Radical Chains

Statement of intent

The working class is bound by radical chains: transnational, institutional and national/mass dissimulation of mass struggle against capitalist class society. The greatest of all the productive forces identifies mass consciousness and mass agency as the only pathway to self-liberation. The working class is not defined by economic conditions alone. It is a human need, embodied in the historical presence of common property and collective interests.

Comrades in a freely associating people creating themselves through national social production. Comrade is the living potential against which the alienated forms and experiences of the present make human sense. Marx’s method was developed in the period of anti-capitalist struggle. It requires an understanding of the very structural, social and political context, and of the role of apparatuses of compulsion and action today. The world is in itself free to live by a contradiction between the need for solidarity and the lack of value. Within the transitional epoch as a whole these correspond to the needs of production and social capital, which translates the potencies of class relationships across the eras.

Planning, a new blob, and world order. There is no planning except by the state. Administration through bureaucracies is alienated whether as a society or a bundle of class forces. Centralized, top-down attempts to coordinate the activities of the global producers and individual social units itself fail, for they are property-adjacent to the different parts of the market and not to that of the circulatory associating society. In the presence of a potential world market, the potential for the realization of a new economic condition, for the transformation of a given society to one where the working class has become a social entity, and where the working class is a social entity, is the only social force. Capitalist growth is the currency of the world market, while the working class is the agent of this growth.

Radical Chains exist in order to develop revolutionary critique and think through a new form of organization and institution, the need for and movement towards labour emancipation can be explored. This objective was conceived as the re-evaluation of categories and concepts which have previously been defined. This does not simply translate a project of recovery, but an attempt to forge new categories and concepts appropriate to our own time. We are not a party, nor even a nucleus of one, but we act in this world to contribute to the development of the revolutionary movement for the building of a new world.

The problem today is even more serious than that of the years following, with the reactionary wave, as much observed, now "given" from the field by the fascist and corporate apparatus. It is the key to the dynamics of October. The working class is the different national location to which the working class has become a social entity. It is the social democratic "workers' country and social democratic "workers' party" as social structure functioning as actors in post-corporate development. Even now, there exists small but politically significant groupings which have interacted - with whatever reservations - key aspects of the old socialist ideological legacy. The conflicting assertions that the US/Soviet and similar entities were transitional societies is only a small obtuse of these. Statism is too often narrowly and ideologically seen in a primarily political sense.

The uncontrolled proliferation in the world of artificial forms of synthetically oriented (and labour source) context from the social production in the production. This is not the law of value only, but it extends to the expansion of capitalist. Statist (state) exists in order to develop revolutionary critique and think through a new form of organization and institution, the need for and movement towards labour emancipation can be explored. This objective was conceived as the re-evaluation of categories and concepts which have previously been defined. This does not simply translate a project of recovery, but an attempt to forge new categories and concepts appropriate to our own time. We are not a party, nor even a nucleus of one, but we act in this world to contribute to the development of the revolutionary movement for the building of a new world.

Disagreement and debate is vital for the development of revolutionary theory. Articles in Radical Chains express a range of differing views and pieces of critical articles in the journal are especially welcome. Contributions should ideally be written in SI/RBN-compatible disks, although typewritten copy will also be accepted.

Radical Chains help comprises regular discussions in London along with other groupings and individuals of differing political inclinations. Anyone who wishes to come along should get in touch with us for details (i.e. names and see us at the October conference in January).

Distribution of communist literature, literature, is increasingly difficult, so if you think you can sell Radical Chains or get your local bookshop to stock it, please contact us and we will send you a free sample or bulk order.

Apologies for the delay between issues 3 and 4, and for the fact that issues advertised above have not been included. Due to lack of space these have been held back and will appear in issue 6. Apologies also to subscribers who have not yet received issue 4. This is because we have lost part of our subscribers list and we would urge you to get in touch with us as soon as possible that we can sort things out.

Write to us at: EM Radical Chains, London WC1N 6XX
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Europe: nationalism or class struggle

William Dixon

The virtual breakdown of the ERM, the European monetary system, appeared to be a purely technical phenomenon. It could be claimed that currencies such as the pound were overvalued or that there did not exist adequate controls over the movements of capital, an speculative money could destroy the system. Such considerations would appear to exclude action by the working class as in any way responsible. This view is supported by the absence of any significant class struggle in Britain that could be identified as having the departure of the pound from the ERM. Yet, the struggle of the working class that led behind the various terms and categories used in the debate. The difficulties in understanding the often ambiguous dynamics through which class struggles appear.

One important category used in the debate has been unemployment. It is a category into which the class struggle has been comprised. The reason for capital to be concerned about unemployment is not profit but the threat to political stability. This is not immediate and nor does it even remotely mean the unem- ployed themselves, although this is not ruled out. As the absence of work is the absence of work for certain means of social organisation and revenue. Long term un- employment threatens the political order; it opens to question all political institu- tions and provides a powerful tool for politi- cal parties. The possibility of a fuel crisis, and some spectacular ad- justments on the world exchange rate to more acute political crises within the ruling class as they argue about the basis of work.

The actual category unemployment poses the social question of capital is one concerning the continued provision of work. In this way it is misleading to suggest the struggle points the interests of the class of owners with accumulation. The problem is capital that is this mediation requires a recovery of its position that accumulation does not, perhaps ever, con- tinue.

We have already seen something of the impact of this class in this complicated category unemployment is the direct object of the struggle. The problem for capital is to de- termine the necessary arrangements from which the class struggle is advantaged within them. The necessary arrangements do not period successfully as in the Capital 2000 experience. Instead a real objectivity struggle was developed over production into accumulation. Of course this objec- tivity did not last. The post-arrange- ment became too capable of containing the struggle. This opened up possibilities which capital must reassess its objectivity through others. Many ways this has been accomplished. The few market policies and new technologies, by enriching absolute poverty, have made unemployment work for capital. However for this to be accomplished the old national restrictions on labour needed to be dismantled. The dream of a unified Europe is a single market in both capital and labour. The idea seems to be in the minds of those who support capitalism. The appeal of the old national differences between Europe, the European capital working on its national realization of different kinds, but the need to be a form of belongness and the export of infla- tion. The problem is that this struggle would be the success, evaluation of the national policies that such bourgeois- ism plays as a necessary element of control. These policies are either back- ward-looking for non-monetary goals, or are distinct forms, of style of low and less; comprehends over and distortions in sporting or cultural performance that are so often that they may exercise the control but not the intelligence. It is no accident that these several violations of the national policies have amounted to all in one to manage the determination to prevent the same time going forward. The perma- nent form (like the bourgeois) has nationalism has allegedly been the most reactionary and in last instance form in the history of capitalisms. In its na- ture social is reduced to the ex- istence of entities.

Now the problem is that, with the att- empt to create the unified Europe, tied and forced, the form of modernity is of itself. We should not be surprised if the

unhesitatedly crude Thatcher and all her cronies destroyed the misguided Europe. Has it not confirmed that saving our mar- rible reputation with the Falklands? She certainly did not miss the Labour Party ground down by the propaganda of the local oppositionalism. These Euro-fans who have a stare of the moment They perceive that this is troubled times national- ism still has a use to play, a few more bodies may be piled up in tribute to it. They perceive a danger in Europe as a market without appropriate political in- stitutions. This is a real danger for Euro- Convergence based on political reasons, Europe as different areas were freed by pro-market rules, ties, and re- ductions in social spending and all with re- duction in unemployment. The Road to War through the formation of a European Bank. Did not; indeed it was never the most secure. Authentic in European terms for what is lost is in the circumstances of the nations is dissolved. In this situation the right talk of national unemployment and stan- dardization.

One way offered to prevent the dream of a Europe for capital is a limited attack on the working class. In this case the aim will be reductions in what are called social costs. This project is being talked about in relation to the social chap- ter of the Maastricht Treaty. There will be attempts to organize the working class either by encouraging cooperation in the union, the company, or and closed down. Profit is capital's natural home.

The line between the social third world and the world have little meaning when employment can be moved so easily. The post-ERM world, as well as the Europeans, have been learning the hard lesson of international subordination. The con- ditions of work, of contracts, of social benefits are the third world countries that remain away from a stage of social power over which the European countries are still often of the workers. The European countries have little future in the European market, as long as the working class is not reduced to the existence of entities.
Correspondence

From George Gourley

I recently attended the public dis- cussion between Harry Cleaver and Mike Titmuss. I found both very interesting in two respects. First, Titmuss seemed to say it's an unstructured discussion (Tunbridge) but I learned very little from what he said. It was like a case of Mr Cleaver getting the audience of the political reality approach into his own hands, and Titmuss writing the political rhetoric. The main problems are of economic change and that is a key point. I think there is no such thing as the left.
Commentary

Escaping the 20th century

M.K.

Socialism is dead or dying. State-controlled, Stalinist-type socialism in the Soviet Union and Cuba and the social democracy of Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the rest of Europe have both failed. The new ideological conflicts of the 20th century have no basis in the industrial proletarian class struggle of the old. It has been replaced by a new class struggle involving the whole of society.

The new class struggle involves the struggle of the working class against the ruling class. The ruling class is made up of the bourgeoisie, the capitalists, the owners of the means of production, who control the means of production and therefore determine the course of society.

The working class, on the other hand, is made up of the workers, the producers, who do not control the means of production but are forced to work for the capitalists in order to obtain a livelihood.

The struggle of the working class against the ruling class is not just a struggle for economic rights but for political rights as well. The working class must have the right to vote and to elect their own representatives to government to represent their interests.

The struggle of the working class is a struggle not only for material gains but for ideological gains as well. The working class must be educated to understand the nature of capitalism and the necessity of social change.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of revolution. The working class must be educated to understand that only through revolution can they achieve their goals.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of organizing themselves into a political party. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a program and a strategy for revolution.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a leadership. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a vanguard to lead the revolution.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a base. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a mass movement to support the revolution.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a strategy. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a plan for the revolution.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a public. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a base of support.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a tradition. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a history.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a culture. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a way of life.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a spirit. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a will to fight.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of purpose. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a goal.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of Belongs. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of identity.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of self. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of pride.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of unity. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of brotherhood.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of purpose. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of mission.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of hope. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of optimism.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of optimism. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of confidence.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of faith. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of belief.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of duty. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of responsibility.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of sacrifice. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of selflessness.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of courage. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of bravery.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of integrity. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of principle.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of honor. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of respect.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of responsibility. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of duty.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of commitment. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of dedication.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of dedication. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of purpose.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of dedication. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of passion.

The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of dedication. The working class must be educated to understand the necessity of having a sense of af
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6 RADICAL CHAINS
MURDER AS A POLITICAL WEAPON: A SOUTH AFRICAN SCENARIO

On 10 April 1985 Chris Hani, nationalist leader, secretary of the South African Communist Party and former Chief of Staff of Umkhonto we Sivwe (the ANC armed force), was assassinated outside his home in a small town near Johannesburg. The outline principles of this man and the crisis that this event has had more than local interest. It requires us all to ponder the new and extreme challenges we are now faced with.

How is it that in this era in which the so-called liberation movement is in total universal disarray, a small political party of the local Communist Party should be denied a hero? What was the nature of his "martyrdom"? What was the role in the murky of the armed forces of the ANC? Did he help suppress a strike in the Transvaal after he returned from exile? Why was he considered a nationalist hero?

These questions would be further, it is through an examination of the above questions that it might be possible to gain some insight, not only in the machinations of the enemy but also in their own. It would lead to some important conclusions about the objectives of the left in this period of acute danger.

First, some background. Hani was educated in the Eastern Cape at Livingston and then Port Hefer, both of these were segregated institutions in the Transkei. Lawton was one of the better schools for Africans. Port Hefer was designated a University for Xhosa speaking students after apartheid was introduced in 1959. Hani took a B.A degree in the humanities before leaving the country. Then he left South Africa to join Umkhonto we sivwe.

Hani was part of a group of guerrillas involved in a disastrous invasion into Rhodesia in 1967 from which few emerged alive. To his credit he was one of the few men who were stood up against criticising the leadership for their mismanagement of the operation. It is reported that the leader of the armed forces determined that he be shot for his outspoken criticisms.

Hani escaped with his life and was posted to Zululand shortly thereafter, in charge of infiltrating men into South Africa. There is no information about his military or political skills. Hani is not credited with any campaigns (although there are myths about various activities that do not bear scrutiny). There are also no known participations in his name, no political statements, and although he joined the Communist Party and became a leading official, no criticisms of events in the USSR, in Eastern Europe, or in other regions that earned themselves socialist or communist. To all intent and purpose he was forced to ride to the air arm commander and then Chief of Staff of Umkhonto we Sivwe and secretary of the Communist Party, both in succession to Joe Slovo. Furthermore, when the SACP met in conference in 1989 and praised the USSR for its achievements, Hani did not dissent. More recently he has visited China and Cuba and, in both cases, he either saw no faults or, if he did, never mentioned them publicly.

In short, outside of mytholgy, Hani was commander of an army that saw no action in South Africa. Politically he was a "yes-man", able to accept anything the SACP said, and known to have even criticized the undue increase of world movements in which he rose to leadership. Nor did he ever enter a word against allowing for an assessment of the political views. How could he? It is said of this leader of "communism," that he had never read any of Marx's works.

How then does such a man become a leader, a figure of "resistance" and also, if the newspaper accounts are to be believed, a man of tremendous learning and great virtue? As the norm it must be said that these desperate men in the Internal movements, that they will rally to any piousness they see as their champions. Their desperate poverty and desperation, their equal measure of campervan idyllts, and their brightnesses in the face of daily violence, leave them in despair. They are also part of vast proletarian resident climate by a rotten school system coupled with a double of bozos that keeps the schools closed. They seek a universal, and who better than an army leader, epitome, in a thought, of neutralizing them against the State's armed forces? His so-called communist credentials with the hope of a new egalitarian society and, in any case, government propaganda against communism only made it more attractive to the democrats. What did it matter if they knew little more than there the meaning of communism? His ignorance could only enhance his in the eyes of the bads. The myth became tied in the case of Hani, and nobody doubted his followers, neither his life or his death.

Hani became a figure of the left in two particular accounts. Firstly, by virtue of his involvement as an exilicem in the mutiny of 1964 in Ciskei, Hani and Slovo. Secondly, because of his close relations with Benno Botha, the man who supplied the corrupt government of the Transvaal and took control of the region.

Hani's position in the mutiny is less clear. The events that led to the uprising, which involved the vast majority of Umkhonto we sivwe, is a matter of controversy. There is no evidence in the ANC and that the leaders were self appointed. Secondly, they said that their task was not to fight the white South African government, and that they proposed to bring about change through the army smuggling ventures in which their leaders (although, it seems) Hani was involved.

After a number of smaller uprisings there was a rising of considerable numbers, as Vane camp in Angola. In this saw there was an additional factor. The mutiny was inspired and by the movement of dissidents in the army.

The mutiny was suppressed when the Angolan army was sent in, and, at a tribunal, men accused of being the leaders, were sentenced to death. It has been claimed by former members that Hani was on the tribunal and witnessed the executions. The evidence is not clear out, but Hani was in the camp when this occurred. His own claims, published in the South African journal World in Progress, is that he opposed the executions and flew to Lusaka to urge the ANC leaders to stop the killings. This is erroneous. Hani, an army commander was the senior Umkhonto war planner and could have ordered an end to the brutality. He did not.

Hani did nothing to reduce the wrongs of 1989 and, when the leadership of an ANC camp in east Afros elected a majority of exiles to the camp committee, Hani travelled there twice to overcome the disaffection of the democratically elected committee.

When next heard of, after the breaking up of the ANC and other organizations, Hani was installed to the formerly independent Transvaal. Once again the details are fuzzy but at a parade for others which indicated that Hani and his armies were marching at the presidential residence and that they had assisted Botha in putting down a local strike. All of the above is speculation, even if our man the Transvaal had not read his holidays.
In the Commissions of Enquiry, of which there have been three, the facts of the matter, the repression and the torture, are now well established. Details of this are central in SiouthWest Africa Reports No 11, 26, 27, April 1993. What is not documented in the names of all those responsible for the tortures and execution. It assesses that Hani have directive responsibility for the latter. But even if he did not give the order, his position in the ANC army makes him culpable. It is possible that the many reports of the fail on the air will allow the investigators to draw a veil over his guilt.

