workers’ readiness to return to work on 27 June. Having declared martial law as thousands poured into Youngstown to avenge what the workers termed the illegal shooting of one of their union members, the Supreme Court case over property damage, the SWOC leader Philip Murray, then feebly, but stoutly, forced his hand on 25 June. SWOC leader Philip Murray, who had gathered all along to the call of the masses. But when the CIO decided to march, he was said to have organized the workers’ potential; according to the CIO, the general condition in the country against the ex-

Most executives in this survey agreed that the tide of unionization had turned. 

was the CIO’s accumulation had been slow was evidenced not only by the SWOC and CIO failures but also by its membership figures, which reached their peak size in the AFL in October 1937. Just as any business must accumulate capital before making a move, any union accumulation had also been slow. A prevalent patrician spirit could be felt in the SWOC’s draggin strikers’ down, in strike placards such as, “We’re going to remember you if you’re with us” and in such pronouncements as the following: “Every man owes to his community a duty to maintain it free from the degrading influence of strike tactics.” 

While the Roosevelt recession continued to concentrate on the farm problem and not for the SWOC’s abolition, it is hardly surprising that the unorganized workers found it difficult to the alienated minority of workers did, SWOC leaders did not appeal to the public to support it. They were barely able to file a change of status. If the SWOC leaders had faced a fearful choice. If they became quitters, they would sacrifice the support of the membership. If they pressed for further concessions, they would no longer have the support of the workers. By no means, they would expect the support of the workers in turn remained undefined, their effectiveness diminished by the SWOC’s failures to make a campaign at the World War, for there is no action to operate the plants.
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CIO reliance on the NLRB, however, did pay off in crucial strikes. In December 1937 steelworkers at the Weir and Bridgman’s plant in the AFL’s jurisdiction struck against the Phelps Dodge Corporation. This strike, like many others in the period, was part of a larger trend of organized labor seeking to expand its influence in the American economy. The CIO’s efforts were successful, and the steelworkers won a significant victory.

However, the CIO’s success was not without its challenges. The organization faced opposition from both the AFL and the Communist Party, who saw the CIO as a threat to their influence in the labor movement. The CIO’s tactics, such as the use of strikebreakers and the breaking of contracts, were also met with criticism from some within the movement.

The CIO’s expansion also had implications for the New Deal, as the administration sought to balance the interests of labor and industry. The CIO’s success in organizing workers and challenging the power of large corporations raised questions about the role of government in the economy and the balance of power between labor and capital.

During World War II, the CIO played a significant role in the war effort, with many of its members involved in the defense industry. The CIO also faced internal struggles, with splits within the organization and conflicts with the Communist Party.

Despite these challenges, the CIO’s success in organizing workers and challenging the power of large corporations during the New Deal period and World War II had a lasting impact on the American labor movement and the economy as a whole.
shop system had been cracked by the modified union hiring hall. But a Coast longshoreman, a GM settlement, and industry-wide agreement in the commercial coal mines and in Minneapolis trucking. But when Henry Ford, forced to accept the UW in May, 1941, replaced his vigilante agreement with the first closed shop, this lifeline of opposition to unionism irrevocably became a trend toward union in labor relations. That fall, a new captive mines strike wrung a union shop agreement (i.e., a closed shop modified to allow anyone to be hired provided he joined the union before entering the service) from the coal companies, who were pressured to settle for fear of sparking further interruptions in war production. In July 1942, in hopes of establishing production labor peace, the NLM announced in its Little Steel Formula a further improvement on the closed shop—its "maintenance-of-membership" policy, which required that voluntary union members "shall, during, and after" their employment, remain members of the union in good standing and by paying dues through a payroll deduction system known as "the voluntary, binding checkoff." \( ^{49} \)

The Little Steel Formula also proclaimed the NLM's "legal sanctity" policy, whoserawl-wage freeze was legislatively confirmed in September 1942. Having already achieved a union wage freeze with the threat, the UW rejected its wage control in this inflationary period in a series of agreements which proved ultimately rewarding despite CIO condemnation and NLM's mistrust of the unions. Although threatened with being drafted into the army under the War Labor Disputes Act of June 1942, workers' allowance contracts are an example with a wildcat strike wave that by 1944 surpassed all previous years in strike frequency.

Having always depended on government assistance in its efforts to organize the mass-production industries, the CIO did not at this late date bite the hand that fed it. When faced with loss of union security through revocation of their NLM-granted maintenance-of-membership privilege, some large employers proved themselves responsible unionists by disciplining workers without NLM aid. The unemployed rejected its wage control in this inflationary period in a series of agreements which proved ultimately rewarding despite CIO condemnation and NLM's mistrust of the unions. Although threatened with being drafted into the army under the War Labor Disputes Act of June 1942, workers' allowance contracts are an example with a wildcat strike wave that by 1944 surpassed all previous years in strike frequency.

The wage freeze was not to continue indefinitely in discipline the labor force; 92% of contracts in 1945 provided automatic arbitration of grievances, and by 1947 90% of contracts pledge no strikes during the war. The CIO's primary concern was the war.

The resolution of America's greatest strike wave was over. The CIO unites firmly established in basic industry. The CIO membership was at its peak in 1946, just as the Wagner Act was passed. The Taft-Hartley Act extended the President's wartime strike power to the national interest and the national unions. The Wagner Act's open shop policy was thus overruled and the 1935 unions were no match for the new CIO. The new government policy of union-employer by prohibiting certain organizing practices deemed unfair to capital. In acting against their leaders with the world-conquering American economy, the CIO unions found their powerful new allies, by closely throwing their support to wildcatting UW locals, managed to use the ruling faction, the CIO, to further its own ends. The result was a massive wave of strikes and economic recessions. Following the failure of the President's Commission (1937-1945) and the Wagner Act, unemployment peaked in 1936 at 22.7% of the workforce (and 26.2% of the non-agricultural workforce), \( ^{50} \) and in 1937 at 20.1% of the workforce (and 25.4% of the non-agricultural workforce), \( ^{51} \) and the second world war was easily isolated and restrained, if not suppressed, by military and legal means. Finally, the CIO has suffered the reemergence of recruitment movements to reform capitalism. By leaving the fundamental capital-labor relations intact, the labor movement of the 1930's allowed its destiny to be determined by the demands of controlling national capital accumulation. No sooner was its control accepted by industrialists during the war, than the CIO despised its radical postures and settled down to the business of unionism, the hard core of labor power. The verdict that subsequent history has passed on the CIO might well be epitomized by Marx's remark, "The proletariat is revolutionary or it is nothing!"
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Je$cure living. They did not feel the capital's unions and employers' unions. The idea of overthrowing capitalism could not be possible, by cutting down wages and increasing the hours of work. On the other hand, the workers attempt to increase their wages and to shorten their hours of work.

The price of labor power is not a fixed quantity, though it must exceed a certain lower minimum, which is necessary to keep the capitalists of their own free will. Thus this antagonism becomes the object of a contest, the real class struggle. It is the task, the function of the unions to carry on this fight.

Trade unions were the first training school in proletarian virtue, in solidarity as the spirit of organized fighting. It embodied the first force of the organized proletariat's power. In the early English and American trade unions, this virtue often persisted and degenerated into a narrow self-interested group, a true capitalist state of mind. It was different, however, where the workers had to fight for their very existence, where the greatest efforts of their unions could hardly uphold their standard of living, where the full force of an energetic, fighting, and expanding capitalism attacked them. There they had to learn the window that only the renegade worker could break.

So there comes a discrepancy between the working class and trade unions. The working class has to look beyond capitalism. Trade unionism lives entirely within capitalism and cannot look beyond it. Trade unionism can only represent a part, a necessary but narrow part, in the class struggle. And it develops aspects which bring it into conflict with the greater aim of the working class.

With the growth of capitalism and big industry the unions too must grow. They become big corporations with thousands of members, extending beyond the shops and mines into every town and every factory. Officials must be appointed. The leaders are no longer treasurers, by conducting the affairs, to manage the finances, simply representatives of the leaders, of course, but who negotiate with the capitalists and who this practice has acquired a special skill. For this they pay a price, as big a capitalist employer himself, and he discusses with him, on equal terms, the interests of his members. The officials are specialists in trade union work, which the members, entirely occupied by their factory work, cannot judge or direct themselves.

So large a corporation as a union is not simply an assembly of individual workers; it becomes an independent capitalist, an independent factor in the market, and here the leadership is essential. The capitalist attempts to increase his profits, the surplus value, as much as possible, by cutting down wages and increasing the hours of work or the intensity of labor. On the other hand, the workers attempt to increase their wages and to shorten their hours of work. The union officials, the labor leaders, are the bearers of the special union interests. Originally they existed only because they acquire, by long practice at the head of the organization, a new social character. In each social group, once it is fit to form a special group, the nature of its work and needs to determine its social character. It is only a question of time and setting.

The officials' function is entirely different from that of the workers. They do not work in factories. They are not exploited by capitalists, their existence is not threatened by unemployment. They sit in offices, in fairly secure positions. They have to make contact with the employers' associations, attend workers meetings and discuss with employers. Of course, they have to stand for the workers, and to defend their interests and wishes against the capitalists. This is, however, not very different from the position of the lawyer who appoints the secretary of an organization, will stand for its members and defend their interests to the very best of his ability.

However, there is a difference. Because many of the labor leaders come from the ranks of workers, they have experienced for themselves what wage slavery and exploitation mean. They feel as members of the working class and the proletarian spirit often acts as a strong tradition in them. But the new reality of their life continually tends to weaken this tradition. Economically they no longer need the workers to do any more. They sit in conferences with the capitalists, bargaining over the price of their interests against interests, just as the opposing interests of the capitalist corporations are weighed one against another to understand the capitalist's position just as well as the personal interests of the leaders, or who negotiate with the capitalists and who this practice has acquired a special skill. For this they pay a price, as big a capitalist employer himself, and he discusses with him, on equal terms, the interests of his members. The officials are specialists in trade union work, which the members, entirely occupied by their factory work, cannot judge or direct themselves.

The trade unionists in advanced capitalism are numerous enough to form a special class or class with a special social character and interests. As representatives of the unions they embody the character and the interests of the unions. They are necessary to the existence of the unions, they embody the character and the interests of the unions. They are necessary to the existence of the unions. So labor leaders see it as their duty to participate in the work of the unions. The labor leaders are in conflict with the workers. The labor leaders are in conflict with the workers. The labor leaders are in conflict with the workers.
In the trades where unions exist as mighty organizations, their position is safeguarded by this same concentration of capital. The large funds they have collected for strike support are insignificant in comparison to the money power of their adversaries. A couple of iron-clad over the whole union's class must join in. To the whole class, to the trade unions. It means that primary fund they had collected for strike support are they will gain something else. By not submitting and to postpone their claims to more shorter hours, more humane conditions, the right the workers insist on fighting in opposition to the realities of the capitalist's power to destroy them completely. He has his large means, even when the realities of capitalism, war, or any other class struggle appears now as a rift between the trade union leaders, and the growing revolutionary feeling of the masses. This rift becomes apparent in the opposition to the trade leaders' stands alone on various important social and political questions.

Trade unions are bound to capitalism; it has its best chances to obtain good wages when capitalist policy is at its worst. But if the masses are in the right, and if they are free from colonial exploitation and oppression, they often with horrible cre- ations. The working class fumes colonial exploitation and opposes it, but trade unionism often supports colonial politics as a way to capitalist prosperity.

With the enormous increases in colonial workers' view, social instability, providing colonial workers' assimilation into the capital is possible. For example, if the capitalists, who are the dominant class in society, have to give not only their labor power, but their feelings and national sympathy, *The labor leader has become the slave of his colossal task of securing industrial peace now at the cost of the workers, though he is also aware that they are completely, but not the least bit. He wants to force the workers to fight to any cost, he is right when he thinks that fighting is of no use. Or, if the workers are not able to stand up to the union's demands, he has the right to use his power to subdue the workers.

When the trade unions fought against the capitalist class for better working conditions, the capitalist class hated them, but it had not the power to silence them. The trade unions tried to raise all the forces of the working class to fight, the capitalist class would persuade them with all its means. They may see their actions as repression, but for the capitalists the strikes, their leaders thrown in jail, and their funds confiscated. On the other hand, if they keep their workers from fighting, the capitalist class may consider them as valuable instru- ments to be employed and protected, and their leaders as law-abiding citizens. On the trade union side, they believe in the April and the deep blue sea on the one side, and which is a tough thing to bear for people who want to be peaceful citizens; on the other side, the rebellion of the workers, which may understand the union's demands, is real. If it is wise, it will recognize that a bit of that light, and be able to uphold the influence of the labor leaders over the workers.

These conflicts arise here are not any- one's fault; they are an inevitable consequence of capitalist development. The spirit of trade unionism, but it is at the same time the way to ruin. It must be fought as a living thing, and at the same time, as a transitory thing. The workers must wage a steady fight for wages and working conditions, while at the same time keeping alive the ideas, more or less clear and conscious, awakened in their minds. They cling to the unions, feeling that they are still necessary, trying now and then to transform them into better fighting instruments, but the spirit of trade unionism, which is in its inner form a capitalist spirit, is not in the workers. The divergence between these two forces is enormous, and the class struggle appears now as a rift between the trade union leaders, and the growing revolutionary feeling of the masses. This rift becomes apparent in the opposition to the trade leaders' stands alone on various important social and political questions.
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Trade unionism abhors communism. Communism takes away the rights of individual workers. In communism, the absence of capitalist employers, there is no room for the trade union and labor leaders, into big strikes, occupations, with a strong social movement, where the bulk of the workers are organized, the labor leaders must be socialists too, by origin as well as by environment. For then they are right-winging socialists, and restricted to the idea of a commonwealth where instead of greedy capitalist bosses, leaders will manage industrial production.

But the reactionary trend of trade unionism’s history is not without significance. Trade unionism is a power in itself. It has considerable funds at its disposal, as material element of power. It has its spiritual influence, upheld and propagated by its periodical papers as mental element of power. It is a power in the hands of leaders, who make use of it wherever the special interests of trade unions come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of industrial workers. Such a struggle of separate unions, the I.W.W. put the principles: all workers of one factory, as comrades against one master, must form one union, to act as a strong unity against the employer. Against the multitude of small unions and bickering trade unions, the I.W.W. raised the slogan: one big union for united action in the struggle for all unionists. Solidarity extends over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labor towards the unorganized immigrants, it saw these working-poor proletarians that the I.W.W. led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the I.W.W. who taught them how to deal with these small unions all over the country, and who defeated their cause in its paper and earlier strike. The workers, too, in the strike fight to win the big funds of the old unions. The I.W.W. gave the old skilled labor a taste of the fight, so that the workers, in the fight for the state, the I.W.W. will bring out the real fight into the striking group alone. The strike is still close, only in the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers. It is then that the working class will throw the political power of the state into the fight. The dollars stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, where the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one whole. The workers will be different, of course, when the mass of the workers really consider such a conflict as directly concerning them, when they find that their own future is at stake. If they go up to the fight themselves, then they must defend their cause as a class against the capitalist class. They have not a glimpse of their way to freedom.

The narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But the workers themselves are not in a position to narrow the field of the fight. They have to take a wider view of the world. From their struggle, from the fights within the factories, from the efforts to organize a struggle among the unemployed, they see that the workers must fight for freedom, for their own rights, for the struggle against capitalism. They have to see the class enemy; they enter the realm of politics. This problem of politics must be dealt with.

The I.W.W. originated from two forms of capitalism expansion. In the communal forests and plains of the West, many of them have made fortunes, taking riches with Wild West methods of fierce and brutal exploitation; and the worker-adventurers who, in the struggle between the workers and the capitalists, must be socialists too, by origin as well as by environment, have swept away the strife of its gigantic force.

The forms of trade unionism are different for different countries, owing to the different forms of development in the various states. Even in the same country, they may vary from one to another, due to the way the fighting spirit of the workers is sometimes able to transform itself, or to build up new types of union, with the help of the workers, who are always the same in every country. When they come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of industrial workers, they are the forms of trade unionism that have been built from the resources of poor dockers and the other able to transform them, or to build up new forms of development in capitalism. Nor do they arise out of the state of the working class. Trade unionism is a power over and above the state, a power over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labor towards the unorganized immigrants, it saw these working-poor proletarians that the I.W.W. led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the I.W.W. who taught them how to deal with these small unions all over the country, and who defeated their cause in its paper and earlier strike. The workers, too, in the strike fight to win the big funds of the old unions. The I.W.W. gave the old skilled labor a taste of the fight, so that the workers, in the fight for the state, the I.W.W. will bring out the real fight into the striking group alone. The strike is still close, only in the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers. It is then that the working class will throw the political power of the state into the fight. The dollars stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, where the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one whole. The workers will be different, of course, when the mass of the workers really consider such a conflict as directly concerning them, when they find that their own future is at stake. If they go up to the fight themselves, then they must defend their cause as a class against the capitalist class. They have not a glimpse of their way to freedom.

The narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But the workers themselves are not in a position to narrow the field of the fight. They have to take a wider view of the world. From their struggle, from the fights within the factories, from the efforts to organize a struggle among the unemployed, they see that the workers must fight for freedom, for their own rights, for the struggle against capitalism. They have to see the class enemy; they enter the realm of politics. This problem of politics must be dealt with.

Anton Pannekoek
It is understandable that there is a certain folklore surrounding unions. Many heroic struggles have been fought to achieve unionization, and the power of some government leaders can cash in on ideals two centuries old, so can present union enthusiasts tap the rich history of workers’ struggles.