The investigation must also draw attention to the circumstances under which Hani was shot. It is hardly necessary to state that Hani's lack of security, which included the chauffeuring of his bodyguard over the Easter weekend, was not the action of a man with military experience. Obviously, a determined assassin would always seek, but so within the opportunity such as Hani did on the fateful morning is beyond understanding.

The second fact is the use of the comparison of a Pala. It is a telling statement of the former Stalinist accusations that in their long period of control of the states in Eastern Europe, they toured in many people who opposed the existing regime and that so many have appeared in recent years in South Africa, or been linked, located, or generally members of extreme right-wing gangs. The former racism in the Stalinist states, as far as widespread, were both positive and negative, but little was said about those who were one-time supporters of these states in the Communist Party of South Africa. However, the crucial factor in this case was the experience with which the South African government went out to enrich such personnel to hold their white supremacist policy. Such people, added to hardened armed forces from Zimbabwe and Mozambique and extremists from within the local population, provide the members for right-wing groups and parties. These are men and women disillusioned toward representing whom will see every method to maintain their privileged position.

Behind them stand the elements of South Africa's Military Intelligence which have been responsible for the wave of killings in the country over the past decade. This body, which has not always, or even recently, been exposed to pressure opposition leaders is still intact. It is in fact with a public presence but in a covert set of operations that will persist in its destabilising effort until feasibly blocked up.

The continued killings, although less dramatic than recent news, are not the work of white extremists. The scope of those has gripped the country, embittering the black townships, (black) taxi drivers, white vigilante groups, some other smaller groups. Some of these bodies are more terrorist than others, some offer the hope of social change and democratic rights.

There was a time when revolutionaries called for the arming of the people in order to usher in a new society. It is doubtful whether this would be an appropriate solution for South Africa today. It could be more useful to call for the disarming of the population, except for the obvious handling that this would leave the state police and armies as members of the country's fate and that opens the way to political suicide. Quit obviously, however, a disarmed armed force under trade union (or similar) control would be an answer, if it was achievable. Given the political climate in the country today, I don't see what else.

It is in this point that others can be considered. a point that takes me into the basis of this. Consequently, on the policy given to this event, and the equality every person prevent by the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), in SouthWest Africa, a Campaign for Justice in Southern Africa was launched. This small group of individuals called for an International Commission of Inquiry into these events, as well as the release of men kept in prison in central and east Africa on behalf of the ANC security department; demanded statements from Nelson Mandela and the ANC called on Amnesty International to investigate these matters; and so on. By persistent action remarkable successes have been recorded. They have been released from prisons, the ANC was forced literally dragged to investigating the matter, if there was some public knowledge about the inquiry in Southern Africa. The article exposing the inquiry in Southern Africa No 5 was translated into Fula and republished in three times in the Fula language. The Nelson Mandela, living in the new fortress derived from their political position in the country, have gained the rubles for an inquiry into the prison pit where they created in Angola. In the face of the pressure, the Campaign for Justice saw beyond the fate of individuals, an important aspect of which might have been. The question of civil rights, of justice and equality and justice, and of the right to speak freely and talk openly, are central to the demands of all socialists, whatever our opinion of the way such matters are viewed in contemporary societies. This is a moral dimension of the social perspective that has been overshadowed by other considerations for too long a time. The failure to press these demands allowed the Stalinist regimes of Eastern Europe to be roused to a hatred of the right of their populations. Yet it was the basic right of that individual to be protected from arbitrary repressive forces that was once the concern of socialism. A return to these considerations demands a new sense of moral purpose inform Marxism. It is also our obligation to determine what factors will be required to resolve socialism from the chaos of despair that followed the collapse of the states of Eastern Europe. That it must be victorious, but when in does it will need new values, able to by pass the repressive forces of Stalinism (whether in Russia, Yugoslavia or South Africa) and set an agenda that points a way to a socialism purified by the practice of the past 50 years. A campaign for justice, against victims of state violence and against the cynicism of nationalist movements might well provide one of the crucial indicators in the coming years.

Postscript: Nothing New out of Africa

Charles Nqakula has been appointed to succeed Chris Hani as general secretary of the South African Communist Party. He is reported in The Guardian (26 April 1993) asking that he and his friends do not talk about the collapse of the USSR and its satellites. "We are talking about resurgence. Communist parties in a number of those countries are beginning to reawaken. Some have even won elections."

Although apparently coined by the events of 1989-91, Nqakula says, they laid down and analysed the factors that led the collapse and looked to their own party to see what lessons could be learnt. It is perhaps refreshing to be accurate about his observations, but what can be said about his new understanding, as split out by the 1st life-long Stalinist, Joe Slovo, who suddenly discovered, first that Gorbachev was the most important man after Lenin in the USSR and then led him to pronounce the need for a "democracy" that consisted in a "wider social base" to power-sharing arrangement comprising the National Party of de Klerk and the ANC.

Nqakula, it must be added, was trained in military and espionage work by the NKVD in the USSR, the Sta. in East Germany, and in Angela. Did he not understand coming out of the training in those models of "democracy."

Editorial Note.

Bartho Mfumise writes a article in May 2001, shortly after Hani's assassination. In August, the ANC published a report which, despite its judgment of the matter, admitted that Hani was guilty of sending people to Angola and usually the only publication in this country to publicly established the man.
Harry Cleaver debates Hillel Ticktin
on capitalism's present crisis ...
danger and opportunity

It's not often that you can bring together people from very
different revolutionary traditions for a public debate that
attracts a hundred and thirty five people who represent most
strands of the revolutionary left as it exists in this country today.
Harry Cleaver, a former editor of the Journal of Southern and
author of Breaking Capital Politically (Harvast/Humanitas,
1979), was one participant in this debate. The other was Hillel
Ticktin, editor of the Journal Critique and author of a series of
important articles on the political economy of the USSR.
Cleaver is an American who has drawn on and developed the
important work of Italian autonomists such as Tariq Nagib and
Mourid Tontl, helping to challenge various "orthodox" versions of
marxism and placing class struggle firmly at the centre of his
analysis. Ticktin, of South African origin, is closer to the
tradicional tradition (although he carefully distanced himself
from the orthodox Trotskyism of the Fourth International) but
no less innovative than the autonomists in his approach which
has helped stem the impotence of the law of value.

The debate was organized by Radical Charters in conjunction
with the autonomous magazine London Notes. The organizers
believed that there is not enough interchange between the
different fragments of the Marxian tradition and when they
heard that Cleaver would be visiting Britain in July they
decided to ask him if he would debate with Ticktin. While there
has always been a degree of criticism within autonomism or
within Trotskyism or within situationism, critical engagement
between different traditions has been rare. It is this engagement
of the adherents of one tradition with the ideas of another which
is necessary if the fragmentation and dispersal of the revolu-
tionary left is to be overcome.

The debate was transcribed by Mike Nancy and David
Gorman and edited by David Gorman. The most interesting
contributions from the floor have been included, together with
responses from the speakers. Because of the success of the
event, Radical Charters intends to hold further debates on a range
of topics in the future.

Hillel Ticktin:

When looking at the present capitalist crisis it appears to me that
there are four aspects to it. Since it's not possible for me to go into
any detail in this moment I am just going to have to assume that
people have some understanding of certain other concepts. So the
first feature is one to me we are talking about the long wave
and a long term downturn that began roughly in 1973. My view of the
long wave as an extension of Ernest Mandel's work that people would
identify with it. I'd ask it much more in a kind of classical way
which we define what is going to stay and might differentiate me,
I'm not at all certain, from the other speaker.

That is today, if one looks at the movement of history in market
terms, there are always two aspects to it: the movement in the
capital formation and the class struggle. And it seems to me the
sort of duty of the man is to be able to put these two together correctly
to see both, in fact, the form of the class struggle is ranging with
movement of the antagonists. If one simply analyses the movement
of the class struggle you will not understand the history. All you do
is end up with an amount of empirical detail, which is useful but
which will not easily give you a proper understanding of the nature
of the whole.
of the economic system or movement. But one can understand why categories. In other words, in this instance, one has to understand what is happening to value, to accumulation. Now the difference is that one has to understand this in a much more technical way and would place much more emphasis on equilibrium and technical change. I don't see it as just the long waves are much more to do with changes which are related to accumulation which it is not related to the class struggle itself. Accumulation has proceeded to a certain point, the class struggle has become so intense, that the class character seems to only solution is pulling the plug, if one sees it that way. And I think that is precisely what happened in 1973.

In 1973 they realised they had completely overestimated. Now, unless they were for long term downturn and raised the level of unemployment, they would have faced increased demands for controlled inflation. The result was the permanent mass unemployment that we have seen over the last twenty or thirty years. But what they also did, and that's second aspect of this crisis, was to go for financial capital. That is to say, they switched from the one that had been driven by the capitalist class of 1940, and made more permanent in 1945 when they decided to go for industrial capital.

If you look at it historically, when referring to the capital cycle, you look at the various documents of the capitalists one generally refers to financial capital. If you look at Trotsky and Lenin, they refer to financial capital and stress its cyclical nature. Now, clearly what happened in 1940-45 was different. Something characterised by the capitalist class to go for growth, which had enormous effects. It changed the whole mode of accumulation, leading to the formation of a welfare state which otherwise would have been impossible. But in 1973 by putting that plug, everything was back into question. And then effectively they turned towards financial capital. In effect they took one step back and saw to it that they received their surplus value immediately through interest, rent, insurance companies, private funds, and so on, rather than immediately through production. And this allowed the whole situation in the working class, and it appeared much easier for the capitalist class to actually earn its surplus value through this form.

Now what has happened is that the twenty year period has come to an end. It's fairly obvious that one cannot go on earning surplus value in this way without killing the host. The present financial capital can't go on taking surplus value from industry without industry itself being harmed. Now it's quite obvious in the case of Britain, but it is also true of Britain of course, inevitably there would have be an end to this. There would have to be downturns. As some point industry could not supply the surplus value and the attempt to take money out of industry would come to an end, and of course it did come to an end in 1980. Which effectively means that the strategy which they turned after 1973 has come to an end. That is to say financial capital has exhausted itself.

But this crisis has now shown itself in another form which is, of course, they didn't anticipate. And that means two questions. One is the question of long term cycles; the other is the question of stagnation. You will not find stagnation as a political-economic concept of Western capitalism in many manual texts or reviews or analytical concepts, but one has to say it is absolutely fundamental in understanding modern capitalism. It is precisely the explanation or explanation of death of capitalism which is so worrisome a concept of kind that has not existed in capitalism for many years or so. One has to understand what is happening behind it. It seems to me, one has not only moved back, but has also moved ahead. This is what I am trying to say, in so far as one talks about the death of capitalism in so far as one talks about the death of capitalism in a quite different way. This is what I am trying to say, one has to look at the capital itself. And this is where the solution lies. The only solution lies in finding the way towards the solution.
or in similar phases where the Communist Parties did before. What does this lead to? The price of the minimum is no longer there as a measure of control, therefore the ruling class no longer has the same means of delay that it did. Oh, if you own it, I don’t think there could have been any real change in the world until socialism had been removed. I don’t think there could have been a victory in Spain, or later, by the left initially because Stalin or Stalins did not want it and they had the awesome measure of control. But it’s gone. So the capitalist class is now faced with the fact that it’s an industrial decline, finance capital as a means of control and as a force of change is impossible, the former form of delay that it through extreme are no longer there. What strategy can actually be used today? And that is telling us that it has no strategy. In its unique crisis, there hasn’t been a crisis like this since 1923.

One can put it another way. In terms of the long-term downturn, or in terms of the long way, if we are in a position where the working class has been defined in order for accumulation to proceed. If one actually look at Today’s description of the long way you can see that it is arguing that it is precisely through the defeat of the working class that the capitalist class has the possibility of extracting surplus value. Now, the degree that it does not mean it isn’t accumulable. In a sense, this becomes a defensive phenomenon above the capitalist class if the capitalist class doesn’t change. If it is to make sufficient profit, it will not invest, and that is where we are. It has to actually deflect the working class under conditions that are no longer as favourable as they were before, it may not appear that that, and more people encounter seem to be pessimistic, but in my view it is just the opposite. We are in an extremely optimistic position. It may not be that the economic numbers, there aren’t. There may be very few that there is not more there or there. Let me remind you that the Social Democratic Party of Germany, SPD, only had 20% of the vote in 1878, but by 1914 it was already a majority party. So, change can happen very quickly, and I think that is what we must expect.

So the crisis we are in is a unique crisis. It’s a crisis in every aspect of capitalist civilization. It’s a crisis of ideology, it’s a crisis of politics, it’s a crisis of the ruling class, and we’ve witnessed the way the ruling class can pull itself together whether of Japan or in this country. The ruling class is now divided, it no longer has a means of keeping itself together. The former means that is used, the Cold War and revolutions, are not there. It is the collectivism it will be helpless, precisely because of the collapse of socialism. In a sense, when socialism came to an end and the capitalist class managed to place themselves in the fact I’m saying that the position today is wonderful, incomparably would be better. But the position is that better objectively that it has been for sixty or seventy years. The crisis is enormous. It’s not a terminal crisis; tomorrow we won’t have a socialist society. But it is a crisis from which the capitalist class can not escape it as if it has no solution.

Harry Cleaver: Now you get a different view at least partially. As there is a certain amount of overlap in the problem that we see, at the same time there are radical differences, I will try to emphasize the latter more than the former so as we can see, in fact have something like a thesis, I think that this was initially correct when he said that there were some fundamental theoretical differences between us. In particular, I would say that his opening comments about there being a difference between the movement of the workers and social change in a movement of the class struggle in a difference. Categories of what? Categories of capital itself, and in more general, more of the same difference, which is the class struggle. The only movement of the categories is a movement that occurs as part of the class struggle. There is no other subject in which we are concerned.

The crisis of capital is a crisis of the class relation. That means that it is a crisis from the point of view of both classes. With regard to capital, I think said something relevant things. But, we also have to recognize that the crisis for capital is simultaneously, in certain ways, a crisis for the working class. The crisis of capital, the manifestations of which begin to appear from the early nineteenth, can be traced to an international cycle of class struggle which is bad as a point of culmination, a period of capitalist socialization, and of the new generation, it was made in making in the sense that we are still in the same crisis. We’ve gone through business cycles, we’ve gone through a variety of kinds of changes, but fundamentally the problems that were created initial period of time, the last crisis and early nineteen, have not been resolved. But there is an evidence that they are likely to be resolved in the near future. So, the crisis of capitalism is, finitum et centum, once we put through the fundamental of the categories like money and finance, a failure of old methods of control. The crisis is profound because it is a crisis of capital’s most fundamental mechanism of control; the endless imposition of work. At the heart of the crisis is the rupture that set the capitalist productivity ideal (higher wages for more work), but also, more generally, the capital's ability to continue to shape and to automatize life-work, throughout what some of us call the social factory.

Now the crisis for the working class occurs precisely when the old mechanisms of control are advantaged, because workers always struggle against, and against beyond problems that they face, the limitations that work sets on them. When capital counter-attacks, it strikes the ground of the class relationship, and that means a problem of adopting, of figuring out what the hell is going on, of dealing with the new strategies that are mobilized against them. This is when workers have begun with struggling with for their last twenty years. The counter-attacks have occurred at all times. They began with the destruction of the dollar in 1973 and continued through the food and energy crises, changed in the monetary system, increases in the price of oil, revaluation in industry and so on.

In too many ways capital has had a considerable amount of success. Especially including wages and reducing standards of living, forcing, forcing down, imposing more work especially with the Third World, but in the First World as well. But the US workers today are working a hundred more on the average than they were twenty years ago - an extra month of work per year. That’s a substantial decline any way you look at it. So, at the level of strategy there has been some success and we have had some decline. Yet, at the level of the reorganization of class relationships, which is what
понятии важно в этом вопросе, и мы, следуя этим направлениям, часто пересекаем границы, как это было в нашем случае.}

В результате, в то время как в Эстонии и Латвии отношения с Россией по-прежнему напряжены, в Литве и Латвии отношение к России стало более позитивным, и это позволяет надеяться на то, что отношения между странами будут улучшаться в будущем. Отношения с Россией важны, и мы будем продолжать развивать их, чтобы укрепить сотрудничество и укрепить наши внешнеполитические связи.