"Solidarity forever, for the union makes us strong" was once sung by labor militants who had a vision of the entire workforce unionized, daily growing in strength, and working as a collective whole for the benefit of all workers. Reality, however, has cruelly intruded, and unions have become a major barrier to worker solidarity. Union gains are made for members, not for the unorganized. As the total wage must always be limited by profit requirements, the greater the number of jobs in the spirit of unions, the less will be the relative wage of the non-unionized. This is not exclusive and must be in competition with the non-union sector.

Unions divide workers by race and sex in several ways. Minorities and women are far less unionized; therefore, the conflict of unionized against non-unionized has race and sex aspects. The solidarity system defended by unions (and frequently subvert to loyal challenges within the unions by those historically excluded from seniority) usually works against women and non-whites. And the existing union power structures are nearly always dominated by white males.

Unions defend the narrow interests of their own members in competition with other unions. Sympathy strikes are almost unheard of, and in the recent coal miners’ strike the union, in order to demonstrate its "responsibility" to the bosses, kept the western miners on the job, as a matter of policy. While they are sometimes able to protect jobs in a narrow craft sort of way, in times of economic crisis, unions are more often in the forefront supporting layoffs. This is because of the fact that if a given industry isn’t allowed to survive, it will be unable to survive competition with foreign or domestic rivals. This would result in the loss of even more jobs, and would destroy the union in the process.

In addition, unions have distinct interests of their own either, or by which they are longer likely, as aid to capitalism; they are an integral part of it. The mandarins of the unions, now being invested in "real" ways overshadow the more important fact that dues are invested in "legiti­mate" businesses, including, at times, the company unionized by that particular union. Unions, while they may "anti-strike" insurance to the bosses, thus play the main role in the capitalist system as insurance companies—that of finance capital. Is it any wonder they don’t want to threaten profits?

But why must unions have vested interests separate from both the rank and file and from the management? The answer is that it is a mere question of leadership: that the capital, which must be replaced by honest and efficient leaders, preferably those coming up from the ranks. Those advocating union reform believe that with sincere leaders, unions will be able to consistently squeeze the bosses for higher wages and better working conditions, to organize the unorganized, and even to speak to internationalism as parts of the larger task.

Another misconception is that unions inevitably bring both better working conditions and large pay increases. Anyone who bothers to study the matter even superficially can verify that unions only trade off a repression in working conditions for pay raises. The fact that unionized labor is far better indicates primarily that those companies big and rich enough to be able to afford a union can also afford to pay higher wages.

Another myth is that unions, irrespective of what the economy is doing, can fight layoffs as a matter of policy. While they are sometimes able to protect jobs in a narrow craft sort of way, in times of economic crisis, unions are more often in the forefront supporting layoffs. This is because of the fact that if a given industry isn’t allowed to survive, it will be unable to survive competition with foreign or domestic rivals. This would result in the loss of even more jobs, and would destroy the union in the process.

In addition, unions have distinct interests of their own either, or by which they are longer likely, as aid to capitalism; they are an integral part of it. The mandarins of the unions, now being invested in "real" ways overshadow the more important fact that dues are invested in "legiti­mate" businesses, including, at times, the company unionized by that particular union. Unions, while they may "anti-strike" insurance to the bosses, thus play the main role in the capitalist system as insurance companies—that of finance capital. Is it any wonder they don’t want to threaten profits?

But why must unions have vested interests separate from both the rank and file and from the management? The answer is that it is a mere question of leadership: that the capital, which must be replaced by honest and efficient leaders, preferably those coming up from the ranks. Those advocating union reform believe that with sincere leaders, unions will be able to consistently squeeze the bosses for higher wages and better working conditions, to organize the unorganized, and even to speak to internationalism as parts of the larger task.
Unions can only be destroyed by capitalist crisis. At that time, they may be destroyed by capitalists themselves because they have outlived their usefulness to capitalism, or by a revolutionary workers' movement because they have outlived their limited usefulness to workers. It makes no sense to align oneself with unions or for that matter even passively leave them. Unions are against the revolution now merely as the thorns in the revolution's flesh. Anyone needs to think this would be the case if only there weren't unions unions can explain why there is no revolution, or, for that matter, even much militance in the mass movement. Unions, themselves arbitrary, at least stop much of the more arbitrary repression of the bosses. Whether or not a given workers' movement will be better off with one than without one cannot be answered programmatically, but only by trying each case individually. Some unions can be useful to workers and some can bypass them as one more channel to the unfolding struggle. When slaying direct control over their lives, workers will have no more need for militant union bosses than they will for any other kind of boss.

Another variant of militant unionism is revolutionary syndicalism. This method, favored by some anarchists, would make unions dependent of political parties of all sorts. Structured democratically, without paid functionaries, they would fight for day-to-day demands for a social revolution at the same time. In times when there is relative social peace and no ascending workers' movement, syndicalist unions can only be tiny propaganda groups. If the proper conditions produce an expanding militant workers' movement, however, a loose syndicalist union might possibly come into being and be able to fight for workers' needs in a tangible way. But unless syndicalism is redefined to mean only a broad, non-strucured movement opposed to a rigidly structured organization, syndicalism will only become another obstacle to militant struggle. This will happen because (1) the struggle inevitably expands and contracts, and, just as the regular union cannot stop struggles from expanding, neither can the syndicalist union stop them from contracting. No one can dictate militance for good or bad. (2) In order to survive and thrive as an activity, the syndicalist union must be able to guarantee some kind of concrete advantages for its members or it will all leave. It therefore develops a separate interest of its own, and furthermore can become conservative to protect that interest. (3) When the next crisis occurs, the syndicalist union will see this crisis as reckless and a direct threat to the established syndicalist structure.

UNION TO A POST-CAPITALIST SOCIETY

UNION OR NO UNION?

Another variant of militant unionism is revolutionary syndicalism. This method, favored by some anarchists, would make unions dependent of political parties of all sorts. Structured democratically, without paid functionaries, they would fight for day-to-day demands for a social revolution at the same time. In times when there is relative social peace and no ascending workers' movement, syndicalist unions can only be tiny propaganda groups. If the proper conditions produce an expanding militant workers' movement, however, a loose syndicalist union might possibly come into being and be able to fight for workers' needs in a tangible way. But unless syndicalism is redefined to mean only a broad, non-strucured movement opposed to a rigidly structured organization, syndicalism will only become another obstacle to militant struggle. This will happen because (1) the struggle inevitably expands and contracts, and, just as the regular union cannot stop struggles from expanding, neither can the syndicalist union stop them from contracting. No one can dictate militance for good or bad. (2) In order to survive and thrive as an activity, the syndicalist union must be able to guarantee some kind of concrete advantages for its members or it will all leave. It therefore develops a separate interest of its own, and furthermore can become conservative to protect that interest. (3) When the next crisis occurs, the syndicalist union will see this crisis as reckless and a direct threat to the established syndicalist structure.

Two off-duty police officers were wounded and an off-duty detective hospitalized when they fell on a gun blast in a street fight as they tried to stop a traffic jam on the Brooklyn Expressway last night.

Cross-Bronx Expressway last night at 10:20 PM: The police said when a car driven by Patrolman John Benton who was attacked in the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway near the 180th Street station. The three officers developed trouble and stopped on the Expressway near 180th Street. Traffic at that point was already hampered by construction.

Then the police spokesman said the detectives saw Patrolman Benton was shot by Patrolman Dennis.

At that point according to the police, Detectives Ginola still not knowing that the other drivers were also victims of the force, drew his revolver and taking cover behind a car ordered Patrolman Benton to drop his gun.

Indeed, the Police fired, Detective Ginola returned the fire while nearly 100 feet away from the trapped and armed occupants were backed up near the line of fire.

Within an hour of the shooting, Chief Inspector Sanford S. Cudlerd and other top police officials and at the Spring Avenue station house to put together the story. Chief Cudlerd reported that a full-scale investigation was being made.

Police Department regulations require that all members of the force carry their service weapons when they are off duty.
ROSA LUXEMBURG IN RETROSPECT

It will soon be sixty years since the memorials of the German social-democratic leadership卡尔·马克思和罗莎·卢森堡。Although they are mentioned in the same breath, as they both symbolized the radical element within the German political revolution of 1918, Rosa Luxemburg's name carries greater weight because her theoretical work was of greater seminal power. In fact, it can be said that she was the outstanding personality in the international labor movement after Marx and Engels, and that her work has not lost its political relevance despite the immediate capitalist system and the labor movement having undergone since her death.

Just the same, like everyone else, Rosa Luxemburg had a child of her time and can only be understood in the context of the phase of the social-democratic movement of which she was a part. Whereas the critique of bourgeois society evolved in a period of rapid capitalist development, Luxemburg's work arrived in a time of increasing instability for capitalism, wherein the abstract formulated contradictions of capitalist production showed themselves in the concrete forms of imperialistic competition and in economic crises.

Without entering into Rosa Luxemburg's biography, it should be said, that she came from a middle-class background and that she entered the socialist movement at an early age. Like others, she was forced to leave Russia before World War I and went to Switzerland to study. Her main interest, as behooved a socialist influenced by Marxism, was political economy. Her early work in this field is now of historical interest. There was her inaugural dissertation, The Industrial Development of Poland (1912), which did so for Poland, though in a less extensive manner, what Lenin's The Development of Capitalism in Poland did for Russian capitalism a year later. And there were her popular lectures at the Social-Democratic Party School, posthumously published by Paul Levi (1925) under the title Introduction to National Economy. In the latter work, it would be noted, Rosa Luxemburg declared that the validity of political economy is specific to capitalism, and will cease to exist with the demise of this system. In her dissertation, she came to the conclusion that the development of the Polish economy would proceed in conjunction with that of Russia, and in complete integration, and that would end the nationalization aspirations of the Polish bourgeoisie. The dissertation also unity the Russian and Polish proletarian and lead to the eventual destruction of Polish-Russian capitalism. The main contradiction of capitalist production was seen by her as one between the capacity to produce and the limited capacity to consume within the capitalist relations of production. This contradiction leads to recurrent economic crises, the increasing misery of the working class and thereby, in the long run, to social revolution.

It was only with her work on The Accumulation of Capital (1912) that Rosa Luxemburg's economic theories became controversial. Although she claimed that this book grew out of complications arising in the course of her popular lectures on National Economy, surely, her inability to relate the real capitalist reproduction process to the hypothetical objective limits of capitalist production, it is clear from the work itself that it was also a reaction to the annihilation of Marxism initiated by the "revisionists" that swept the socialist movement around the turn of the century. Revisionism operated on two levels: the primitive empirical level personified by Eduard Bernstein, who merely compared the actual capitalist development with that deducible from Marxist theory, and the more sophisticated theoretical turnabout of academic Marxism, culminating in Plekhanov's Marx-interpretation and those of his various disciples.

Only the first volume of Capital was published during her lifetime, the second and third were prepared by Friedrich Engels from unpublished papers left to his care, although they had been written prior to the publication of the first volume. The second volume, finally, deals with the capitalist system as a whole in its phenomenal form, as determined by its underlying relations. Because the reproduction process necessarily controls the production process, Luxemburg thought it useful to display this fact by means of a number of abstract reproduction diagrams, in the second volume of Capital. The total division of social production into two sections: one producing means of production, the other means of consumption. The transactions between the two departments are imagined to be such as to enable the reproduction of the total social capital to proceed either on the same or on an enlarged scale. But for the correct functioning for the reproduction diagram, namely, an allocation of the social labor as required for the reproduction process, that in reality first he brought about blindly, through the uncoordinated activities of the many individual capitals in their competitive pursuit of surplus-value.

The reproduction diagrams do not distinguish between values and prices, that is, between the reproduction of this and that, but are instrumental in aiding in its understanding of the internal and external relations between the different spheres of production, the diagrams fulfill their pedagogical function. They don't depict the real world, but are instrumental in aiding in its understanding. The reproduction diagrams, taken up in the third volume of Capital, refer to the actual capitalist production and exchange process, the imaginary equilibrium conditions of Marx's reproduction diagrams do not refer to the real capitalist world. Still, Marx found it "quite necessary to view the process of reproduction in its fundamental simplicity, in order to get rid of all confusing interferences and dispose of the false substitutes, which assume the character of a metaphysical analysis, but which cannot be removed so long as the process of social production is incompletely analyzed in its concrete and completed form." Actually, according to Marx, the reproduction process under capitalistic conditions precisely reflects in its simplest form the interrelations between bourgeois equilibrium theory, the main tool of bourgeois social science, and the historical necessity of the proletarian struggle. The reproduction diagrams provided comparatively with respect to its reproduction requirements, it had not quite objective limits. Crime is caused by disproportionalities arising from these contradictions, because of their superficial resemblance to bourgeois equilibrium theory, the main tool of bourgeois social science, but can always be overcome through the restoration of that proportionality which assures the accumulation of capital. This was a disturbing idea, as far as Rosa Luxemburg was concerned, and this the more so as she could not at the time of writing of the equilibrating implications of Marx's reproduction diagrams. If Plekhanov interpreted these correctly, then Marx was wrong, because this interpretation denied the inevitable end of capitalism.

The discussion around Marx's abstract reproduction diagrams was particularly vehement in Russia because of earlier differences between the Russian and the populists with regard to Russia's future in face of her backwardness and her peculiar socio-economic institutions. Whereas the populists asserted that for Russia it was still too late to enter into world capitalist development, the labor movement and the party as a whole assumed a universal and irreversible character, and were therefore obliged to treat the question of social revolution. Thus, the conflict continued.

Less than a year after the death of the "united" Marx-Luxemburg, the International Working Men's Association was dissolved. Another year, Lenin returned to Russia and the Third Congress of the Communist Party was held in December 1912. The following year, the Third Congress of the Communist International was held in February 1913. The struggle continued.
of peasant production, the Marxists maintained that development itself was impossible and that this development itself would produce the market required within Russia and in the world at large. The Marxists emphasized that it is the production of capital, not the capitalist mechanism, that determines capitalist production. There is, therefore, no limit to the restriction of consumption would retard the accumulation of capital; on the contrary, the less there is consumed, the faster capital would grow.

This "production for the sake of production" made no sense to Rosa Luxemburg—nor because she was unaware of the productivity of capitalist production, which constantly strives to reduce the workers' share of social production, but because she could not see how the extracted surplus-value could be realized in money form in a society in which only labor and capital, such as is depicted in the reproduction diagrams, prevails. The reproduction process, the production process. It starts with money, invested in means of production and labor-power, and it ends with a greater amount of money in the hands of the capitalists, to be reinvested in a reproduction cycle. Where would this additional money come from? In Rosa Luxemburg's view, it could not possibly come from the capitalist capital for if it did, they would not be reciprocals of surplus-value but would pay with their own money for these goods they could not come from the purchases of the workers, who only receive the value of their labor power, leaving the surplus-value, its commodity form to the capitalists. To make the system workable, "Socialism," apart from the exchange relations of labor and capital, in which the produced surplus-value be transformed into additional money.

This aspect of the matter Rosa Luxemburg found missing in Marx. She intended to close the gap between Marx's conviction of capitalism's necessary collapse.

Although The Accumulation of Capital approaches the matter of the "productive"-starting with classical economy and ending with Yugoslav Marxism—Rosa Luxemburg was as to show that this problem has always been the Achilles heel of political economy, her own poor place: the difficulties of the capital-expansion process, new with Marx's theory, were invisible. No one, in the last analysis, no more than a simpering addition of the relation processes of several of the phenomena of the Marxian text. As she presents matters, however, everything seemingly falls in its proper place: the difficulties of the capital-expansion process, one as emerging out of the production of capital, which is not economic, the necessary extension of this process to the world at large, as illustrated by the creation of the slave labor and the colonialism in search of markets for the realization of surplus-value, and the collapse, finally, the inevitable collapse of capitalism for lack of opportunities to realize its surplus-value.

Rosa Luxemburg was carried away by the logic of her own construction to the point of reversing Marx no more thoroughly than had been done by the one who some time ago, with a theoretically possible harmonious capital development, transformed surplus-value into a purely ethical problem and into one of social reform by political means. On the other hand, the reproduction diagrams, if used as a version of Hay's law of the identity of supply and demand, has been depressed by her adversaries. Rosa Luxemburg failed to see that these diagrams have no connection at all with the question of the reproduction of the capital, but are merely a methodologically determined, intermediary step in the analysis of the laws of motion of the capitalist system as a whole, which derives its economic form from surplus-value. Although capitalism is indeed affiliated with difficulties, the difficulty, the contradiction, is not in the realization of surplus-value, it is not the case that Marx looked for, or found, the key to the understanding of capitalism's susceptibility to crises and to its inevitable end. Even on the assumption that there exists no problem at all with regard to the realization of surplus-value, capitalism finds its objective limits in those of the production of surplus-value.

According to Marx, capitalism's basic contradiction, from which spring all its other contradictions, the most important one, is the surplus-value relations of capital production. This drive for surplus-value, the drive for surplus-value relations of capital production, represented symbolically in the exchange of labor-power for the surplus-value in the form of money, is the negative form, the commodity form of surplus-value. The drive for exchange-value manifests itself in a growth of capital invested in means of production relatively faster than that invested in labor-power, which produces, besides its own exchange-value, surplus-value, surplus-value, surplus-value as a result of surplus-value, surplus-value as a result of surplus-value, surplus-value. Rosa Luxemburg's conception and analysis of capital accumulation, in contrast, is that of a process that expands the capitalist system, through the increasing productivity, the objective limits of capitalism. The imperialist war for money, the imperialist war, and the end of capitalism understood entirely in fact. The collapse of capitalism became the revolutionary identification of capital; surplus-value. It is only a small step to turn the political upheavals into social revolutions.