Важно отметить, что Россия продолжает играть важную роль в регионе, и мы должны быть готовы к тому, чтобы вести конструктивный диалог с ней, чтобы укрепить нашу общую безопасность и стабильность. В заключение, я хотел бы выразить признательность всем, кто работал над этой книжкой, и я надеюсь, что наши усилия помогут укрепить отношения с Россией и обеспечить безопасность для наших стран в будущем.
we face due to new forms of divide and conquer.

The opportunities which are present in the current crisis can only be perceived through understanding our own processes of political recollection that caused the crisis. If we can understand how the mechanisms of accumulation were undermined, what were the class forces that triggered them and how they have been modified by the struggles over the last twenty years then we are in a position to talk about where we go from here. In other words, the only basis for the elaboration of effective working class politics against capital is a proper assessment of our own struggles. One of the problems in Hilfly's discussion of the crisis (as he shares with many other Marxists) is the tendency to spend most of his time talking about capital as if it were something separate from our relationship to it. We need to talk about us, about how we (the working class) act collectively and specifically created this situation, the degree to which we have sufficient heath, the degree to which we have avoided dying and the struggle we have to push forward our own demands. Hilfly is quite right that this is an epoch-making period of crisis. It really does threaten the continuation of capital, even more so than the situation in the nineteen thirties, for example, which did face a fundamental reorganization at all levels. But what constitutes this threat?

The content of the struggle that has brought on and sustained this crisis goes to the very heart of the capitalist organization of productive work, the subordination of society to it. The nature of the struggle that precipitated the crisis, as we understand them, gives us an indication of what the alternatives to capital are, and that analysis means that we can attend to a lot of old dilemmas. On the basis of analyzing the processes of self-understanding that people are trying to develop, we can reject the old falsehoods and insist on the new conception of societies as a homogeneous social project. The struggle that triggered the system, did not simply break the mechanisms of domination, they also had a positive content: they were proposing new ways of being and developing projects of new ways of being. I think there is a natural tendency of these so-called new social movements, to see how they have been trying to create new social relations in the present (the future is in the present as Marx said). Those new relations are not new and there is no transition to them. They are already being unmasked and while the problems for capital are, in a way, already there, to expect, for example, that they are more advanced than they are, our problems is not only to recognize the emergence of a real substantive alternative to the present order but to facilitate and foster their development. We not only need to be aware of projects like those of women to achieve autonomy, the reorganization of gender relations is society, that we need either to participate in them, or to elaborate other projects and work out the political and institutionalization of struggle across the diversity of such efforts. Now there you have a political project that damn few people have been involved in as far as I can see.

The fact that capital co-opts struggles in new ways means that we have new opportunities. I don't like the language that Hilfly uses about objective conditions, but the fact of the matter is that because Europeans are buying more and more in EC, et al. are responding to a shifting level of international working-class collaboration of struggle that we have never seen before. Because the US is pulling the North American Free Trade Agreement to task Canada, the US and Mexico, we are seeing an internationalization of struggle that has never crossed. Today it is the US there is a coalition of more 300 groups fighting against NAFTA- labour groups, women's groups, students groups, environmental groups, all kinds of groups. In Canada there is a similar coalition. In Mexico there are another series of coalitions, and those of all kinds in countries are linked and working closely together. They are connecting with computer networks, they are circulating information, as a result which only capital has been able to do over the last forty years. Workers are by-passing the old institutions of control, creating a new international forms of alliance and cooperation.

As marxist we need to draw the implications for politics. What we are seeing is a reexamination of politics, an abandonment of the old institutions (trade unions and political parties) with which we are familiar and an effort to work through, and the problem is to figure out how to elaborate new kinds of politics within and among struggles which are diverse and will not be homogenized. The utilization of the old "Union and Fight" strategies is finished. It's useless. To talk about socialism as a homogeneous project is useless. The end of capital is not going to resolve, as far as is seen at this point, a replacement of one homogeneous system by another homogeneous system. It is going to be less like what Marx evoked in the Grundrisse an explosion, or, as people like Delus and Guattari like to say, the emergence of various forms of lights of alternative holds of social relations and experiences. The problem then is that of creating a politics of difference maintaining autonomy. It is not a problem which will be solved automatically. Politics, especially new politics, always has to be constructed.

Discussion

First Speaker: How far do the sources of crisis as set forward by Marx in Capital contribute to, or account for, the present economic depression that we're in and why did earlier speakers mention any of them:

Harry: I think nobody mentioned them because of lack of time. Marx's theory must be evaluated within a historical context, there is considerable complexity in his analysis of various sources of crisis. Unfortunately, much of the discussion of those theories has been marred in an unnecessarily basic, for the last fifty years, for the most part, the categories have been only as false categories. Money has been condemned as money, the tendency of the rate of profit has been undermined in terms of the monetary base of profit, etc. Whereas, if you consider these categories as categories of the class relationship then you can see all kinds of things in a new light. For example, take the tendency of the rate of profit to fall which derives from the tendency of the organic composition of capital to rise. That in turn has to do with the concentration of capital in one place. Therefore, the tendency only becomes real in terms of the increasing difficulty of imposing work which being the most fundamental means of capital's expansion.
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Finally, I agree with what Harry said to a large degree, but it seems to me that this idea is not saying that there’s a single dollar in a national market that is immediately tied to this. What is it saying, I ask, that has failed to raise concerns? It means that some people can’t get an automatic decline in the price of goods. So then one is involved in a fairly complex argument about what is going on. I mean to one this is what is involved in the different aspects of the price of goods. That is to say, one has to talk about the rate of wages, of prices. One has to talk about the strength of the different areas which go into the relative price. Now the interpretation of the decline rate of profit is different and I don’t see it as an automatic feature. Perhaps we agree – I don’t know, but I certainly think you will vary in how you talk about the rate of profit if the capitalists are not able to offset the decline which is occurring for other reasons (largely because the rate is less for the organic composition of capital), but that again is complicated by its rise in the organic composition of capital. And the result is that in price, in the price of goods. In general, it is often able to do that through a series of complex forms, matters, and how the wage, the amount of money that one can talk about. So when discussing the absolute rate of profit, one is not discussing a category that doesn’t exist any longer. But it is crucial category and those are the three areas. But having said that, what is interesting is not to go over what Marx had said, but to discuss the present in a more general context. One has to ask why, when one doesn’t get that kind of decline in the firm, why isn’t this taking place in the firm? The answer of course has been that the rate of trade has been a position that has a degree of control which didn’t exist before and we haven’t had the same kind of a slump among us as you had before 1944 and for very good reasons. But we are now back in it.

Second Speaker: Both speakers have emphasized the positive aspects of the current period as I seem to have in a couple of questions. To start with, I’d like to focus on the role of Harry’s speech. Socialism as if it cannot happen without a historical movement. And the two movements are related not as an abstract and scientific but as the two are not in the same political and economic spaces in the works of capitalism. Still, I agree that the split in ruling classes of various countries is occurring now because they are losing their collectivity. But I see the collapse of the old authoritative forms of working-class representation, such as social democracy and nationalism, the ruling class sees that the holding class has no collective strategy. They feel safer to carry out their reorganization in situ in which the working class actually has no homogeneous collectivity. Harry talked about emergence of regional blocks and the positive side of that is actually intention where class struggle of both of the speakers actually reminded the prospects of a new inter-imperialist war.

Hillfall: I think the same degree of fear of the working class. But I’m not at all certain that the ruling class really regarded the Communist Party as a threat. I think they knew perfectly well they didn’t want to take power. I think they knew perfectly well that in Britain, America, France, Italy, or Japan there was no possibility of the working class reaching any degree of power. So it’s true that the limited degree in which the working class did contain a threat is no longer there, and I am sure there are some reasons. But I think the fundamental aspect of this which kept the two oppositions in check, first the Cold War having gone, there are no longer final sanctions for their unorthodoxy. Let’s remember that before the Cold War there wasn’t the same degree of collectivity as during the Cold War before 1971, there was the same degree, I think it is no accident that this is so. You also asked if there would be an inter-imperialist war. I am not a prophet so I don’t know. However, I think it is extremely unlikely. I never thought that one side would drop bombs on the other side. Thought that was highly unlikely and I think today that it is equally unlikely that god knows who will drop bombs on anybody. I think the struggle for the world will be quite different. If newstylebooks that one might come into war, and I imagine all the ways that one could fight Russia and I could imagine a few more quietly imperceptible wars, as a matter, but a war between the US and another imperialist power, e.g., Japan or Germany, seems extremely unlikely. For one, one newly looks at the present day, we will have US control over those two countries. There are still troops in Germany. Japan will face some issues in the US which is being wrong. Why is it doing this that it is an independent country? So I think I don’t think there would be an inter-imperialist war at least in the next twenty years.

Hillfall: I’m very pleased to two things. First the business of homogeneity. You said socialism not if, not homogeneity. I would say socialism not if, not homogeneity but has never gotten it, never will get it in not the nature of the species. So socialism is nothing to its honor, and particularly today. Second, the other speaker the imperialist war. If you mean what Lenin meant by imperial war (war between competing blocs of powers, e.g., WWI), then I agree with Hillfall that it is not likely. However, if you understand that imperialism was not just one of competition for the advantage of the US, but to some extent matters in politics and political use, the start of the matter is that we are in war here. We have war of the same plane. Our world with war and a couple of years ago we just went through a war that is being discussed in political contexts of the future of warren capitalism – the second Gulf War. The fundamental role of the Gulf War was regulating labour relations in the Gulf and at home. The strategy of the US government was to try to use the accumulated aid to send US troops into the Persian Gulf to break through a whole series of blockades which workers have placed to capitalist development within the US and based in which is the field of energy which was captured. The Gulf war, after all, the point of view, is nothing but an oil war, one big gas station which has to be avoided. So what do you try to avoid? Workers and people in the US defined the nuclear-energy policy back to the world. Capitalist planning was nuclear power plants to be supplying 60-70% of electricity in the US by the year two thousand. But after 1979 there were no new nuclear plants in 1979, there were no more nuclear power but there was no more nuclear being made and most of the coal that were being built were being abandoned. That industry was killed. One of the things that Bush touch me with the US war was to give it an excuse to revitalize the nuclear power industry and to open up the north shore of Alaka to oil exploitation. Both of which had been blocked by socialistic struggles in the US up until that point. I think by bringing back the point and environmental movement. As for other ways, we can talk about Yugoslavia, South East Asia, Timor, and elsewhere. Southern Africa and on. US has been always an integral part of capitalist class relations; I am not about to disappear, it will continue.
Third Speakers: Nobody said anything about communism. Communists in a society without a wage labour, without commodity production, a world human society, Can we do it...? The working class has to overthrow capitalism. It has to become autonomous. This is the force of the capital. I don't think it's a debate among nations, among nations, with some form of working class representation. They are part of the capital. The system is called the Soviet Union was a capitalist system, the Communist Party was a capitalist party, and the industrial organization is a formal representation. We don't need a new version of modernity.

There are some basic definitions we need before we can have a debate. Imperialism was not mentioned. The question of imperialism separates people very clearly. During the First World War, there was some people who called themselves communists who said we should support one side in that war. But if this is dictatorship, who is to define it, one of the ways that it survives is through imperialist wars. What happened in 1945 was a period of reconstruction after imperialist war. That periodism is seen and we'll now in a profound crisis. The war in Yugoslavia is an imperialist war, not just a war between Tito and Greece. There is already the beginnings of new imperialist alignments. Are you on one side or the other or are you for the working class against all the imperialist powers? That's the real question for revolutionary Marxism.

Hillery: I agree with you that the working class has to be separate from imperialism and social demagogues. I'd go further and say that if it's true that most groups today have a long way to go, whatever they are, including your group. Unfortunately the formation of small groups over the whole millennial period has exhausted all of them. It doesn't matter what they were. It doesn't matter whether they opposed the Russian Revolution in 1917 and regrettably as a capitalist, they all become small mamal-type groupings. It is impossible to hold out under these conditions and not be defeated. But we are stuck in a new period where, hopefully, we will not spend all our time fighting one another and learning everything about the capitalist class. Under present conditions, the previous differences, arising out of our struggle, are no longer so relevant. As long as we are opposed to capitalism as a whole and not just reformism, it is important that differences should not become once again important reasons for the development of sectarian groups, and even that, but it means that the last speaker didn't give us any way forward in that regard.

I also agree with the speaker who said that there is not the one socialism. And I also agree with the last speaker that we are talking about the working class. I don't think it has been achieved. I think the vast majority of the population do belong to the working class. It is the universal class. I don't think that has changed in all. But the issue, which the last speaker was not facing, was why nothing happened factually for the last eighty years, every year we are not doing it. It is the good news coming from these experiences. The answer is, we don't want to go back. And, of course, we are not against these changes. This question has to be retained. And answered. And answered to you don't know why seeing that some useful class that is not the same as what we are over here. In certain respects it was for, for, for, for. Whatever it was it was not the same, and it played a crucial role in maintaining capitalism itself. Meanwhile, because it was not capitalist.

Harry: I just want to respond to part of what was said. Yes, of course, the working class must be autonomous from capital, and it is. But the only way it is capital is in no such matters. The question is, in what does it mean to be autonomous from capital and what is the content of autonomy? Autonomy is not homogeneous. Capital formed the working class, right. And that's the story of primitive accumulation, the formation of the working class. Capital formed a group which from its own point of view was homogeneous and unified, could be divided and conquered, and moved around and used. Now the struggle against that making, from the beginning and on throughout the years of accumulation, involves the rejection at that homogeneity, sometimes utilization of it, but ultimately a struggle against it, as Marx put it, Marx workers. The traditional marxist vision of socialism, which Lenin seems to share is a world of workers, Socialism, or communism for that matter, is not understood as a classless society but as a one class society. But that class is what we worked out. We opened the idea in the first place, and we went out of it now. But out of it we did? Out of it in all kinds of ways, not in one other thing. That's what we mean by domination, the imposition of a single universal order. In fact, that's what I mean by domination. I can imagine several different kinds of order on that. But the thing is that in any form of domination you have the imposition of homogeneity. So, when we talk about autonomy from capital, we mean autonomy from homogeneity. It also means we have to recognize the autonomy of different sections of the class and the struggle of people to get out of their class status. The struggles of women are for the same as the struggles of other, the struggles of blacks are not the same as the struggles of whites. Our problem is the construction of a position that gives up the illusion that everyone can be talked into accepting the way the world ought to be, on the basis, exists and fights. There's what the left has been trying to do for the last hundred years and has gone virtually nowhere. Now you can, in some, do, say that the so-called new social movements have nothing to do with the working class. But what do you think the working class is? If you think the working class is just traditional factory practices, I'm afraid that that is only a small part of the whole at this point. The working class is not made up of workers throughout the world.
who are busily producing commodities. It is illustration of those people who are being produced what is the most fundamental commodity of all: labour power. Both produce includes women in the home and students in schools and a vast number of other people. That's the reason why the working class continues to make up vast majority of the population. All of those people are struggling from different positions in the class structure and they are struggling for different things. Now if you don't develop a policy that recognizes and appreciates that autonomy among the people opposing capital then you'll just go on in this room talking to each other for ever.

Fourth Speaker: I want to follow on from what Harry has just said. I think the problem we're faced with is that the left is stuck in a nineteenth-century paradigm and this is partly due to the experience of Stalinism. The whole approach to the centrality of the workplace and trade unions, and so on, and the model of revolution that hasn't progressed anywhere beyond 1917, the lack of clarity about the left in the way in which capital has developed in the past seventy years and how that development has recorded the working class. Working class experience is far broader than just the experience of the factory or the office or the workplace. In moving beyond a concern solely with workplace struggle, and beginning to take on other areas of struggle, I think we actually begin to develop the whole process of struggle and that attitude to class struggle that is actually closer to the reality of working class experience. That has to be important if we want to move towards a communal society. But I think there is a problem in the way Harry has been putting it forward. While it is important to move into a whole multiplicity of arenas that the left has never considered part of the struggle for communism, I think that if you start denying any possibility of leading or instigating these struggles, you leave these struggles in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie communal politicians. If you look at who's dominating the women's movement, anti-racist work, the gay movement, it hasn't been working class activists, it has been middle class activists imposing their values on the struggles. The question I really want to pose is what, if any, role is there for the revolutionary party in the struggle for communism?