Of course, Rosa Luxemburg's theory was no less correct. She showed the real source of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. At one point in time it would no longer be possible to compensate for this fall by an increasing expansion of production. The classical theory of accumulation, capitalist crises, as well as the insatiable end of the system, find their source in the temporary, in the total breakdown in the accumulation process due to a lack of surplus-value.

For Marx, then, the objective limits of capitalism are given by the contradiction of production relations as value relations, while for Rosa Luxemburg capital cannot exist at all, except through the absorption of its surplus-value by productive means. This corresponds to the absurdity that these backward nations have a surplus in monetary form large enough to accommodate the productive forces of all the so-called technologically advanced countries. Not as already mentioned, and the one which leads to the collapse of Rosa Luxemburg's false notion that the whole of surplus-value, required for accumulation is paid out in money form, in order to be realized as capital. Actually, of course, capital could not exist at times and at other times when the only commodities of all others is money, the world terms without simultaneously absorbing the money form. Only a small and decreasing part of surplus-value had to be realized in the form of money, the rest, absorbed in terms of money, remains in its commodity form, and so much allows for the realization of surplus-value as additional capital.

Rosa Luxemburg's theory was quite generally recognized by her contemporaries, a criticism of Marx. Yet her critics were just as far removed from Marx's position as was Rosa Luxemburg herself. Most of these critics adhered either to a crude underconsumption theory, a theory of disproportionality, or a combination of these. Lenin, for example—not to speak of the Revisionists—saw the cause for crises in the disproportionality itself, the surplus-value, and merely adduced arguments that the underconsumption of the workers. But in any case he did not believe that capitalism was basically different from other economic systems. It was only with the first world war and the revolutionary upheavals in its wake that Rosa Luxemburg's theory found a wider response in the radical section of the socialist movement, particularly among those workers who supported her. However, the particular analysis of capital accumulation, as well as any analogy with the problem of the limits of capitalism, needed an interpretation to which Marx himself must have been accustomed, that of which surplus-value. via the transfer of purchasing power from the population at large to the hands of the states from which it had been attempted to reach full employment by way of deficit-financing and monetary manipulations. However, this interpretation is the one that is necessary in order to accomplish Marx's theory of accumulation and to understand the form of political economy, of the reproduction process, the political economy, of the reproduction process, the political economy, of the reproduction process.
While Rosa Luxemburg did not fare well with her theory of accumulation, she was more successful in articulating her internationalism, which was, of course, connected with her concept of accumulation and the necessity of the capitalist mode of production. In her view, imperialism was rapidly transforming the world into a single market, and the logic of the bourgeoisie coincided with the formation of the modern nation-state. She argued that the ideology of nationalism, the exclusivity and decline of capitalism implied the imperialistic "internationalism" of the bourgeoisie, which also included the internationalism of the working classes, if they were to make their class struggles effective. The realist form of proletarian aspirations into the capitalist system led to social-imperialism, as did the other sides of the nationalist coin. Objectively, there was nothing behind the factually growing nationalism but the imperialist imperative. To oppose imperialism demanded the rejection of all forms of nationalism, even that of the victims of imperialism, the nation. Nationalism and imperialism were inseparable and had to fight with equal fervor.

In view of the at first covert but soon overt anti-systematic of the official labor movement, Rosa Luxemburg's internationalism represented the leftwing of this movement—but not completely. This explains the intensification of her specific experiences in the Polish socialist movement as well as the question of national self-determination. As we already know from her work on the industrial development in Poland, Rosa Luxemburg expected a full integration of the Russian and Polish capitalist countries and the unification of their respective socialist organizations, both as a practical and as a principled matter. She could not conceive of national sentiments and movements and less of a nationally restricted working class. She understood Poland and also the world at large, national feeling and nationalism only in the unity of international socialism.

The Bolshevik section of the Russian Social-Democratic Party did not share Rosa Luxemburg's view. For Lenin, the subjugation of nationalities by stronger capitalist countries brought additional cleavages into the basic unity of working classes, which could, perhaps, be turned against the dominating powers. It is quite possible that Lenin, in his turn, did not consider whether Lenin's advocacy of the self-determination of nations would be reflected in a subjective or democratic attitude, with regard to special national needs and cultural particularities, or was simply a revolution against all forms of oppression. Lenin was, first of all, a practical politician. He might feel that this role only at a late hour. As a practical politician, he realized that the different nations of the Russian empire represented a steady threat to the czarist regime.

The Russian revolution found Rosa Luxemburg in a German prison, where she remained until the overthrow of the German monarchy. But she was able to follow the revolutionary turn of events in Russia as well as abroad. Through her experiences in the Russian revolution, she was able to understand better than ever before the importance of the Russian revolution. She had come to the realization that the Russian revolution, which was preceded by the revolution in Germany and other countries, would lead to the establishment of socialism in Russia.
Still, the Arian question was with the urban masses by deism and sovietism in order to secure the revolution.

"If the bolsheviks, had they been able to avoid a civil war and to win the peasants, would have been in a position to form a soviet government even without the support of the state and the means of production. They hoped to secure this support by a policy of low taxation, while the peasants required a government which would prevent a return of the landlords by way of counter-revolutionary tactics.

As far as the peasants were concerned, the revolution involved the extension of property rights and was, in this sense, a bourgeois revolution. It extinguished the system of serfdom and the serf rights, and increased the state monopoly on the absolute right of property and the enhanced capitalization of Russia. For the industrial workers, for Lenin and Trotsky, it was a bourgeois revolution even at this early stage of capitalist development. But as the industrial working class was still a minority part of the population, it seemed clear that sooner or later, the bourgeoisie would have to play a role in the revolution within which they would have, not power for the bolshevik state-power could only be held the alternative theory of ideologically, but success in this endeavor would negate both the socialist and the bourgeois aspirations within the revolution.

This was a situation not foreseen by the bolsheviks which was not possible in terms of strategy, which held that the proletarian revolution presupposes a high capitalistic development in which the working class finds itself in the majority and thus able to determine the course of events. While Lenin was not historically a bourgeois revolution, except as a preliminary to a socialist revolution, he was not in the sense of the bolsheviks. It was not possible to change society by purely political means, but in the will of a political party. This idealistic reversal of Marxism, with its features, presupposes the material development instead of the product of the workers, by which they are to live.

In the case of the bolsheviks, the organization was a failure, but in the case of the bolsheviks, the organization was a failure. The bolsheviks, in contrast, were able to live like kingdoms of their own right, as long as they were themselves in control of the state monopoly on the absolute right of property, and the bolshevik state-power could only be held the alternative theory of ideologically, but success in this endeavor would negate both the socialist and the bourgeois aspirations within the revolution.

P.43
As it turned out, the agrarian question for Lenin, she wrote, "the agrarian question for power," became the great question taking place in Russia, she perceived, when the Bolsheviks first form an organized party. In her eyes, the soviets were merely strike committees in the absence of other more permanent labor organizations. Even after the 1917 Revolution she felt that "the practical realization of social democracy and the realization of its bureaucratic and juridical system is something which lies completely hidden in the state of the future." Over and over again, the party was the subject of which to evolve a rational governing body was known, not the detailed concrete steps that had to be taken to achieve the needs of society. Socialism could not be derived from readymade plans and realized by governmental decrees. There must be the widest participation on the part of the workers that is, a real democracy, and it was precisely this democracy which alone could be characterized as the dictatorship of the proletariat. A party-Dictatorship was for her a mere "a dictatorship in the bourgeois sense in the sense of the rule of the bourgeoisie." All this is undoubtedly true, on the general level, but the bourgeoisie characterized as it was originally and as politically--the objectively non-socialist nature of this particular revolution, which could not be the product of the quasi-feudal conditions of Cadmus to a socialistic society. It had not started as an "evolution" without the bourgeoisie, it was a revolution without a sufficiently large proletariat; a revolution without a significant function of the bourgeoisie was taken up by an apparently bourgeois party by means of its assumption of political power. Under these conditions, the revolutionary content of Western Marxism is not even in a clarified form. This may explain the vacuity of Rosa Luxemburg's argument against the Bolsheviks, her complaints about their disregard for the Constituent Assembly and their terrorist acts entirely against the laws from the right or the left. Her own suggestions as to how to achieve the goal of socialism, however, correct and praiseworthy, would not fit in with a Constituent Assembly, which is itself a bourgeois institution, with its direct political points of view and their wishes to express themselves, also its course of events, cannot be realized under civil-war conditions. Socialism cannot be left to a liberal trial-error method because the future may be discerned in the "immediate" moment, it is dictated by current necessities that call for definite actions.

Rosa Luxemburg's lack of realism with regard to the nature of the revolution may be traced to tendencies of her own. On the one hand, she was a revolutionary in spirit and on the other a revolutionary, at a time when both positions had fallen apart. She looked upon Russia with the eyes of a theoretician upon Social Democracy with revolutionary eyes; what she desired was a revolutionary-Social Democracy. Already in her famous debate with Eduard Bernstein in 1913, she had declared that the working-class revolution had to be prepared and not only through the party and the trade-unions but with the workers in the streets, and that within bourgeois democracy was to be assured by the direct actions of the masses in every everyday struggle. However, what were most important, as they increased the need for the new class position and thereby their revolutionary consciousness.

The direct struggle of the workers against the capitalists was the real "school of socialism." In the spreading of mass-strikes in which the workers acted as a class, she saw the necessary precondition for the coming revolution, which would topple the bourgeoisie and install the workers to be stratified by the natural class-conscious proletariat.

Until the outbreak of the first world war, Rosa Luxemburg did not fully comprehend the new nature of Social Democracy. There was a right wing, a center, and a left wing, Liebknecht and Kautsky representing the latter. There was an ideological struggle between these tendencies, both supported by the Social Democratic party, which remained purely ideological. The practice of the party was reformist and opportunistic, unattached to the masses. The party was directly aided by it. But there was the inclusion of the Social Republic, not only the Social Democracy, restored to the revolutionary character of its origins. Suggestions to split the party were real, yet mostly to maintain contact with the hopes of the socialist workers. Their confidence in these workers was not affected by her lack of confidence in their leaders. She was thus more surprised that the social-democratic party of the Left even was led against the party's left. Even so, she was not really effective and did not until 1917 on the issues of war aims, which led to the formation of the Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD), in which the Spartacus League was composed of a circle of people around Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Bellinikoff, and a small faction. In so far as this faction waxed and waned, there was a matter of propaganda against the war and the class-collaborationalist policies of the old party. That the idea of a new revolutionary party did Liebknecht recognize the need for a new revolutionary party and a new International.

The German Revolution of 1918 was not the product of the spontaneous outbursts of the workers and its members of all organizations played various parts in it. In its upheaval to end the war and to remove the monarchy held responsible for it, it occurred as a consequence of the war and was not only the result of the revolution. The war had been called and ended not only by the workers, but by the accepted "revolutionary" leaders. The workers and the suggested leaders then played the usual role against the transformed revolutionary movement.
This revolution brought Social Democracy into the government, which then proceeded to ally itself with the military, in order to crush any attempt to turn the political into a social revolution. Still under the sway of tradition and the old reformist ideology, the majority of the spontaneously-arising workers' and soldiers' councils supported the social-democratic government and declared their readiness to abide in favor of a National Assembly within the frame of bourgeois democracy. This revolution, it has been aptly said, was a "Social Democratic revolution, accompanied by the Social Democratic leaders: a process haphazard in the history of the world." There was also a revolutionary minority, to be sure, advocating and fighting for the formation of a social system of workers' councils as a permanent institution, but this was soon systematically subdued by the military forces arrayed against it. To organize this revolutionary minority for sustained action, the Spartacist League, in collaboration with other revolutionary groups, transformed itself into the Communist Party of Germany. Its program was written by Rosa Luxemburg.

Already at its founding congress, it became clear that the new party was internally split. Even at this late hour Rosa Luxemburg was not able to break totally with social-democratic traditions. Although in the course of time the program might be adjusted in order to meet the socialist demands of the dualism, there was in this situation the lack of an early proletarian revolution demanded the consideration of policies defined within the given social institutions and organizations. In practice this meant participation in the National Assembly and in trade unions. However, the majority of the congress voted in favor of anti-parliamentarism and for a struggle against the trade unions. Although reluctantly, Rosa Luxemburg bowed to this decision and wrote and acted in its spirit. As she was murdered only two weeks later, it is not possible to say whether or not she would have stuck to this position. In any case, encouraged by Lenin, via his agent, Rakos, her disciple, soon split the new party and merged its parliamentary section with a part of the Independent Socialists to form a "Bolshevik Party." This, however, as a self-organization in the social-democratic sense, competing with the old Social Democratic Party for the allegiance of the workers, in order to form an instrument for the defense of Bolshevist Russia.

But all this is history. The failed revolutions in Central Europe, and the states-capitalistic development in Russia, overcame the political crisis of capitalism that followed the first world war. The economic difficulties were not too overcome, and led to a new world-wide crisis and the second world war. Because the ruling classes—old and new—overcame the revolutionary upsurges in the wake of the first world war, they defeated their possible recurrence in advance by the direct means of military occupation. The enormous destruction of capital and its further centralisation by way of war, as well as the raising of the productivity of labor, allowed for a great opening of capital production after the second world war. This implied the most total collapse of revolutionary aspirations, save those of a strictly nationalist and state-capitalist character.

This effect was strengthened by the development of the "military economy," nationally as well as internationally, where governments influenced economic activities. Like all things of the past, Marxism became an academic discipline—indeed, its decline as a theory of social change. Social Democracy ceased to use itself as a working class organization, but rather as a people's party, ready to fulfill governmental functions for capitalist society. Communist organizations took over the classic role of Social Democracy—and also its readiness to form, or to partake in, governments upholdiing the capitalist system. The labor movement—divided into Bolshevist and Social Democracy, which had been Rosa Luxemburg's concern—could not exist.

Still, capitalism remains susceptible to crises and collapses. In view of present methods of destruction, it may destroy itself in another configuration. But it may also be overcome by way of class struggles leading to its own transformation. The alternative formulated by Rosa Luxemburg—Socialism or barbarism—remains today. The current state of the labor movement, which lacks any revolutionary inclinations, makes it clear that a socialist future depends more on spontaneous actions of the working class as a whole, than on ideological anticipations of such a future which may find expression in newly-arising revolutionary organizations. In this situation, there is not much to be learned from previous experiences, except the negative lesson that nothing social democracy nor Bolshevism has to say about the problems of the proletarian revolution. By opposing both, however, inconsistently, Rosa Luxemburg opened up another road towards the socialist revolution. Despite some false notions with respect to theory and some illusions regarding socialist practices, her revolutionary impulse yielded the essential elements required for a socialist revolution: an unswerving internationalism and the principle of the self-determination of the working class within its organizations and within society. By taking seriously the dictum that the emancipation of the proletariat can only be its own work, she bridged the revolutionary gap with the revolutionary future. Her ideas thus remain as alive as the idea of revolution itself, while all her adversaries in the old labor movement have become part and parcel of the decaying capitalist society.

Paul Mattler

FOOTNOTES

5 Ibid., p. 738.
6 Michael Kalecki, "The Problem of effective Demand With Tugan-Baranovsky and Rosa Luxemburg.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Luxemburg, "Organizational Questions of Russian Social Democracy" (1904), CHIL, p. 102.
13 Ibid., p. 69.
14 Ibid., p. 72.
BOOK REVIEW:

GUY ROU'TH. THE ORIGINS OF ECONOMIC IDEAS. N.Y.: VINTAGE BOOKS, 1975

In writing this book Guy Routh has done a service to economic historians and economists by bringing to study economics not only economic science itself, but also the ideas that have been the driving force behind it. He has surveyed the literature on the origins of economic ideas and has attempted to explain the development of economic thought from the earliest times to the present day.

In order to maintain this view, in which the capitalist economy, if only left alone, will automatically regulate production and income in such a way that the self-interest of each promotes the good of all, elements of experience conditioning decisions must be interested in both Adam Smith and the eighteenth century, and Keynes, in our day, included in their sciences material which contradicted their own theoretical pronouncements. What is typical of economics is that only the latter lived on in the tradition of the "science."

A very interesting feature of Routh's book, not shared by most other histories of economics, is its treatment of nineteenth-century popularizers. Translating theoretical formulations into moralistic tales, they make it understandable that the content of the abstractions of the time. This content is admirably summed up in "The Rich and the Poor, A Fairy Tale" by Mrs. Harriet, who was praised by J.B.S. Boyce as "the only woman who had written on Political Economy and shown herself superior even to men." Her exemplary tale leads us back to the original principles of the rich are derived from the riches of the rich.

The discussion of neo-classical economics is particularly well done. Routh begins by inquiring why the idea of the determination of value by marginal utility gained popularity when it did, and answers by agreeing with Marx's proposition that it was the need to abandon the radical implications of the labor theory of value that led him to it. He then explains how the combination of utilitarian psychology with the differential calculus enabled economics to prove that the market, if left to itself, operates so as to maximize consumer satisfaction. With this conceptual apparatus (Pearl 1895-1892) could prove the absurdity of the very idea of "marginal utility" (i.e., depression) and Clark (1847-1938) could show that weeps and interest measure exactly the contributions made to society by workers and by capitalists; as he put it, "we are to get what we produce so much is the dominant role of life."