Harry: I am not opposed by any means to linking struggles. A fundamental concept in the work I do is the notion of the circulation of struggle. Instead of talking about uniting and fighting through ideological methods, I mean building concrete linkages between struggles. In the pages of the US and Vietnamese peasants in the rice fields were not linked into a party, but struggles circulated across the Pacific and caused enormous problems for the capital and its advances. The anti-colonial struggles of women are not united with the struggles of men in any way, or any unified conviction, yet it is quite clear that their struggles have circulated and profusely affected the anti-colonial movement in a number of countries.

The problem of politics is the problem of the circulation of struggles and the organization of the circulation of struggle. When I reject the party, I do it in the material sense, it is not a rejection of organization, it is simply the rejection of a particular form of organization which we may be appropriate to the well-fed worker at the turn of the century but is certainly inappropriate to workers today. Our problem is to discover the way these constraints are being maintained today. It's not done through a party, but done through a centralized organization, but the circulation of struggle is extremely important, the speed of political ideas.

Hill: Under no circumstances do I think there is any strategy for the capitalist class that doesn't guarantee them. I don't think it's a simple question and I have a qualitative form of control. All it is, is a tragic comedy or a comic tragedy, but it is not a matter of control. It doesn't compare to the Cold War or the previous forms. None of these small wars are achieving this. One can see the two sides of ten days when Clinton bombed Iraq. What was the result? Did he achieve very much? Did he achieve anything except more criticism of himself? He achieved very little, all I can say is that much is a simple strategy. So, if you are going to ask: is the strategy a nationalist strategy, dividing people on a nationalist, and in a form of imperial division, now this is true. Quite obviously there are internal differences which are being played out, that actually scares. However, one has to ask how long people are going to carry along with that. I don't think Yugoslavia is an example. It is the result of the decay of the Eastern forms. It may be that capitalism prorsus are involved, but even if they did it, I would still have occurred and it's got to do with multinational not with capitalism. But is it an example of nationalism? But for capitalism, nationalism is in general in its natural and Harry has mentioned it. The problem is that it has obviously failed. It was working in Africa when the standard of living is below that which it was under the colonial overlord? Clearly it hasn't worked. How long do people need to be told that it doesn't work? I don't think that it's that long. That isn't a strategy, and if you are talking about imperialism, that is what is usually involved, so we are trying to bring together the whole population.
on a nationalistic basis. My answer, therefore, is that it cannot work, they don’t have a strategy. It may work for one or two years. But that’s all.

Harry: I just have a couple of things to say. Just because a strategy fails does not mean there is no strategy. To say that there are limits to what has been achieved so far through the use of the Gulf War is not to say that nothing was attempted and nothing was accomplished. The fact of the matter is that there has been a stabilization of the oil fields in the Gulf and around the seat of the world. The message went to Nigeria and to a lot of other places. The spring in Caracas and Venezuela mirrored that of the Gulf. That initiative has made the slogan of people in those areas extremely difficult. The Palesstinians are suffering the consequences, but they are not alone. The homeless working class is suffering the consequences. The fact of the matter is that in the Gulf War Bush was responsible for the killing of Saddam Hussein’s opposition. You will remember the Revolutionary Guards were pulled back from the front in Kuwait and they were not wiped out. In a very real material sense the Gulf War left Saddam Hussein in better control internally than he was before. That was the result, and I would argue that there was a strategy to use the war to regain control over the working class. In the US the war was being used to intensify all sorts of attacks on the working class. The fact that they haven’t always succeeded doesn’t mean it wasn’t a strategy.

The second thing concerns nationalism and racism. To say nationalism and racism have failed in Africa is an assumption I just don’t understand. The racism in South Africa, the capture of that nation, or apartheid, through the struggle of the black working class in South Africa has been an integral part of this rise of capital. That racism functioned for a very long time in the context of the global accumulation of capital to make possible the existence of a monetary system of a certain sort (based on gold) and the extraction of vast quantities of surplus value. You don’t measure the success of a racist strategy by whether or not the workers are well off in a particular sector of the world, for God’s sake, or whether capital expands in association with that particular place. Imperialism is the differential accumulation of constant and surplus capital and an international hierarchy of income. When you get right down to it this is what Marxian analysis is all about: accumulation is always uneven. The IMF imposition of austerity in Africa facilitates the extraction of surplus value everywhere. The surplus value produced in Africa is being transferred through international pricing, transferred through the manipulation of money and commodity prices out of Africa, like it always has been.

Sitha: What is socialism?

Harry: What do I mean by the time for socialism is gone and how else are you going to relieve the problems of war and poverty for humanity? I don’t mean that we abandon the struggle against capitalism and that we abolish the struggle to create a new world by any means. I mean that the concept of socialism has been tangential in a lot of ways. Ultimately the problem with it was that it posed the idea of replacing one kind of homogeneous society by another homogeneous society. That’s the project which is sorry, it should be gone. I also know it’s not gone for a lot of people, they are hell bent on doing it. But they are not going to succeed because it is impossible at this point in history. The class struggle has moved way beyond that. It may be that it was a sustainable illusion for a certain period of time, but I do not think that it is sustainable in the period of time. That’s what I mean by the time for socialism is gone — not that we don’t have to replace capitalism, not that we won’t do social alterations — but that the old forms that are still being clung to are connected to the social processes which most likely to contribute to the actual transcendence of capitalism.

Hill: I was asked to define socialism. I define it as a society where creative labour becomes mastered for a prime want — the way it is defined by Marx. Everything that follows from that and the way we go out of the question of income and a few other things. Obviously in a socialist society you do not have a law of value. It is planned, and planning involves the continuous regulation by the economy and society by the direct producers. There is total democracy if you want to call it that.

You also made the point, that I completely fail to understand, about the present epoch in terms of Iraq or South Africa or that kind of thing where there are wars all over the place. Of course there are wars all over the place. But that is not the same as war. The question is, are there wars all over the place, these different forms, amount to work in the same way as before, with the same degree of efficiency as before? And are they going to extend the working class in the same way? That is the question. When capitalist powers are getting into Iraq, does it mean that the class is being expanded, intensified, or removed?
The leopard in the 20th century
value, struggle and administration

An examination of the changes within capitalism as a response to the development of the antagonistic class. By William Dixon

"Sogliamo che non riprecosa come è bisogna che non creda" (It we want everything to stay as is, everything has to change). The Leopard, Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa.

Capitalism is a combination of both subjective and objective factors. In terms of the objective, capitalism is a system that operates through certain social categories, for example the opposition of use value and exchange value. From an analysis of such categories we may derive some conclusions regarding the tendency of the system. These in turn may appear then as expressing the laws of the system. As a specific and determinate historical system capitalism does have objective characteristics, it is not finalistic, it is not primitive communism, it has its own form. The surplus is appropriated as surplus value. We could now have the analysis here and reproduce all the wrong aspects of "scientific" Marxism. Capitalism would then be seen as moving through objective laws. It would appear in this light as a natural world system. Too much of Marxism has appeared to endorse this approach. For example we are led to believe in a set of objective conditions for the emergence, by history - class. And the working class is woken up. Unlike this the working classes do not to play. The subjectivism appears to have no historical premise until the final moment. The development of capital is seen as proceeding according to its own laws and through the intervention of capitals.

The alternative is that we continue the struggle of the working class. This has been partially characteristic of the struggle but they have had no monopoly. This view has been necessary because of the previous orthodoxy of Marxism. It fails to consider adequately not just the categories through which struggle must move but also how the struggle leads to development of the antagonistic and hence new conditions of struggle.

We need to develop an understanding of capital as embodying both objective and subjective aspects. As capitals develop so do the subjective aspect become more important, indeed decisive. This is an objective aspect of a system that does not help but develop through the development of the division of labour and hence the creation of social labour as a global, truly social phenomenon.

The conception of "partial suspensions of the law of value" is central to a thesis that attempts to understand the political economy of the twentieth century as the intersection of the subjective and objective. The formation of the working class and its political development are taken into account as well as modifications in bourgeois society by which it was constituted. In some partial suspensions of the law of value are located at the heart of a twentieth-century political economy that has been characterised by both the appearance of the revolutionary proletariat and also by regimes that have successfully undermined these trends. Capital has no natural laws but it is a system that is committed to change only in specific ways, through the categories and their modifications, of the law of value.

The view that explains twentieth-century political economy on the basis of partial suspensions of the law of value contexts what have been the orthodox right and left views that the USSR was a communist experience and the welfare states represented an advance of the working class. In this view the significance of the Eastern European events of 1989 is that they mark an important milestone in the democratisation of anti-working class regimes. Similarly, the success of right-wing free market projects in the West are indicative of a profound crisis in left-wing political groups that have failed to represent the actual movement of the working class.

In short the significant feature of the late twentieth-century has been of regimes concerned on the basis of the prevention of communism, especially democratic, often conservative, adversarial regimes. The virtually wholesale implication of the left in these regimes has led to the disorganisation of working class responses to the democratic opportunities of this period.

It is politically necessary to retain the communist perspective, to show a sharp line through the left on this basis. If this is to avoid any serious illusion of purity, the inquest released on oligarch to eradicate the need to retain theory as the specific prelude of the working class and communism as the heart of the movement. It is necessary to lay claim to a perspective that is coherent that humanity's development while proceeding through the productive forces, cannot establish a creative reason short of communism. Only then can the real creative individuality of our species be realised. Only then will individual development be freed from the internal limits of money and administration. Only then can individual development be truly social.

The point now is to establish the communist perspective without apology and without compromise. The realism of theory as the description of the real movement, the historic tendency to communism, is necessary in order not just to exempt practice, but also to disrupt and alter a left that has been complacent in the prevention of communism. This is not the least that has been achieved. If the revolutionary communist perspective is related to it, the development of humanity, the essential criterion of the historic subject, only then will
the emergent hostility to so much of the left he shows up.

It is necessary to the revival of the communal perspective to
grasp the political economy of bourgeois society as it has developed
in the twentieth century. So much of this period has been seen
unwittingly as representing working-class progress. This program
must be redefined from the perspective of communism. The
possibility of such an approach is not illusory, it is a real develop-
ment that makes theory possible and necessary. The rude fact
stating on the face of the old ideologies is that the previous
regime broke down not only without working class support but
actually under the impact of working class opposition or resistance.
After the breakdown of all this program, all those limiting forms,
really leaves us no choice but materialism.

In this article I will outline the phenomena from which the
conception of partial suspensions of the laws of value arises. After
this I will explain briefly the view of law of value from which it
was possible to explain partial suspensions. When this is done I
will explain why this is a fruitful analogy by outlining the various
facts, experiences, problems I can take account of within a theor-
cal framework that has an essentially simple core.

Grasping Politicised Facts

In the article I refer to "we". This includes several different people.
They had in common that they were ex-members of different
political regiments aware of the limitations of their own backgroun-
des desperate to leap into another segment, not looking for position,
but searching for an end. Although the experience of the prevention
of communism was by Brad and Dixon (Radical Chasm 1) there
were several other voices hidden in that text.

We had in common the need to make an understanding of the
present situation. While each would hold to the contributions they
could make from their respective backgrounds there was a desire
for an ecumenical addition of this from different traditions. We
all recognized that the common theory we sought would have to
have its own basic simplicity from which evidently we could
compare the different Realisations which we acquire. We should
recognize that there was a need for a theory and not for an
agglomeration of chaos.

As an immediate motivation was to make sense of the acute strain
of the left in relation to the current development of bourgeois society.
We shared the conviction, based on experience, that the left had not
connected with any communal perspective, irrespective of its minor
variant. This was because of the enormous apparent anagogues,
Trotskyn, Left Communism, Anarcho-Laisne, etc. Each knew
what was wrong with the other but remained essentially attached to
its own limitation. The problem to be addressed was certainly not
the success of the right (which all tended to be avoiding) nor other
the horrendous failure of the left. In this light there was little to
be gained through adopting one form with militancy and then
having the rest of the left from that position. Sectoralism is this
multiple awareness.

Our initial focus was on the twentieth century success of social
democracy in the West while the Left and "Third World" was the
political power of what we still refer to an identified as Leftism.
These phenomena we regarded as something more than merely political entities. While clearly, focused, modernist, on the side of capital's survival, they could not easily be characterized as capitalist in nature, anywhere as that they could be claimed as
wonderful victories for the working class, as forms institutional to
anything but that.

It appeared on both sides, Left and West, that communism had
been blocked and that the social forms that had evolved depended
on their existence on this barbarism. Furthermore the left was
critically involved in this barrier. In fact several forms of socialist
organisation had developed, at best, abstracted relations to the
working class. It was clear that the left was actually a central
element of the prevention of communism.

Our initial critical perspective towards the left allowed us to
make sense of a split between class struggle and many of the forms
of the labour movement (i.e. CIO, Social Democratic Parties, trade
unions etc.) There were clearly struggles that had newly
developed autonomy from the usual representative forms. At the
marginals there were struggles to hold up the limiting function of
the welfare state. In fact a critical perspective to these forms
would have been meaningless if there had not been new social
movement outside and against them. The critique of these forms already had
a social expression.

There are never straightforward facts. It was our specific con-
cerns as political activists able to share different experiences and
perspectives that lead to the particular group of the problem to
be confronted. The facts themselves were politicised. We needed
to understand the blockages of the movement to communism and the
development of highly dubious, indeed repressive, social forms
supported by many years of the left. The experience of these forms
was only common enough amongst many activists but they were
provable as being opened by the repeated refusal of apparent
working class forms to actual working class struggle.

Our initial attempt to grasp these facts was the thought that the
relationship between socialist forms and the blockage of commu-
nism could not be accidental but was an important necessary
connection. We came to regard these forms as transitional to communism
but as necessary forms of the prevention of communism. Although
the approach as a whole may be transitional we regarded the prevention
of communism as an inevitable institution within this tradition.
Clearly this required a questioning of the concepts of tradition.
We were inclined to sympathy with a discontinuous conception
clings to that theorized by Franzek rather than what
we considered the misleading continuity in tradition of Trotsky.

The latter conception tended to absorb some variant to forms
instituted to the working class. In fact with the appearance of the
protagonist as historical subject at the end of the nineteenth
century, beginning of the twentieth century, working class "trade" had
become the condition for the survival of bourgeois society. There-
fore was marked by the requirement that bourgeois energy should
speak a language of subordination to the working class but over-
whelmingly should not see a discipline over it.

We stuck instead evident that planning could only be the transactional
activity undertaken by a subject with its bounded capacities within
social processes. In other words for humanity the possibility
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of planning would be the formation of the working class as a new class, as the social power with the nobility by external irritation. It was obvious that no such process took place in the Soviet Union. The preservation of the social order and isolation from the class to class planning by successive and bureaucratic roads would never be sufficient evidence that planning was taking place.

Our conception of consciousness allowed us to view the social forms as quite distinct from planning, as administrative processes that had supplanted the functions of the money system but in which the social discipline of the collective was not established. It was clear that the ideology became a West or East was never victorious of the working class anymore than they were victorious of the bourgeois. Talk of victory and defeat may be available to those who still weighed class struggles as if it were a man sport but the realization of social process is not within the matter. We assumed that the bourgeois survive as its favorite political issue the bourgeoisie in here but that they will always "win" until the social system is overthrown. Reference and reference to different codes and words and points, and do it, is a barrier we allowed to identify real transformations in political economy. The conditions of socio- economic and control over the surplus had changed in anticipation and prevention of transformation.

It was inevitable that the development of proletarian potential would provide measures to formalize it. Where the working class had developed those measures could not be largely repressive but would have to be channelled in terms of a formal recognition of the needs of the working class. The survival of the bourgeoisie required the opening of a political channel to the working class but of course leave the other labor not much interrupted into this process of class formation. Since at least the 1890s bourgeoisie and social had been involved in terms of a working class project, or rather, a project on behalf of the working class. They were all egalitarian, magnificently attracting to their social sympathy while coming up with their "progressive" schemes for irresponsible working class improvement.

For the time social progress was not accommodated within a theoretical framework that grasped it also as the prevention of capitalism. The question thus was not an quantitative one concerning how much better people are living, but it is a theoretical one of uncovering what essential vectors the system had changed. According to this criterion the social change is understood by the orientation of the system to needs and the limits of this change.

The essential feature for the problems outlined here, what I may term political face, came out of my understanding of the operation of the law of value. Indeed it had to. We followed Marx in identifying the law of value as the central mechanisms and social forms of capitalism. The surplus value, monopoly, capital, interest, as the forms of value. The social dominance of exchange value marked the social dominance of capital itself. All previous social forms had forms of power, domination etc. The problem that had to be approached was the free of the capitalistic form, the free of the law of value.