But no sooner had Walras (1894-1910), with his theory of general equilibrium, turned economics into a heavily mathematized "exact science," than the basic concepts and assumptions of marginalism began to disintegrate. The idea of "utility" as a psychological datum explaining market behavior gave way to the "preference" concept of "utility."

The crucial principle of diminishing returns had to be given up. In the 1930's, Chamberlin and Joan Robinson discovered (i) that the search competition on which the theory rested did not exist, and (ii) that the economy could not be assumed to constitute an exact, predictive science, like physics; its relations were determinate and statistical.

The spirit of the science as a science, however, is that of Joan Robinson's conclusion, in one context, that "the amount demanded increases, the supply price may rise, remain constant, or fall." But such results are of little moment in the economics of government-and, as Routh says, economics is predominantly a teaching order. They have after all only increased their power of "theories that lend themselves admirably to teaching and examination."

And we are left to wonder how, with the new textbooks blandly incorporating both the discredited theory of perfect competitive equilibrium and the theory of monopolistic competition that had been designed expressly to supersede it. (pp. 256-7)

The Great Depression swept away the marginalists' equilibrium dreamworld. (Routh gives wonderful examples of the economists' responses to the reality that disproved their theories. He also draws from cases that it wasn't really happening in the 1930's; he will be dead right if the workers would only eat less.) Better axioms, supposedly to create a new, realistic "phenomenological" model of the economy, were projected on to a space of between theory and facts as those of other economists, as he sees them on a brief tour of its faulty logic, dubious assumptions, self-contradictions, and factual errors. Aside from details, Keynes' theory fails because it is an attempt to save the neo-classical theory of the economy as an equilibrating mechanism.

Then, as Routh notes, could Keynesianism have succeeded in "saving capitalism," as it is claimed to have done? As a matter of fact, the "Keynesian" methods were not yet to work in the New Deal and the Hitler regime long before the General Theory was published. Keynes merely developed the Quine's "ontology" from a form which could account for what was happening in the world with a minimum of simplification. The final proof of the scientific irrelevance of Keynesian theory, as Routh says, is the state of affairs in curriculum where Keynesianism "comes happily with the failures it purported to replace." (p. 281)

Routh's history, as he has hoped to communicate, is convincing as well as informative. He gives the original texts enough space to serve them justice. His book is a fascinating and all the more interesting, because of his inclusion of the marginalists' manuscripts, which are often as unctional and apologetic. As he says, his book comes at the time when the economists' failure to control or even explain the turbulences of the world economy has produced a crisis in the theory of economic orthodoxy. Routh offers the outlines of a new way of thinking about the economy.

His recommendations, however, are disappointing. First of all, he suggests looking at the economy as a social entity, as a well-ordered system, but as one in which almost anything can happen. (p. 902) Economic decisions are made by agents, and these agents act largely on the basis of rational knowledge, but on hunches, fears of the future or the lack thereof, especially on guesses as to what others will do. He gives his self-fulfilling prophecies, and South moneys, which explain the cyclical character of economic life.

Secondly, offsetting this, there are stabilizing influences at work, due chiefly to "non-economic" institutions: custom, morality, law. There are "socio-psychological drives".
such as the desire for power, as well as ideas of what is right and proper" (p. 238) which, for successive generations, made it possible for all and for some, for settling and maintaining ways roles (1). Finally, the economy as a whole is to be visualized not as a system of self-contained ideas, but as made up of different situations (each as an optimisation or profitability) but also as a category of capital and institutions, each with heterogeneous constituencies and flexible modes of interaction. Particular conventions, for example, have their local origins, and must be studied as much if the economy as a whole is to be understood.

The most striking feature of Routh's "alternative economic theory is the way in which it maintains, under yet another disguise, basic features of the economic ideology be as well criticalities in the bulk of his book. Despite his picture of the system as involving "different forms of behavior at different times," he views capitalism as a fundamentally static, non-material, non-energetic, way. None are basic are permanent: "the 'hard characterise of consumers and producers" (p.148) which are not plant "depressive devices" or stabilising influences" (p.101) holding the system on its course. There is no discussion of the fact that these "hard characteristics," however rooted in "anthropo-sociological" drivers, have reference to historically particular structures of social relationships. In particular to the social relations of production, which forms a basis for all the others. Custom, competitive, and so on, are all defined themselves in reference to these relations which set the possibilities of social action. It is striking that these given make no appearance in Routh's "alternative." Instead we have only the usual list of "economic structures," such as "the market," plus the "non-economic" ones of the "sociology"—all of these treated as given, not in need of further analysis. The question of the nature of the system, in contrast to other systems before it (and possibly after it) is not raised; a foregone conclusion is not asked whether this system is changing over time and if so what changes are possible. The theories can be due only to "sociological" or "political" factors outside the economy. The "economy has a permanence; though its tendency is to disintegration, the business cycle itself is a continuation of a cycle, on the other hand, in fact a "process" of which it is a subject of calculation except as represented in the prices of irreconcilable forms; whatever changes take place will have to be by design."

But for Marx, "as an economist, a theory of capital is not an economist will be clearer if we take a look at a material of detail, the Ricardoan condition of value. Routh believes that this theory is weakened by the fact that it does not have a single measure of skill and intensity of work, as there is in some other theories. Therefore, the idea of labor-content, which is the basis for regulatory exchange values, is incomparable and incomplete, as it is to determine the "hard" from "the soft" economic terms that we must turn to explore these mysteries." (p.111). In any case, it does not follow from the fact that labor-content cannot be measured that the concept is incomparable or incomplete, or that Ricardo's labor-content could not be said to contain definite (though measurable) quantities of labor. As Ricardo pointed out, exactly this is the characteristic of labor as value, that social labor, since it is embodied in private forms, is subject to calculation except as represented in the prices of commodities. Furthermore, the subject of calculation except as represented in the prices of commodities is that reason the (abstract) labor-content of commodities is not measurable at all, even aside from the problems of value and intensity, since the measure of value itself is not so much an explanation of value in terms of labor, as an expression in theoretical terms of the fact that in capitalism human productive activity is represented, organized, and controlled via the labor-processes. That Marx—and this is the most important point—is a naive, the category of "value," he treats both as the product of human activity, as social, and as the "social" in the anthropological sense of "culture," for the organization of social life. For

Routh's comparison of Marx and the marginalist is quite mistaken. For the latter, "economic variables are based on the laws of supply and demand", which are then "translated into a language of general equilibrium" (p.23). But even further discussion of which had led to the last chapter of the book, it is not forthcoming. Routh's comparison of Marx and the marginalist is quite mistaken. For the latter, "economic variables are based on the laws of supply and demand", which are then "translated into a language of general equilibrium" (p.23). But even further discussion of which had led to the last chapter of the book, it is not forthcoming. Whether or not he would agree with such a positive evaluation of Marx's view, it is a pity that Routh does not deal with him. But, as Routh says, "we would not expect economists to subscribe to Marxian doctrine..." or, one might add, even to take it seriously enough to study it. This is not just because of its subjective content, but also because its method and spirit are alien to those of economic, heterodox as well as orthodox. Marxist theory is not a new, improved economics, but a critique of the field, an attempt to do away with it theoretically as a contribution to doing away with the phenomena it deals with politically. It is not the case that Marx outside of and opposed to the dominant ideology. This is why radical economists, even most of those who call themselves Marxists, tend to abandon the theory of value and capital accumulation that forms the core of Marx's work just as, conversely, many radicals are not again drawn to study homogeneous economics for all his difficulties in stepping out of the circle of economic thinking. Routh's book has great value because he is a "potential radical," in the scholarly sense; his pseudo-science must be left behind if we are to understand, and change, the world we live in.
Dear Friends,

I'm not sure where to start. Root & Branch 5 was very interesting, in addition to being readable. I've sent the copy to one well-thought-of subject—Root & Branch is working on the working class (as an actuality, Marxism as viable doctrine on the working class in articles, or even mention, of a whole range of issues and policies—and you just don't seem interested in national and sexual oppression being the obvious examples. So if you're worried about 'discussion about the nature of capitalist society, the origins of the present crisis, and the future possibilities of creating a new socialist society,' then this should be changed. In fact, it seems to me that all of the articles have the same problem of conclusiveness.

How I know you had a first issue is, but doesn't this reflect a certain political narrowness?

Anyway, it also seems like this narrowness has produced the articles on the 'Novell Against Work' and 'A New Class Theory,' polemically really, and the latter reminded me of Trotsky! I think the important point, incidently, about the Ehrenreichs' articles is that their focus on the problem of the New Left, where it came from. Although their historical and class manipulations fall short of supporting their argument, there is something of value for socialists in 1976. If I can quote from an introduction to Pasmore's 'Workers' Councils' that Root & Branch is working on, it has no dimensions of problems raised for the movement by divisions between the groups within the working class, nor the role of such growing sectors as students and white-collar administrative workers.

Is Conrad both writing to solve this problem, or to attack the Ehrenreichs as 'broad Marxist'?

But the bulk of the first issue is devoted to the growth of the C.W. in particular, and the 'New Workers' Movement' in general. Interesting enough. You're wrong, of course, to say that the Leninists think that the socialist revolution will come in stages, but I'll get back to that later. I'm interested in hearing that you devote half the issue to Spain. What about similar articles on other countries and the U.S.A.? I feel, actually, that the one thing that is needed in America is a journal talking about the U.S. working class in a concrete way. You have yet to do that.

And of course this is a broader point: to quote from International Position 5, 'Parties often talk about "develop theory." In fact, Marxist theory is not developed on the basis of general words to theories. It grows in response to actual problems facing Marxism.' Absolutely true. It's an easy out to rely on year-old material from Spain, when things like the coal miners' strike are happening here in the U.S. But don't you criticize Leninism in a way based solely on the U.S. working class's seeming rather absurd.

You haven't presented, either in this journal or at your forums in Boston, an overall critique of Leninism. I gather you feel that Bolshevism Revolution of 1917 was a patch. This is an old argument. It was helped by your insistence that only those who are 'neither leaders nor bystanders' be part of the struggle are of consequence when, of course, leadership will come gradually out of those struggles. As a Marxist, I think the Bolshevik faced certain material conditions that made it impossible to create a workers' state (marginal economy, civil war, etc.) and helped the growth of Stalinism. Stalin, I'll grant you, believed that states were necessary, but Lenin and Trotsky both resisted it. All I can do, since neither of us will be convinced, is refer you to Lenin's biography of Trotsky and Tony Cliff's biography of Lenin.

I can't seem to pull together a critique of Root & Branch only because there isn't enough there. I will always find Mattick's writing valuable, and the political of 'communism council' used to be pursued. But I'd say it's a good likelihood that events, always the final determiner, will leave you behind you are essentially correct, can't be said. As Steve Wonder said, 'Trying to tell us from right and wrong ... but you haven't done nothing.'

Root Worcester

ROOT & BRANCH RESPONSE

We wish you would pull together a critique of Root & Branch only because there isn't enough there. I will always find Mattick's writing valuable, and the political of 'communism council' used to be pursued. But I'd say it's a good likelihood that events, always the final determiner, will leave you behind you are essentially correct, can't be said. As Steve Wonder said, 'Trying to tell us from right and wrong ... but you haven't done nothing.'

Koot Voorhees

CORRESPONDENCE

The national question is one on which we are publishing several pieces at the moment. One on Rosa Luxemburg in this issue. In general, however, as we are not finding anything to do with the national question, it is necessary only to have a line on every question of the day, not to say something about everything in the next issue.

2. The other reasons seem to us more obvious. In fact it was easier for us to find out about the workers' movement in Spain than the Leninists in the U.S. We have here, for example, in Boston, access to libraries and information that almost anyone else would glean from the newspapers, and it is easy to see, even in our own hands, in the Leninists' work on the whole, the several contradictions of the whole picture. We used the space for Spain not as an 'easy out,' but because this was material quite unavailable in the U.S.

We are no longer manufacturing any more arguments about Marx's allegations. As we have already pointed out, we are not interested in the Leninists' discussion of the 'economic base and superstructure.' We have never found the history of the Russian revolution more useful, in any discussion of the Russian revolution and so on Leninism in its original context come up in our position very well. We do agree, however, that Leninism will require thorough-going criticism as long as it is alive as a potential threat to workers taking social power themselves.

To conclude, we hope that in all of the tasks required, all will help fill some of the space he has indicated by writing articles for us or otherwise galvanize his well-labeled. And this is for the rest of you too! Thanks for writing.

Koot Voorhees

SCIENCE for the PEOPLE

Recent issue:

"Drug Abuse and Social Control" (Chapter VI)

"Women and Agriculture"

"Uncovering DNA: Does the Fault Lie Within Our Genes?"

"Infection: A Basic Synthesis"

Science for the People is published by the organization of the same name, a national grouping of people from various walks of life who are concerned about the absorption of society in the biological process. Science for the People, 689 North Street, Cambridge, MA 02140.
clearly necessary if we intend to produce a socialist society. This means opposition not only to the current political and economic order, but also to the mode of production itself. The Bolshevik alternative of the small vanguard of revolutionaries preparing for the day when they would lead the masses to the conquest of state power has also proven useless for our purposes. Each party has a role to play only in the unidimensional areas of the world, where they have provided the ruling class needed to carry out the work of forced economic development supervised by the native bourgeoisie. In the developed countries they have been divided into either active or passive elements, with unwilling masses of people. This has proven false. Whether the organ-
ROOT & BRANCH

With the 1960s the eternal prosperity, the managed economy, and the attendant "death of ideology" of the post-World War II period came to an end. The combination of unemployment and inflation in the capitalist West and the inability of the state-run systems of the East to satisfy their working classes are producing unsettling effects throughout "industrial society:" the deterioration of conditions in the big cities, which nonetheless draw an increasing proportion of the world's population; the brutalization of the seemingly permanent army of the unemployed, which has been accumulating in these urban centers; the instability of governments in the democracies, in the absence of any clear policy alternatives, inspiring a drift towards open authoritarianism; the development of opposition to the party dictatorships in the East, both in the form of liberalization among the intelligentsia and, more significantly, in that of strike movements among the working classes; and the continuing decay of ideologies and social norms. All this testifies to the basic character of the "limits of growth" that modern society is coming up against.

Whatever disappointments Nature has in store for us in the future, the limits we are encountering now are not ecological but social ones. It is not even socially caused, environmental disaster but the third world war that most directly threatens our extinction. That a fascination with zero-growth has replaced the nineteenth century's discovery of eternal progressive development is only the ideological form of the experience of the bankruptcy as a social system of capitalism and its state-run analog.

As yet we cannot speak of the existence anywhere in the world of forces or social movements which represent a real possibility of social revolution. But, while in no way inevitable, social revolution is clearly necessary if possibilities for an enjoyable and decent life are to be realized—and perhaps if human life is to be preserved at all. For this reason we see the overthrow of the present order of society as the goal to which we as a group wish to contribute. While the ideal we aim for has been called by a variety of names—communism, socialism, anarchism—what is important to us is the idea of a system in which social life is controlled by those whose activities make it up. Capitalism has created the basis of such a system by so intertwining the production and consumption of all producers that only collective solutions are possible to meet the producers' need to control the means and process of production and distribution. To eliminate the problems caused by the subordination of social production to capital's need for profit, the working class must take direct responsibility for what it already produces. This means opposition not only to the existing ruling class of capitalists and politicians but to any future managers or party leaders seeking to hold power in our name.

Root & Branch, therefore, holds to the tradition of the worker's movement expressed in the Provisional Rules of the First International. The purpose of our activity is "that the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves."

From the past we draw not only inspiration and still-meaningful ideas but also lessons on mistakes to be avoided. The fundamental idea of the old labor movement, that the working class can build up its forces in large organizations in preparation for the "final conflict" has proven false. Whether the organiza-

While history has indicated that there can be no revolutionary movement except in periods of revolution, the principles of such a future movement must guide the activity of those who wish to contribute to its creation. These principles—in contrast to those of the old labor movement—must signify a total break with the foundation of capitalist society, the relation between wage-labor and capital. As our goal is that of workers' control over social life, our principles must be those of direct, collective action. Direct, because the struggle for control of society begins with the struggle to control our fight against the current order. Collective, because the only successes which have a future are those involving (if only in principle) the class as a whole. We recognize that the working class does not have one uniform identity, and thus experiences oppression under capitalism differently according to age, sex, race, nationality, etc. However, what defines and thus unites the working class is its exploitation by capital, even if the character of that exploitation varies giving the appearance of separate problems and thus separate solutions. While it is true that the struggle against capitalism will not by itself solve these problems, overcoming capitalist exploitation raises the possibility of their solutions. Thus, each working-class struggle, even if it does not address an issue experienced by the class as a whole, must be aimed at the real enemy, capital, and not other members of the class. In the same way, we think workers must overcome in action the division between employed and unemployed, between unionized and non-unionized members of their class. Such a view automatically brings us into opposition to existing organizations like trade unions, which exist by representing the short-term interests of particular groups of workers within the existing social structure. Similarly, we are in conflict with the parties and sects which see their own dominance over any future movement as the key to its success.

We see ourselves as neither leaders nor bystanders but as part of the struggle. We are for a florescence of groups like ours and also for cooperation in common tasks. We initiate and participate in activity where we work, study, and live. As a group, we would like to be of some use in making information available about past and present struggles and in discussing the conclusions to be drawn from this history and its future extension. We organize lectures and study groups. Since 1969 we have published a bi-monthly and series of pamphlets. We hope others will join us to discuss the ideas and the materials we publish and that they will help us to develop new ideas and means to circulate and realize them.