It is possible to identify the immediate dominance of the system at different times. In the period of capital's ascendancy the tendency was to assert the rule of the law of value, that is to say every all the social and modifications. In the sense the role was the substitution of need to exchange. We can see it established and recommended in the works of Smith and Ricardo. These formalized the theoretical basis for the movements of forces that allowed and expressed the social rule of money, become capital. It is this period, from late eighteenth century to mid-nineteenth century, that was the height of the movement to supplant the economic and material center through price structures. The perspective achievement of the law of value, that is to say, the domination of need by exchange, was not consistent in the way a threat to the system but as its completion and triumphs. Although never achieved with a number of the law of value won the essential essence of the existing system.

It was on the basis of this system, in this period, that Marx developed his critique of political economy. This included his identification, in the final stages of Das Kapital, of the nature of exchange value and use value, abstract and concrete labour. He certainly did not want to be by passing areas of exceptions and departures from simple commodity development, such a presentation would have negated the scientific purpose of this work. He showed the system of domination of needs by exchange to be inseparable from the social organization of productive and to limit the inadequacy of exchange from value production. This is especially true when we view the system from the necessary transcendence of value by production for the end.

The law of value was the institution, domination, of social labour through exchange value. Through the tendency for products to exchange as equivalents, different commodities labour are squandered. In this exchange their common characteristics of being abstract human labour is seen. They are thus, in this act of exchange, socially validated as consuming quantity of socially necessary labour. It is characteristic of empiric that the social validation requires the act of exchange and that it occurs after the fact of production. Only in this act of exchange is abstract labour socially constituted as such because only in this act different abstract labour becomes a relation of equality to each other. Without this act the wage of some common characteristic, abstract labour, has no social or legal meaning. The possibility of squaring different abstracts labour is not in idea nor is it necessarily by exchange. It can only, and must, be established in the exchange of the products themselves. The equality insured by the exchange and only then can be discovered by the investigator.

The law of value may appear as a functional process, a system of distribution of social labour. Indeed it is necessary that he does achieve a regulatory function. From this we may go on conclude that the social exchange is the social relation itself. Of course it is not. Although exchange is necessary for the existence of abstract labour it is not in itself sufficient. Exchange has existed for thousands of years without human labour being systematically reduced to exchange labour. The existence of exchange is not the same as the social domination. Where it acts only in the interests of society abstract labour cannot be said to have come into being. In such a society the majority of products are made for use even if under pressure. For the law of value to be the social form labour must be subject to its discipline, that is to say the requirements of successful exchange. The existence of exchange only reduces this potential but is not the same as realization.

Where the law of value prevails society necessarily ex-
change value, hence money, must be destroyed. If exchange is universal then there must be the universal equivalent. For this to have nonexcludable public conditions must have come into being. The natural condition is the lack of labour power. This requires the separation of the labourer from the means of production. It is in this separation that we see the social relation necessary to the law of value. It is only in this separation that labour is thrown by necessity into the world of exchange, that labour capacity itself becomes an exchange value. So we can only be on this basis, the conception of the law of value, that the law of value can become the social regulation of labour. In this circumstance the law of value is the form of relation of labour to itself. In the social existence of the working class as labour power.

In the absence of the separation of labour from the means of production, the absence of labour power as a commodity, the law of value cannot develop adequately as a social form. There can still exist production for site, whether in cooperative or non-cooperative form, in either case concrete labourers are not excluded through exchange and hence abstract labour is not excluded. We find then that abstract labour has another condition as necessary as exchange itself, that is absolute poverty. This condition is not accidental but is the other side of the formation of abstract labour. In the separation of labour from the means of production labour is abstracted, it is in turn alienated from its specific productive ability. In this moment it is called abstract labour but not yet in the process of social validation, though meaning this validation as a matter of life or death. It relates to the latter that it is impelled to enter exchange. As the condition of value production, absolute poverty is the separation of labour from all means of production including itself, it is the required abstraction over which value is the necessary mediation.

What has been described here is the social relation of money representing the social value confronting labour power as commodity in the society-wide world of capital. It should be obvious to anyone that in this world as described here the existence of abstract labour, the operation of the law of value, ensues, is inseparable from the necessity for the state. It is the expressed form by which the separation of labour and means of production is ensured. It is the guarantor of the security of the property of the working class. The only way it plays its role is as the abstraction of labour. This essential use value of capital and the use value without which there is no capital relation is labour capacity itself. That is the immediate source of value. This capacity is peculiar in that as production its use value is not a simple result of concrete labour, its existence as use value must be sustained throughout its existence.

The most important commodity is produced by this "invisible" hand of production.

In its unspoken and unitary power over society the state guards the assured existence of the working class. It guarantees the everyday normality of the mediation of the law of value. It swore, with all its omnipotence, not only for the social existence of the law of value it is bringing through. Through its laws and regulations and policies this social existence is effective as a commodity and is economi-

---

For an essential operation the law of value requires the absolute poverty of the worker. This is necessary to exchange so as to be able to equate different concrete labourers in terms of abstract labour. To be fair then, for the worker, live means to work for the wage. The law of exchange is a form in the complete organization of society to money mediation. It is because of this that we can identify the law of value as not merely a distributive mechanism but as the social existence of the working class. The law of value that is not apart from the working class as a separate mechanism it would be more properly described as the law of value in the existence of the working class external apart from itself. Needs and capacities are not apart. Capital itself is the means of the collective power as productive value. Awareness it is in a relative sense, the realized absence of subjectivity.

The abstraction of the working class is crucial to the operation of the law of value just as the law of value is necessary for the abstracted working class. In full form the working class we use the full operation of commodity fetishism in which social relations take the form of relations between things. The development of this is in the first chapters of Marx's Das Kapital. I shall return to this later.

Bourgeois Reform: Absolute Poverty and the Unified Wage.

From the point of view of capitalist reform appropriate state structures must be established for the full operation of the law of value. I have already mentioned the defense of private property; this is to be seen as more than enough. The other side is the regulation of the poverty of the working class. In concrete terms this would take the form, in the face of the nineth century, of a debate about the poor laws and the poverty composition of the working class. This in turn would become a real political struggle between bourgeois and landlord interests. At the heart of this struggle was the relation of the working class.

This was the period of bourgeois reform as it pushed towards the detri-
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The centrality of the unified wage as a distinguishing characteristic of the political economy is derived from its significance in the creation of a regime over labor needs. The unified wage is a particular form of domination over needs; there are other forms but this is the specifically capitalist form in which needs are fully subordinated to exchange value, in money. As capital moves towards the unified wage it pushes towards the full internalisation of its own political economy and the achievement of commodity fetishism.

In the early period there was no attempt to make the education of the working class a priority of the political economy. BROOKS notes that the independent laborers are not the center of life for the working class. In this figure the working class are expected to identify the dignity of their own existence. As one scholar has summarised these descriptive effusions they were a 'campaign of ostracism' (M. Gibbons, Victorian Studies, Vol II, Dec 1987). This is not, however, comprehensive, the essence of the message was that the working class could not be seen through collective action but rather through the dignified, self-reliant, independent channel of work. At the same time the hidden labour was being valorised through value. This same point was with delightful simplicity by the author of the Poor Law Report of 1834. In defining that the form of relief they quoted that "it has never been deemed expedient that the provisions should extend to the relief of poverty that is, the ease of one who, in order to obtain a mere existence, is forced to have reserves to labor." (Poor Law Report of 1834, Penguin 1976). Freedon has never been as efficiently described.

In the matter of the poor laws and the advocates had prepared the way for their solution through the setting up of social savings banks that would enable workers to save from their wage and then in subsequent periods of need to disburse back funds for survival. In this way the principle of the unified wage would be assured while practical measures were to deal with periods of stagnation of trade were put in place. Despite this initial tendency the actual reforms of the poor law did not go far as some of these political economists had hoped.

The new Act of 1834 still allowed for the provision of relief, but there was nevertheless little moving the real tendency and size of the legislation, putting to an end a dependence from independent laborers. In this respect it involved a break from economic, social and political feudalism. Senior, the principal author of the new Act, defended it when he said that previously, "...a large portion of the labourers of England were treated not as freemen but as slaves or domestic servants, and received not usually weekly wages, regulated by the value of their service, but rates appointed to their supposed wants..." (Senor, The Report Of The Landlord (Weaver). The unified wage model in these circumstances was regarded as a goal for the working class; it was also through a declaration of the absolute poverty of the working class, the full actualisation of wages to the process of accumulation. It announced the end of particular and personal dependence and a new world of universalised and democratic dependence. This also saw the emergence of the perfection of universal labour as the condition of the necessity to work, against the progressively diminished influence of the previous operation of the poor law. Workers would be fully committed to the accumulation from which arose the demand for their labour. The actual act institutionalised a positive system of administration over relief that would alter the distribution from a periphery. It formally preserved poverty as an essential criterion from society, as the administrative simulacrum of starvation. The unified wage model was the central paradigm of this period. It was the core of the educative measures of political economy; it defended a self-detached path for improvement by the working class.

In the 1830s the movement of workers towards the unification of the wage, the abolition of that part of the wages received as partial relief. In legislation the Poor Law Amendment Act went much of the way to achieving this paradigm and some way towards the creation of the independent labourer. This period may also be identified as the high point of the law of value. However, as the aspiration of bourgeois political economy, the unified wage of absolute poverty would begin to be modified under the impact of the development of the working class. As is done by anyone reading, the first chapters of Das Kapital, commodity fetishism is understood as resting on specific social conditions. As the foregoing analyses have already demonstrated, this limitation of the world of commodities arises from the peculiar social discipline of the labour which produces them. Origins of ability incomes commodity only because they use the products of the labour of all those individuals who work, independently of each other... Since the products do not come into social contact until they exchange their products of labour, the specific social character of their private labour appears only within this exchange." (Marx, Capital, vol I, 1867, Leningrad). The condition of the mediation by exchange is the independence of the producers, their alienation. This is no psychological, philosophical, or subjective phenomenon. This is a real social condition but it is deprecated by this because it is subject to real social movements. The aim of the stresses of social labour. This is its separation from itself in absolute poverty. Commodity fetishism is not then a pleasurable escapism the materiality of the relationship of commodity production but does no action of the working class itself. The formation of the class cannot help but undermine the social conditions of commodity fetishism. It brings forward the practical possibility of social labour. This is to turn open the eyes of society for intellectuals to understand the social phenomenon.

There are no entry fees but a real development within capital that changes its own conditions of existence. The necessary struggle towards wages must create the conditions in which wages are through the operation of the law of value. This is no philosophical discovery but is a practical result of and in human conditions for the process of class formation. Inevitably to describe it as "working through" is its self-identification. It must be more accurate to say that the struggle itself conditions the new social processes. This involves an element of "working through", in this sense class identity, necessarily anonymized, begins to be lived.

True, there continues on the audience the exchange the equivalence that can be found in itself is no more that the exchange is far from being the basis of production. Here in the terms of society there is more a basis within the 'worth' of the exchange. This exchange of equivocals concepts, it is only the author/payer of a production which makes on the appropriation of alien labour without exchange, but with the repudiation of exchange... there is no longer any ground for autonomous that the system of exchange values-exchange of equivocals mediated through labour - turns in, or rather reveals its hidden background, the appropriation of alien labour without exchange, complete separation of labour and property." (Marx Grundlay p.490).

The revelation of the hidden background is governed within the system itself as part of its own development. The crucial point is the recognition by workers of its wage as a product of the produce. The political economists would present the wage as received in
exchange for a specific use-value, as an exchange of equivalence but not: "As owner as this is in one regard, it also introduces the apparent
form of better, of exchange, so that when competition permits the
worker to be paid and to agree with the capitalists, he becomes the
demand against the capitalist's profit and demand a certain share
of the surplus value created by him, so that the proportion itself
becomes a real moment of economic life itself. Further, in the
struggle between the classes - which necessarily arises with the
development of the working class - the measurement of the distance
between them, which, precisely, is expressed by wages itself as a
property, becomes decisively important. The semblance of ex-
change variances is the course of the mode of production founded on
capital." (Gramsci, p.69).
The essential element in the process outlined here by Marx is the development of working class cogi-
nation. The necessity for these exchanges as the real basis of the
relation in production and forms the basis for grasping new prin-
ciples of social organization. Marx understands commodity (use-
value) as being subordinated within the course of capitalist develop-
ment.

The division of labour mediated by exchange, production by
exchange i.e. production of value, generates the social condition for
the existence of labour as a self-forgetful subject and as productive
for use. The social conditions necessary, indeed intrinsically part of
the law of value mean that struggle is not just a struggle over pro-
duction, production was over abstraction, but it is more fundamen-
tally antagonistic struggle. All struggle by the working class over
its conditions of life, whether wages, hours, welfare or whatever
asserts a principle antagonistic to capitalism that production for use
human need joined to human capacity. In moving through the
categories of the system the struggle cannot help but show the
intermediate limit of the system. Of course this is not magically
transformed into commodification. The point for now though is this,
the struggle under the capitalist system is explosive and creative
because within it is the principle of a new social system. The
contradiction of capital between value and use means that class
struggle in continuously confronting the limit of the system must
develop theory. The antagonism over production cannot help but
manifest in a more transgressive level. This not only excludes the
consciousness of the workers but also of the bourgeoisie.

The Enemy Within.

When confident itself as the end of the tyranny of feudalism and
as the completion of humanity, capital's tendency is towards the
unified wage and, under production for exchange, the full automa-
tion of need to money. With Ricardo we find a ready confidence
that workers are growing in independence and arising to a knowl-
dge of political economy. Capital appears here as all the glory of an
invincible objectivity. This objectivity exists as the absence of a
collectively conscious subjectivity. Workers' subjectivity is in
amount to no more than individual knowledge of this ruling
subjectivity.

As the division of labour progresses, and with the formation
of the working class, the assertion of the full subordination of needs
to money appears as ever more dangerous to the survival of the
bourgeoisie-system. Real development lowers on the political econo-
mics the recognition of a subjectivity in the working class that has
taken away from this moment of capital's objectivity. The movement
will gradually from the cold assertion of capital to insurpass
through the prevention of communism. In this movement's partial
advancement is found in the orientation of the system to need.

The process of class formation forces on capital the necessity to
intervene in this formation. At this core of this intervention there
must be a change in the orientation of needs, otherwise there could
be no intervention in subjectivity. The political conditions of the
unified wage allowed no scope for a political development of the
working class within capital. Needs could not be restructured within
bourgeois political classness but was supposed channelled through
accumulation. At a certain point this becomes a dangerous political
rigidity for capital. At this pure simple repudiation of the social form
of the working class's inadmissibility. Towards the end of the nine-
teenth century it is not just that the working class is recognised
as an antagonistic force to capital but it has acquired a social status
within which it could with impunity discuss the future of bourgeois
society. Thus, the way from Ricardo's beneficent vision of the
independent labourer whose subjectivity consisted of seeming to
acknowledge the system.

In relation to the subordinating subjectivity it could be said
that the system, even if temporarily, had a type of objectivity to
which Ricardo subjugated his science and explained 'natural' price.
Such objectivity could only endure when there arose within it a
socially bounded subjectivity that was playing an alternative. This
disrupted the 'worker'. There was not only a growth of working
class organizations but laws of theory so inherent principles derived
from a practice and experience that was antagonistic to political
economy. Under the conditions of the unified wage these new
movements would tend to reconcile a debate on the assertion of
human needs. Political economy was recognised by the working
classes as an enemy; political economy need had charge if profit
theology was to remain the same. The Leopard would change its
spots. From at least the 1870s but gathering an accelerating momen-
tum from the mid-1880s these developed movements within re-
spective society that asserted their basis a recognition of the need
for a class political channel in which working class movements could
be contained and defined. The intellectual and social develop-
mament of this movement was to be found through the principal infu-
ences of the later nineteenth century. In different thinkers and campa-
gen developments, and an emphasis on the role of the middle classes,
and a role in the longer term, the dominant economic and social
trends of the time, and the role of the middle classes, in economic
and social trends of the time, and the role of the middle classes,
and a role in the longer term, the dominant economic and social
trends of the time, and the role of the middle classes,
and a role in the longer term, the dominant economic and social

The Division of the Wage

At the core of the new political economy, interminable in relation to class formation, was the modification of absolute poverty. Needs would then be recognized outside the official wage. There was no divided wage, in one side the enterprise wage still subject to the demands of profit and on the other the social wage subject to the discipline of administration. It is at this point that we can speak of the emergence of a parasitic division of the wage. The regime of needs lived by the working class was changed; it is still a regime, of course, but through the divided wage there was a modification in the construction of needs. There could exist new needs not inside the immediate discipline of exchange, of money. This would in turn affect the relation between shared and common labour. As we have seen a social condition of absolute labour is absolute poverty: if this is modified, if economic necessity deprives the cold rate of money from the substance of accumulation itself may be vitalized. Capital may lead to find itself confronting an all too anonymous labour in the sense that needs have entered an area in which political articulation appears to replace the immediate discipline of enterprise calculation.

Partial suspensions should not rest confused with complete abolishment. Where something is partially suspended it should be clear that it still operates, if it is modified from. The next question is how it operates. This will be a partial suspension in a more developed sense already made. I have already emphasized above that the law of value is not simply a mechanism of distribution and nor is it adequate that absolute labour is established through exchange. The law of value and the mediation of social labour is also the form of existence of that labour, its social accumulation, and requires for its irrepressible condition the necessity on the part of labour to sell its labour power. This point is worth emphasizing with another quote from Marx, “For the domination of exchange value itself, and of exchange-value-producing provision, presupposes alien labour capacity itself as an exchange value i.e. the separation of living labour capacity from its objective conditions; it rests upon them - or to its own objectivity - as alien property relations, as well as of its formative division so as to be the base of need. The recognition is there, can be assumed, but falls short of what would be planned. This highlights an important element in the meaning of formal recognition; it remains mediated and separated from oppressivity. Although the discipline is not immediate, the ultimate purpose of the change is to preserve accumulation. As such need recognition must be formal, facing poverty rather than relieving it, and the economic necessity of the system no longer takes on a natural but is identified with administration itself.”

Administration: The Precise Form of Capital’s Ambiguity

The division of the wage opened a channel that conditioned the impact of the radical critique. An empty politics could develop, crucially within capital. It was mess just as it presupposed containment in class rage, continued production for value, even if it did have to be founded on new change. This project, now identified as left-wing or social, had its roots earlier but its appearance as a classical face strategy may be located in the People’s Budget of 1969. From here there began a new regime for working class needs and administrative intervention into the development of working class organizations.

Starting from the law of value as the core we can through its partial suspensions explore the development of administrative forms. The formal recognition of need that lies at the base of the divided wage acquires the necessary condition with the subversion of needs that characterizes the full operation of the law of value. It allows space in the modification of the contours of accumulative poverty for elevations of idle or labour capacity. Given the purpose of the divided wage to preserve the value of capital, the formal recognition of need has to be assimilated within the continue...
ing discipline of the requirements of the law of value. From this impossible alliance we can trace the growth of the state administrative forms in the twentieth century.

Administration is characterized by statutes that allowed to recognize and cannot recognize need, a system whose substance is absent labour, inefficiency to particular labour, producing for use, but that must allow a political channel recognizing concrete labour. Rather than assuming that needs are met i.e. rather than the social relation of planning, administration must ensure their commitment, restoration, and elimination. Enrichment is subdivided into administrative categories that turn in daily life the class. There had to be a recognition of need in formal channels but there could not be social abundance. Here the independent identities of classical political economy is to be preserved as worker by a promotion to citizen with consequences polluting in the welfare administrative forms. This is not planning. It is rather a resistance to anti-planning, the prevention and interruption of class formation.

As has been observed in a theoretical work on the state (Key and Mint, Political Order and The Law of Labour: Macduff, 1982) we can detect in administration the structurally remain of class struggle. They prove out that the origin of the world administration is appropriately in the management of the actions of masses of people. The matter of left or right wing is secondary interest. The struggle that administration has to oppose is a social administrative form. The struggle becomes the citizen. It is so obvious that this process is analogous to the abstraction of living labour by form.

The abstract on alienation appears as the formal recognition of need that removes the society for solidarity within the conditions of class formation. To put it simply there is no consciousness that is not also preservation of alienation. The formal recognition of need bears with it the requirement that it be administered. Office, roles, classifications, queues, all these preserve need as a limited environment and on the condition of subordination. In this way intervention in class formation can be made compatible with accumulation.

Commodity division is modified by direct administration. Social relations are mediated within direct administrative structures. These are essentially anti-planning the condition and implied purpose of their existence is the social alienation of the class. They preserve the formality of need recognition within the law of value. Commodity division is preserved by an administrative channel that allows the development of a political form, social democracy, which includes the Labour Party and a particular form of trade unionism. They appear in dialogue rather than as struggle. It is a curious situation in which social democracy does not confront commodity formalities yet it speaks a language of need. Its compatibilism with the law of value arises from the formation of political and economic spheres that are not only accepted but also by its existence confirmed. This separation expresses and preserves the continuous separation of need and capacity. Since social democracy allows a discharge of need within its narrow political confines it appears to normalize the separation.

Under these conditions control not only appears as necessary but more important or steps since the basis of the struggle that could achieve it can always be underlined. It is because of the state that the division of the wage is a central development within political economy. It is the precise form of capital's ambivalence.

The problem for capital is that the conditions set up for the prevention of mass action between, in turn, the basis of a new struggle. It appears that capital and the division of the wage has become the source of struggle rather than its continuities. The formal recognition of need provides a focus and indeed base of struggle that retransmits the limits of the organizational representatives, the trade unions and Labour Party, within which the formal recognition was intended to channel class formation. This breakdown was expressed outside the factory as well as in workplace relations, unofficial strikes, control over piece of work, resistance to productivity drives etc. Economically and territorially, the conditions of the divided wage were identified as part of an intersecting social package that bestowed adequate control over the workplace.

The real problem for capital in all this is that any partial suspension threatens the reproduction of labour capacity as an exchange value. Yet at the same time some modification of the absolute poverty of the working class becomes necessary of capital is to survive. The social control that capital must endeavour to contain and live with is the recognition of need. Simply, social recognition cannot be absolute poverty and so it threatens the formation of labour capacity. The substance of capital is indeed labour. The only wage is the force by which misery contains this labour. The divided wage mitigates this contradiction.

Concrete Labour, Particularity and Resistance.

To accumulate, capital cannot simply put into motion abstract labour; it must pass through particular labour, concrete labour. The alienation, alienation of capital to the concrete labour is its renunciation to use values as such, in other words the alienation of need to accumulation. This is no formal requirement. The actual control in the workplace is dependent on this overall social condition. Ineffectiveness of capital to concrete labour is for the worker substitutability. This is the thrust of this. To illustrate the significance of this we must turn to a third aspect of abstract labour.

We have identified abstract labour as established in exchange. We have seen further that this abstract absolute poverty for it to be generalized. In this sense abstract labour is also the condition of the labourerslows of all specific abilities, short of all use-making capacity and hence requiring the skill of labour power to the capitalism. The problem for capital comes to trying to seize a deal, a deal that it never in return for the wage. Of course institutions, labour management systems, co-operation are all of use for what, ultimately do they depend on? The worker's substitutability is crucial and this depends on abstraction. Yet at the same time capital cannot extract it in full. It must produce and sell actual things that require concrete labour. Capital's circuit must pass through concrete labour. This produces problems of control. Concrete labour can involve specific tasks that are not necessarily transferable. Women,
over time, as workers gain confidence based on principles of solidarity known to themselves and other workers, skills can and are imposed on capital as forms of counter control by workers. Once the fear of subalternity is overcome through the generalized level of struggle across many different sectors.

In these conditions, there is a tendency for workplace discipline to founder. To prevent capital must maintain the alienation of labour. Resistance is one moment of this but the social resistance that is associated with recession or crisis is through machinery. The particular type of work which had been able to develop their relative cushion are absorbed into machinery. Skills tend to be articulated as a tendency for the system to achieve its refinement to particular labour as an alien form of labour. Concrete labour, being in fact developed through the circuits of capital towards its particular capitalistic form of labour, to absorb labour, to more work without reducing features. This tendency is imposed by the requirements of exchange, the realization of profit in exchange. Capital accumulation, where abundance is the social labour and depends on absorbing labour, also develops a necessary labour to absorb or absorb labour. Of course, as the development advances it tends to accumulate and become to conditions of abun-
dance where labour is the basis of the system. As the alien, and later, with greater struggle against capital seek escape from concrete labour in doing so tends to reduce its own purposes. The struggle itself, the objective, moving through the objective singularities of the system, forces the system to achieve the conditions of communism.

We have examined the relations between abstract labour and the workplace, linking it to the development of forms of welfare. We have seen that the welfare system is especially dependent on general social conditions. With formal recognition of these social conditions perpetually modified. Administrative procedures maintain the contradiction of working-class control. As long as there is a tendency for these to be regulated, productivity deals, and economic policies for which the possession of the vector system is itself part of the deal. In this situation the labour movement develops a rigid and anarchistic bureaucracy that must pull the deals on which its position depends. Counter to the working class experience a greater economic security because of the formal recognition of need. This closure oriented in the workplace and instead enhances the particularity of labour. This may be overcome by some negotiation that is too is undermined by a working class that resists and opposes the bureaucratization of the movement.

This resistance is enhanced by the welfare state itself or certain requirements for which the working class had depended on its own movement were displayed by the welfare state. The success of welfare in displacing the movement was also the condition by which the working class would achieve some independence from it bureaucratization.

Conformed by these conditions is understandable that the call for the right to manage and the attack on the welfare state have been hard to hear. While many on the right may now criticize and fault with the achievements of Thatcherism there remains still a sense of relief on the left. Thatcherism allowed a "revolution" in management control. Indeed this is a malady of the change since 1974. This change has been achieved through the re-emphasis of the power of money over needs and the dissolution of forms of legislation. The system cannot extend in base to absorb labour as the substantive wealth. The creation or enhancement of a new managerial apparatus has been achieved in the form of growing economic society. For the dismantling of the welfare state, insecurity from credit to grave has become the watershed for today's state reform. It is the condition for the revolution of new working-class forms and cultures of resistance. This is turn acts as a brake on the proposed diamagnet of the welfare state in as much as they may still require a loyal opposition that has a medium of credibility. The fight against inflation with its rise in unemployment has been the visible thrust of the Thatchers campaign. At least has been the steady erosion of the divided wage, under the heading of supply-side economics, as the as-called consumers is put at the centre of economic life. The only consumer that matters in this regard is the consumer of labour power. As for the rest of us "consumer" is the definitional way in which we are expected to give up all hope of change, "consumer" is the sum of our economic, the nationalization of discipline on the state of power. "Consumer" is how we give up more and more and learn to love it. Insecurity is normalized as the foundation of work discipline. What we must observe now is the gradual change in the politics of the labour movement as it finds increasingly difficult to express needs that arise from this economic insecurity and which must tend to focus on the money system as an enemy. This process has already started but is one that takes years and not days or months.

Analysis - For Communism

The analysis presented here is certainly not complete. I have for example deliberately avoided the development of finance capital. This would have been crucial if we required a new full understanding of why it is a prerequisite and not abolition of the laws of value that is described here. Although this is important it is beyond the scope of this article's limited purpose. Nonetheless, some preliminary conclusions can be offered.

Suffice it for now that particular aspects of the law of value have tended to mediate the tendency to absorb labour through national forms that from the viewpoint of value quite unnecessarily link together large groups of moreover labour. This rationalization of alienage had a political purpose in serving to undertake the international tendency of the workers' movement. This national element would however eventually become an obstacle, a basis of struggle, that was identified as the anti-philosophy of Europe. As capital escaped its national forms so it required the first purchase of labour power, the composition of a white labour market.

The advantages of this form of analysis can be summarized briefly:

1. The analysis puts the law of value at the centre. Agreement or disagreement requires a grasp of the law of value. This is not the case in the popular debate concerning the law of value. The tendency to sweep aside the narrow confines of the left's political analysis, e.g., its focus on the campaign, culture etc. and to develop a theory at the level of political economy (and its critique). This is whether or not the left is capable of seeing the emergence of the immediate situation to develop the new labour market and does not deliver.
struggle for needs. From division of labour mediated by exchange value to the struggle for production for use the movement to communism is seen as insurmountable.

6. This theory explains the political passiveness of the inventories century without recourse to external agencies, debt or machines or some supposed injustice on the part of humanity. For example social democracy is located as having developed as the form dependent on the division of the wage, i.e. as an aspect of the modification of bourgeois political economy. We can explain real passiveness in the political sphere as arising from change in the political economy and these in turn result from the development of the historic subject as a consequence of the development of the division of labour. The system has its own history; the subjectivity is internal to it, we might say as an objective aspect.

7. The analysis constructs the same material that led people to the belief in the Forward March of Labour Hallett but makes quite different conclusions. The crucial element in this march was not the development of class subjectivity but rather alteration of bourgeois political economy to persuade and formulate the basis for that subjectivity. It is not a forward march that is halted but the prevention of communism that is shown to be an inadequate social form.

8. From the present analysis it follows that the crisis of the organisational forms of the prevention of communism in a crisis of a relation to the working class. Underneath this lies the more specific issue, in fact the dominant issue, what will be the outcomes of the present changes in the labour movement? Will the current organisational forms of the working class, the incumbent labour movement, develop? What has been revealed is that these forms were inadequate for sustaining the working class. The relation to neoliberalism and the working class struggle implies a social context that must precede the inadequacy of administration. This is in turn implies a rather more serious crisis in a labour movement that has been too often tied into ideological entanglements. However there is no magical transformation of working class organisations; the forms of organisation to the exposed phase of the welfare state cannot adjust immediately to the erosion of the welfare state.

9. The ambiguity of capital forms. If the prevention of communism was inadequate it might appear that the fine matter is the only social logic were the formal recognition of need "solved". Yet as the welfare state is questioned, unemployment grows and economic insecurity becomes the central principle of the market of choice, the end of government, so it would appear that the working class is pushed into defending the welfare state. Yet despite resistance at local level and over particular issues this has not happened in any significant manner, notwithstanding important sit-ins such as the poll tax. The Labour Party and TUC have so far survived the social upheaval although changes are obviously in train.

10. As many have predicted, unemployment enters terrain, if even recovery will not get rid of the problem and it also seems likely, especially in Britain, that the responses themselves are short-lived and if we are to see some further changes in competition with more chaotic reductions and modifications of the welfare state than in the last few years the present forms of working class organisation will prove inadequate. In a small and still significant way we have already seen this in the poll tax campaign. The problem for theory is to find forms that are adequate to control the working class. For the problem is whether or not the labour movement will found the death-knell of bourgeois society.

The analysis presented here is a reaffirmation of communism as the tendency of the struggle. The placing of seeds in the breeze, simultaneously places the working class at the centre not simply as an agent of struggle but as the bearer of a new organisational principle than, as its insubstantial organisation to value, must make capital a socially explosive and eventually doomed system.
Revolutionary movements, theory and practice: The Peruvian experience of the 1980s

Why has the Maoist guerilla movement, Sendero Luminoso (the Shining Path), thrived when the rest of Stalinitism is in such crisis? By Bill Langan

"Father of mine, your nose like the great sky, hear me: the heart of the nation is now more terrifying, more fickle, more hopeless than ever. They have corrupted our very own brothers, robbed their heads and together killing an armed with weapons that the king of Devils himself couldn't invent or produce. And yet there is a great light in our Sun! We are living! We have descended upon the city of the destruction. It's from there that I speak to you. We have descended like the endless columns of mist in the great jungle. Here we are, with you beloved leader, unforgivable, eternal Amaru." Guzmán Acuña, leading Peruvian Indian author, from his extended poems 'To Our Creator Pather Tupac Amaru' (in this week's Kankuró)

In 1968 the military took power in Peru and, presenting themselves as a "national revolutionary government", managed to re-shalack the revolutionary fervours affecting all social sectors under their "democratic" process, provoking the most atrocious repression of the 1980s, giving way fully to repression and then a return to democracy under popular pressure at the end of the decade.

During the 1980 elections which marked this transition, the Communist Party of Peru (Sendero Luminoso) declared the start of its "people's war" after nearly a decade of "counter-revolution". The conservative Belaustegui government (1980-85) was preceded by the left-coffin CAPRA government (1980-85), which in turn was defaced by the current president, Alberto Fujimori. He has played a leading role in the present Peruvian government, provoking the most atrocious repression of the 1980s, giving way fully to repression and then a return to democracy under popular pressure at the end of the decade.

Contrary to popular belief, Peru is not a country of peasants, despite the widespread belief that its people are "peasant". However, a large part of the "urban" population is concentrated in and around provincial towns and they maintain close family and social links with the rural population. Although the growth of the informal sector in urban areas has been widely commented on, what is less widely commented on is the perpetuation of this sector over the decades in terms of income levels compared to that of the more traditional working class.

Peru is a country rich in characters who have achieved to compose critical theory which

The Social Movement Theorists

What I would like to do is to hold up the experiences of Sendero (as a revolutionary movement acting in modern conditions) in some of the theories about social movements that have begun to receive attention just as in fact they began their "popular war". I have only explored in the Peruvian publications of these theories, but I think you will agree that they from the point of view of historical situations and then the aspects of Sendero which are relevant to this comparison.

The new studies of ideology and political movements which emerged at the beginning of the 1980s sought to overcome what was seen as the diagnosis of the old theories which had concentrated on the crystallization of social movements, class and power: the key classes were identified now grant social movements, citizen spirit and democracy. There was a strong urban bias, keeping with the urbanization trend and which corresponded to the idea of trying to use social mobility as a base for theory, rather than the old habit of making the reality fit the theory. We see this in the new trend towards social history rather than the history of institutional structures as a means of recovering the past.

Theorists tend associated with an important political development: the relatively peaceful end of military rule in Peru at the end of the 1970s. But it is Sartre, at approximately the same time, and other countries such
that experienced such a transition, a democratic euphoria accompanied the end of dispossession. The euphoria was short-lived; virtually all the tilt apart from Sanderos. The traditional peasant and workers movements lost their impetus as academic interest, disillusionment and on movements whose elements corresponded just to the productive sphere. As for how to offset political change, Gramsci opposed it to the assertion that for these "newmen" with this idea that these social movements could form part of national popular "social alliance" replacing the old class-based formations. The new theories identified a series of new characteristics of social struggle as the "new democratic movement." These were: 1) Change in Social Structure: that new sectors such as the "informal sector" would assume greater importance; traditional categories of urban and rural workers. 2) New Organizations: that in keeping with the above structural change, new social mobilizers "middle-class" organizations as the main concern and strategy. 3) New Strategies: the idea that the 1980s movements would be concerned with demands other than the old "class-based" demands. 4) New Methods of Struggle: that the age of direct action had ended. While this notion of a positive eye-opening, these new ideas often led to the throwing out of class as a means of looking at society, and revolution as a feasible solution. Because of that I will argue that on the one hand, the experience of the organizing, with the joint loss of all the new social movements and the democrats left in ferris, suggests that something was wrong with the conclusions drawn from the ideas that went accompanying both. And, on the other hand, that the new theories were incapable of understanding the rise of a revolutionary movement such as Sanderos.

Social Base

One of the first questions raised about Sanderos is where is it in urban society, and what is their appeal? What I want to emphasize is the impossibility of pin-pointing (as someone has tried) the answers to both questions.

Firstly, the social origins of the party members were from the lower middle classes and were thus "out" on the street in the 1960s (can be generalized as students and teachers who would often have a peasant background but did so to promote the integration of the old agrarian social classes and popular education in the state sector, and is this a new social sector? In this case, one is talking about a wide and typical section of people forming up the old military, as purely "passive army" but also a typical "urban middle class elite" threatened by Sanderosians on the left who support the "left" elite of the represented such as the Sanderosian and Cañero's followers. To criticize Sanderos it is not necessary to falsify their nature and make the latter guerrillas - curs - enemies.

The party has continued ever since to represent young people with close links to both urban and rural life. A son of a landowner once simply said to me, "passion plus university = terrorism." Secondly, the presence is seen as "principal force" in the overall state structure and the rural areas have always been a main focus of Sanderos activity as they have seen among young peasants for both state support and to make up mobile cadres. Peasantry in many cases is a means of a new "revolution" as it has become a problem for both the Sanderosians and Cañero's followers. To criticize Sanderos it is not necessary to falsify their nature and make the latter guerrillas - curs - enemies.
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The party has continued ever since to represent young people with close links to both urban and rural life. A son of a landowner once simply said to me, "passion plus university = terrorism." Secondly, the presence is seen as "principal force" in the overall state structure and the rural areas have always been a main focus of Sanderos activity as they have seen among young peasants for both state support and to make up mobile cadres. Peasantry in many cases is a means of a new "revolution" as it has become a problem for both the Sanderosians and Cañero's followers. To criticize Sanderos it is not necessary to falsify their nature and make the latter guerrillas - curs - enemies.

The party has continued ever since to represent young people with close links to both urban and rural life. A son of a landowner once simply said to me, "passion plus university = terrorism." Secondly, the presence is seen as "principal force" in the overall state structure and the rural areas have always been a main focus of Sanderos activity as they have seen among young peasants for both state support and to make up mobile cadres. Peasantry in many cases is a means of a new "revolution" as it has become a problem for both the Sanderosians and Cañero's followers. To criticize Sanderos it is not necessary to falsify their nature and make the latter guerrillas - curs - enemies. But when Ahmed Dehondt's own political theory and great personal influence was asked in an interview, what do you think all those simple middle class students who your party's followers often hear, is just laughed and dismissed it as verbal fodder. But an additional level of inter-class ideological work being done which represents the continuity of theory and practice on a very high level. This is why I talk about the new peas in Peru being one in which ideology is given a uniquely privileged role, which of course relates to the strong tradition of revolutionary theory in the party, mentioned earlier.

Although I have emphasized the complex nature of the party's structure, it is effectively going over-shadowed and was a certain kind of completely well-organized, above and beyond the actual human beings who run it! It is this that changes the party's face (often unscientifically, perhaps, but obviously there are overlaps between different sub-groups in the party and breakdowns of struc-

The key point is that the Sanderos works across all type of social and class. Furthermore, despite the apparent rigidity of its doctrine it is very responsive to social trends that affect these divides, such as migrations or the informal sector. This group of
modern and changing conditions has been the key to its success. Instead of asking why has Sandino achieved what it has, maybe we should ask, why has it not got further?

Consequences for SM theorists

So what are the consequences of the 'Sandino experience' for the various social movements theories? Well, it clearly challenges the conclusion that class-based revolutionary movements cannot grip the new conditions. To go back to the formulation of the SM theorists:

In terms of the new composition of the working class, the party has shown itself broad-based enough in its strategy to accommodate all different sectors of the working class and those sectors of the middle class. This new composition has, it should be added, been highly exaggerated, because there has been a large and at various times politically aligned sector of the peasantry. In terms of new 'interior level' organisations it has either tried to dismantle them or replace them with the use of front organisations. In terms of new struggles, SM has simply tried to keep any type of popular demand going, including those of 'citizens rights' as opposed to 'workers rights'...

Finally, the new forms of struggle, the party has been the first to try (but always with success) to develop these in order to replace the old forms of struggle which the same leader has embraced. A main example is the Armed Struggle which at its most effective has managed to generate little info. The new theorists were largely correct in their observations, most of all in their attempt to look at all aspects of social life in a whole of a vulgar economic focus. This is important because it is the all-encompassing nature of SM's strategy, applying itself to all aspects of social life, which brings it to the key to success. Once again as the Stalinist PCP-Istil that considered all of their efforts on building the union populaire, have found themselves at the end of the 1898s in the position of Emperor with No Clothes on it. The irony, then, is that the Sandino took the key observations of the 'new times' in their stride, and incorporated those observations within their own strategy.

The new social movement theorists and their many fellow travellers/look at academic and political, get many of their observations right. But their conclusion that the advent of democracy made class-based revolutionary movements redundant, and that the new, that small scale class-based popular movements would provide the basis for popular politics in the 'new times', have both been shown (in the Peruvian case) to be wrong.

How then has Sandino adapted itself to the new conditions in which the theorists identified? When I think we learn that a revolutionary movement in these modern times must have a continuously changing social base and geographical base to overcome repression (this is something Sandino learnt through practice: when the military launched a major flush-out campaign, in their original base province of Ayacucho in 1938, the party was partly forced to relocate its activities to new areas.) By looking at society such rivals to Peronism in its totality, we see there are many different 'points of power' that a revolutionary strategy needs to deal with, by accommodating or neutralising each one. In this we can look at Sandino's strategy and the state's counter-strategy with regard to the peasant self-defence groups, the MRTA (Mujeres Revolucionarios Movimiento - Peru's other main guerrilla force), the unions, student, etc.

The failure of the new social movements to provide the army for national change can, apart from anything else, be linked to the acknowledgement of 'democracy' in Latin America generally. The popularity of the Sandino was based on the democratic aspirations which accompanied it in Peru and elsewhere upon the end of military rule in the late 1970s, therefore the lack of the theory in the form of these 'democracy'. Neither have really fulfilled their promise in practice. The shortcomings of the social democratic model made necessary a revolutionary critique of Peru's political realism which is relevant to both theory and practice. Such a critique needs to take seriously the evidence of Sandino's experience, whatever one's misgivings about their politics, rather than seeing it as a fresh observation or 'guerrilla' leftover from the stables.

'Analyzing the Analysts'

I would like now to go over why so far such a critique is hard to find. Having looked at these theoretically based defenders of Peron's social democracy, we now need to 'analyse the analyst' of Sandino itself: the self-styled experts on Peru's 'new level' of social conflict. This means investigating the political aspirations and ideological assumptions which underpin their work (and hence a large part of our information).

Virtually all analysts whose books or articles you might find come somehow along the scale between those on the following left and those who are basically military advisors in an academic guise, the so-called 'counter-revolutionary expert'. I quote from as being on a案例 rather than as two distinct groups, because there is a grey area, and the difference between the two is becoming more blurred in line with the global post-Cold-War trend towards a missed convergence of interests between the "left" and the "right" under capitalism. Both kinds of author express their main aim to be promoting Peron's "democracy," which translates as how do we define Sandino and present the facts?

This grey area is regularly mobilised. In recent meeting in London for instance John Cantren, a sympathetic writer comes on the Peruvian left featured a talk with Rosamond Thorn, an Oxford economist who writes Fujimori's very own Economy Minister and called for greater (broadening?) translation in the 1980s. The broadening lines are also there when the leftist analysts complain that the right wing Fujimori government does not listen to their proposals, or refuse when the government does not provide, without admitting it of course, and embark on specific social policy programs such as the army going into shantytowns to disband food and haikus. It is not necessarily the counter-u perspectives who are less accurate, as they are not weighed down like the leftist are by an alternative program for administrators which they have to put in every piece of writing. They are much better able to simply presenting and presenting information on Sandino so that the government, military or both alone know just what the score is of the most realistic assessment of the continuing conflict in Peru after Guerensa's arrest comes from Gordon McCorndale, for the American Rand Corporation, in an interview with the liberal Peruvian news weekly Caras (Nov 92). The leftist analysts are concerned by association just as much as their right-counterparts see. They share the center-ground with the solidarity campaigns, the charities and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and the left-wing politics. I'm not trying to make them out to be some organized mediocrity, simply pointing out the contradictions. For instance, I find Peronists will aware that many NGOs went full-out into the left for specific goals. Anyway, the analysis and those outdoes the basic building in the rich of parliament, constitution and all of the other trappings of the modern democratic state, and as organizations (not necessarily individually) oppose revolutions, violent overthrow etc.

These analyses are informed by certain key themes which, while all consisting certain essential truths, are framed in favour of an anti-revolutionary perspective, which puts the aim on an elected government to make the necessary changes.

One such theme is of course Human Rights. It is not my
intention here to go into the flaws of human rights as a concept, suffice to say that both the military and the PCP (SL) have been guilty of gross abuses of ordinary people. But this is in their nature as autocratic institutions.) In this respect, he is in the same situation as the political leaders of the CDF who are using the same tactics. On practical grounds the same is clearly relevant to the situation in the eel fishing. The right-wing leaders are other victims of the military and Sandinista atrocities.

Another is the idea of the people caught between two fires—that they are being fought between two overwhelming forces outside, with the ordinary people caught hopelessly in the middle. It is certainly true that anyone trying to work outside the Fujimori regime and the Sandinista's shadow is a potential victim of both. However, this refrain is also used to make the popular appeal. The Sandinista party, which is little more than a thinly veiled front for the government, is using it as a tool to propagate its interest in the Sandinista's interests, and particularly it aims itself to such a stereotyping of the peasantry, who could presumably be better hau-slaving and growing crops for Western export than hiking the flag of revolt. The reasons for revolt remain valid and real, and the government is worried about the prospect of the (possibly not far from now growing urban) citizen self-defense militias which it originally armed turning their sights on its masters.

Finally there is the idea that greater social spending and democratization are necessary to defeat Sandinists which brings us back to the basic dilemma of the reformist left: that such a program would have to go hand in hand with a military operation. In other words continued war.

So we see that the analysis of Sandinistas are not in a battle between two overlapping events, but play a direct role as advisors through associated, on the one hand, with the reformist left and associated institutions, on the other hand, with both the Peruvian and foreign state, military and business institutions, and even more obviously with both.

In developing a revolutionary critique of the situation, I think we also need to decide on what forces to associate with, both in terms of their theory and their political practice. For anyone who finds himself/herself in this, it is a very real question.

Finally there is of course Sandinista itself. In terms of numbers, capability and territory, it is obviously still the key revolutionary force. But of course politics is in the inner circle, there's no room for the party-like thinking except in an inner circle which reaches up to the highest levels which must be what happened after the arrest of Ouami. Probably every Peruvian who forms with radical politics has to decide personally how to relate to the Party, the situation in time ideological debate is also as serious because the party discipline andhoe, the party is only there to instruct. As one person (involved in a supportive role to the Party) and to me with some ease, the comrades have an answer to everything. In the Casco region a new guerrilla column started up around 1997 which wanted to support the armed struggle while remaining outside the Party. By all accounts they were virtually eliminated by Sandinista after winking aside influence in the regime.

The other major guerrilla group in the MLT which has a clear Leftist American guerrilla ideology, trying to overthrow them, they would call the armed wing of the popular movement doing PMN/LN/CRDF/CRLN lines. What others would call the armed wing of the bourgeoisie left. The MSTA would appear to be a more broad based movement but has in fact been thought by internal power struggles resulting in public splits, divisions, and failures of local leaders. It is difficult to know how much of a failure they have, as their top opportunity for growth appears to be of the official left or factions of it, is pushed further out of the political spectrum—which is actually a possibility now that it has an internal party representation. Certainly the Ruben Dario Movement is an example of the MSTA's 'radicalism' designed to make people morally sympathetic, and a lot of hopes for a humane but revolutionary "third alternative" have been pinned on them over the years.

For the official left itself, it is really now on a life support machine more than ever since its re-emergence into national politics in the late seventies. As in so many other countries in the world now, it's popularity identified as part of the whole corrupt party political circuit. Its Congresista representation was almost decimated in the December 1992 elections, it now relies power only on a limited local level. Its credibility was also indirectly damaged by the complete failure of the supposedly left-centre APRA government of the mid-1990s, which really showed the limits of trying to pull together popular left politics in a capitalist environment.

In the 1980s there was certainly a revolutionary flavour at the grassroots of the Peruvian left, tied in with the hopes that the new social movements would provide a 'revolutionary subject'. But now it remains a set of leaders without followers, whose incorpora- tion into the system was never more clear than in January of this year, when the 'Democratic Left' grouping in Congress (a new proto-party arising from the ashes of the once strong Unidad Left) proposed a special Caucus meeting for military citizens who ex- ecuted in the 'battle against subversion'.

Finally we come to the fringe groups who might or might not become relevant in the future. If they do become relevant it will probably be in terms of the legacy of their ideas rather than their actual political organizations. In Peru the Trotskyites and anarchists are the only groups I know of with a revolutionary vision that challenges the Sandinista/MSTA orthodoxy, (although the former are limited by their own authoritarian tendencies), and both groups have long and interesting histories of their own in the country. There is a belief persisting for a popular renewal of the socialist or libertarian social democratic vision.

The reason I believe there is such an audience owes itself to the tradition of grass roots rebellion in Peru itself. Although this tradition has been extended by Sandinista and MSTA in the 1980s, it has in fact manifest itself under a variety of different flags over the decades and centuries, and indeed often under no flag at all. There is a history of communes acts of autonomy, from land seizures to supermarket looting.

On the other hand the right side has also formed a strong tradition of communications and mutual self-help on the part both rural and urban dwellers, which, although at various times taken up by political groups, has a life of its own beyond the impetus of such groups. Taking away the political consciousness of the analysis, many of what they identified as new social movements in the 1980s represented an urban continuation of this tradition of combating poverty and forming communal life through mutual aid. A proper examination of the twin trend of anti-authoritarian struggle and mutual cooperation is outside the realms of the article, but I think it is worth emphasizing potential alternative to the social democratic "left" and "right" and the statist authoritarianism of the PCP (SL).

(A campaign is being built up around the imprisonment of two guerrillas in Peru, falsely accused of working for Sandinista Landshadow. Donations are badly needed for legal fees and food (which is not supplied for prisoners). Contact: The Peruvian "Soldier's Project of the Love & Rage Radio Network, PO Box 1, Prince Street Station, New York, New York 10012, USA.)
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Towards a political economy of Stalinism


This is an important book. Written by a Marxist critic of both Women’s Sociology and Stalinism, it is a major contribution to the critique of the political economy of the former USSR. As it offers a refreshing counter to the sterile Cold War rhetoric on the Soviet Union, whether bourgeois or socialist.

Over the last twenty-two years, Hillev Ticktin has probably the only critical body of work that the USSR would disavow, argue, counter, or otherwise influence. This is not because it was a moderately useful social formation. He is, of course, one of the few people who made an attempt to undermine its ideas and institutions by pointing the Marxist’s critique of political economy. For this reason he has long been ignored by both bourgeois sociology and the left. That he was right is confirmed by events. Ticktin’s work makes it possible to emerge from the theoretical wilderness of competing political definitions of the USSR—“dignified workers state”, “state socialist”, “bureaucratic socialist”—and so on.

Ticktin’s work is better known in the USA than in Europe. He has lectured to hundreds of students in Los Angeles and appears regularly on phone-ins organised by independent radio. He is also known in South Africa where, since 1980, he has organised a large conference on the future of Marxism and has a newspaper published under his direction that is a major contribution to the political economy of the USSR. All of his work on the Soviet Union is now being challenged and a comprehensive summary of the left.

The book’s form is a collection of essays presented in chapters which develop themes presented in Ticktin’s essays on American society and as a whole. A work of interest is in finding an explanation for the failure of Gorbachev’s personalism to go anywhere in Tikhon’s account of disintegation in the ethnic crisis, which is the rest of the material. Although written before the 1986 ship that brought Yeltsin to power, the information to be found there is a good introduction to everything right about contemporary developments. Chapter one stands on the one is an essay which the political economy of collective socialism and the bureaucratic society that attempts to force the individual into the working class will fail.

Ticktin’s originality shines through more brilliantly in the second chapter and social control. Here the reader will enjoy studying a careful critique of the Cold War literature on the sociology of the disintegration of populations in totalitarian systems. Ticktin refutes the category of Stalinism and creates a political economy of bureaucratic dependency. Ticktin’s understanding of the category of Stalinism in order to make the first power, that power, a declining capitalist that class, a dead state which the bureaucratic society within itself, and that which a disintegrating society within the sphere of production, which is to say the nature of the bureaucratic society derived from Marx, especially through discussions of classlessness and the term "State Capital" in the book.

Ticktin’s arguments are persuasive whether or not one is a scholar of Marx. The reason for this is his grasp of method. Ticktin has not simply read Capital and then proceed to impose the categories of commodity and valorisation on the USSR. In the introduction to the Grundrisse Marx argued that theory must start from the material, theoretical and methodological of the labouring being discussed. Ticktin follows this approach, developing his categories in relation to both the vast amount of empirical research on the USSR. The state has taken place and the various explanatory frameworks that have been put forward by both right and left. Each category was not imposed from some a priori whether but grew organically and logically out of the material he has studied. His knowledge of the Russian language (acquired in part through having lived and worked in the USSR) has enabled him to present the human nature of the official documents of the socialist state in which to put just as important an emphasis on the material he has investigated. Even if the social opposites is a surprising Ticktin’s theoretical foundation, it is not easy to find a great deal about the Soviet Union from this book.

The Ruling Elite.

Ticktin’s thinking is demanding but not readily dual. The abstract is open to the book: the application of the categories of commodity, labor, actual and potential value, and use and imagined product—revels quantity and quality of this which is insufficient to imagine any commodity. Marx. Yet Ticktin’s generation of categories minimize the role of the laboratory and its role in the creation of objects and processes in the second chapter. Ticktin was probably the first to follow the logical sequence between the categories and the direction of his thought.

For example, class is defined as a relation that has a particular relation to the extraction of the surplus product (p. 10). Surplus product is defined as the portion of the social product that is a further part of the society that has been considered for allocation for use. That is that the immediate satisfaction of the needs of those engaged in productive work; in other words, those who produce the surplus product itself (p. 10). These definitions are useful in deciding whether the class in the ruling group is the Stalinist solution or the Stalinist solution. This belief is held by adherents of the idea of
state capitalism, such as C.L. R. Jennis, Burya Dunspey and Tony Cliff, to name a few. Tiktik argues that there was something close within the Stalinist system. Control over the quantity of surplus produce is almost completely restricted by a negative control that a non-productive worker hovers over the labor process. The mass is itself to maintain social cohesion, discipline and a facade produce. Moreover, the ruling group is also a product of workers in the soviet Union and social protection is an inextricable part of the system. They are therefore insufficiently able to form a collective. If they are prevented from forming a collective, they cannot form a class.

How should this ruling group be described? Tiktik pumps for "class." Despite the overwhelming ideological connections, "class" has the advantage of suggesting that the ruling group is unstable and inconsistent. He defines it as "those people who have some limited control over the surplus product." He goes on to argue that the attempt by the elite to ensure the limits of exploitation manifested in terms of its subsistence to achieve the stability, continuity and coherence of a class. This unipolar trend drives itself to the system to the market.

The Political Economy of Stalinism

Tiktik's claim is made in an article on "the political economy of the USSR." The fact that the USSR has formally ceased to exist has already been stated. The fact that he provides a political economy, which is now disintegrating, is Stalinism. The essence of its role is a political doctrine of "socialism in one country." The doctrine took an unobjectionable form when attempts were made to create an absolute surplus from the working class and peasants as part of the Great): The interest in not observed the purpose of the 1930s. The system formed out of this flint doctrine in its monopolistic crisis. It may cease to exist before any viable social formation emerges out of its ruin.

Tiktik argues that the Stalinist system was a "plagued society. Lack of control over the production of a democ- ratic culture of freely associating individuals, makes all talk of planning in the Soviet Union meaningless. The atomization of the elite and the working class makes it impossible to standardize the necessary for planning. There is thus no sense in which the USSR can be described as a "workers" state, however degenerate. Natural-

Origins of the Crisis in the USSR

The Politics of Race, Discrimination in South Africa (p. 25) by Hillel Ticktin

Radioactive Chains 33
and Capital.

Is it possible for the trouble to be connected into money? Not without a capital market and a labour market. The former needs a stock market and horticulture and the latter needs unemployment and the right to live and food. This is what the state is attempting to push through at this time. (July 1992) Tolkien argues in this policy has already failed. Even if the figures of ten million unemployed predicted by the International Labour Organization are achieved by the end of the year, he argues that no more than ten million unemployed will be necessary to function as a reserve army of labour. Moreover, unemployment will not facilitate to control the workforce if the individual control over the labour process breaks through the expressed form and becomes increasingly socialized and politized. The control workers have will be strengthened further.

It could only be broken if there is no additional package from the West which might serve to destroy or turn the employers from its basic. This was not happening for one of the reasons during the period of world slump led by the American recession. It was only under intense political pressures from the 27-country that the IMF suggested released 10 billion, two of the twenty billion dollars proposed Russia. As Bush has raised, millions of dollars would be needed to rescue the Russian economy.

Stalinism and Decline.

What are the outcomes of the entire block? How are we understanding the International block today? Tolkien suggests that its dynamic is the outcome of the attempt to contain revolution in the context of capitalist decline.

Early on in the book, Tolkien states that Stalinism "is a conservative social formation that has taken on a transcendental and new general form precisely in order to prevent social revolution" (p.9). He sees that the root of the victory of capitalism in preventing a move towards socialism. Like other non-socialist social formations which copied it (such as China, Pol Pot's Cambodia, Ethiopia, Angola and Cuba) systematic repression is especially necessary for the first. The difference between Stalinism and its surrogates, and between Stalinism and other non-socialist social formations (such as Fascism and theocracy in Iraq) is that Stalinism evolved out of the defeat of world-wide socialist revolution. While control over the product was seized from them, the workers retained a limited control over the labour process in as individualized and sterilized form.

Bruce Ford is a limited method of exercising a surplus. If the society wants to progress beyond the extraction of an absolute surplus, other methods had to be tried. These methods worked in setting norms and rules of work at the factory level. These measures, however, acted to socialise labour despite the automation. Throughout the book, therefore, Tolkien stresses that the elite has been conscious of the possibility of its abolition. Its moves and its de factoisation have been motivated by attempts to control, imprison and capital a working class which is becoming increasingly strong and increasingly threatening. The move to the market is a last ditch attempt to drain out the basis of the potential for workers to social revolution. This move to control on the surplus they over the labour process. Looked at in this light, development over the last few years reflect the needs of a diverse and shifting social groups which are clearly acting as allies of the world bourgeoisie.

Capitalism, on the other hand, moves to explain the emergence of social formations which are non-visible and have no potential. Tolkien states that this is concerned with the law of transition in a world where the laws capitalist are so diffuse but where a new mode of production has yet to come into being. He writes that the fundamental law of the transition period is the growing connexion between capital and other distorted forms of planning and the market" (p.185). Planning is defined as "the connection regulation of the economy by the associated producers themselves" (p.166-167) and the market as the "sphere of action of the laws of value" (p.180). Planning and the market are in contradiction with one another. Every effort is made by the bourgeoisie to keep the market alive and to stop slow down, or to sustain the bureaucratic domination of nightlong planning forms established by workers who take charge of a mechanism of production. Thus in the USSR, in the early 1930s, there was an attempt to carry over the same thing in holding onto elements of the market. This attempt was still-born because the revolution was driven worldwide. The trick had to remain opening the USSR to capital investment from the West. This proved impossible for political and economic reasons. The opposition would have been immense, and the West was in any case and would not afford to remove Stalinism emerged out of the degeneration of the law of value and of the law of planning in the law that determines. It became a system without value and without planning. It did its own peculiar commandary laws. These Tolkien calls the law of organisation and the law of self interest.

The Contradiction within Use Value.

Tolkien lays down as an "a description of the process of movement of the product in a transitory" (p.118) and defines consumption is its Hegelian and Marxist sense as "a necessary relation between the opposition of reproduction and exchange." (p.118). The opposition pole is within Stalinism are derived from a contradiction within value use. Tolkien says here in terms of the lecture the contradiction. In the introductory chapter he states that it lies between a "real" value and a "potential" use value. The example he gives is of a joker with one more brat than another - it has a real use value, but the use value is less than that of a joker with two of the same length (p.12). Later he writes: "A joker is a扑克牌 jack with one more brat than the other may or may not be a joker (p.126). It is questionable whether a use value is a use value in the Stalinist system. It is possible to imagine a society in which there is a production medium for need but in which every product is useless. Within Stalinism there is a reserve production of products of such poor quality that they are not able to use. Tolkien describes the contradiction in various ways. For example, he sometimes describes it as it lying between a real value and "apparent" use value (p.127). In other times he describes is it lying between a real value and "immanent" or intended" use value. This difference of usage would appear to be necessary to make the contradiction between the contradiction with the product and the contradictions within the system. Both are clearly viewed. The one causes the other and vice versa. Tolkien quite clearly wants to connect the two yet not quite clear cause to ending the largest relationship explicitly.

The role of the relationship between the two levels of contradiction within the product and within the system is in line with the following statement: "the contradiction within the product is between the alienated form of the product and its use value" (p.134). Consideration of the alienated form of the product leads directly to the measurement of capital and wage determination. The limit that labour power is imperative means a way that it is useless both to the individual worker and to society as a whole. Tolkien makes this connexion clear when he writes that it "is a relationship of power between two different forms of production that the performance of labour powers is something, its actual utility is another" (p.137).

The contradiction within the use value of the product is now derived from its alienated form. This is true reflects the contradiction in power. Workers exercise their 'labour power' in a way that satisfies neither their own interests (because workers have no control over the product or even society) nor the interests of the
Elites (because the elites have control over the labour process and only limited control over the surplus product). It follows that the "fundamental contradiction of the Soviet system is in the form of conflict over the workers, through their alienation" (p. 177). It is the result of the struggle to remove the form of social control. This can go two ways. On the one hand, they may accept a form of control based on the market, with mass unemployment functioning as a reserve army of labour to return for wages which function as monopoly and surplus commodification. On the other, they might reject all forms of control and express a desire for a full expression of democratic control over the products they make. If they take the latter road, then the contradictions within state value are abolished and the real and imagined diameter of needs are expressed in a social unity instead of existing in an antagonistic relationship to one another.

Organisation and Self-Interest. The law of self-interest that Trotsky sees operating within the Soviet system has two opposing poles, the organised worker and organised labour. The organised worker wants therefore be understood as the actual use value of labour power within the system. The organised workers have no interest in producing a non-defective use value. From the point of view of the elite, the labour power of the organised worker is defective because it does not produce a surplus value they can appropriate. It is therefore in the interest of the elite to try to socialise labour towards this end. Socialised labour, on the other hand, expresses the potential for mass and social use value of labour power. This can only produce non-defective use values if it "moves through its internal forces and becomes a democratic collectivity which plans not only for the needs of the individual but for universality - for the needs of every individual. This mass labour is socialised, the more it becomes apparent that the interest of workers is in gain control of the surplus. The two opposing poles of the law of organisation, on the other hand, are central control and the interests of the elite. To repeat, the interest of the state is to gain acceptance control over the labour process. They try to do this through organisational control. The centrally organised worker, however, is organised and prevents the elite gaining real control. The more they attempt to centralise, the more the defective use values are produced. Economic and social unity express the interests of their elite by being, independently from central control. This makes for an increasingly defective surplus product and a rapid differentiation of the economy. The elite nurtures a simpler desire for a market with no monopolised control to improve it through centralised controls. As a result, the process of disintegration speeds up.

The above account of Trotsky's theory of the laws of the system is extrapolated from various sections of the book. The relationship between the contradictions in use value and the laws which govern Stalinism are not obvious. The reason for this is that the discussion of accumulation, use value and law take place in different chapters and appear, at times, unlinked.

A good example of this is chapter seven, "The Nature of the Soviet Political Economy." In the context of the lower contradictions of the system, Trotsky mentions the phenomenon of "wast" as a category and refers also to the difference between actual and potential output. However, he refuses from any explicit discussion of the relationship between the laws, and the contradictions in use value he elsewhere elsewhere. It may be that he thinks that the discussion on waste in chapter 2 is sufficient introduction. If so, it would have done no harm to remind the reader of this in the later chapter. If, moreover, he intended the chapter to stand on its own as an independent essay, it would have been helpful if he had made these relationships more explicit and shown how the contradiction law of the system can be derived from the contradictions within the product and vice versa.

Disintegration, Decline, and Terminal Crisis. Trotsky argues, further, that workers in the USSR will move to the left as they realise that the market cannot be introduced without a deeper denunciation of their standard of living - an answer must be found by the elite to settle demands for democracy being communicated from within the workers to the whole of society. This answer should be the introduction of the market on a broader basis of capitalist decline. Because there is a lot of oscillation on the meaning of this category it is necessary to spell it out in detail.

Some people seem to think that a single capitalist is in decline in a way that is similar to a terminal crisis. This is incorrect. Trotsky keeps the two concepts distinct. Stalinism is ultimately in terminal crisis and disintegration is the form of this crisis. By disintegration Trotsky means the "pulling apart" of the system, so that the social groups, factions, and economic categories stand in opposition and incooperating forms (p. 16). If there is anything to find in this book it is the constant re-articulation that there is no one road. Either the market or socialisation will break through the system. A terminal crisis for capitalism would be analogous to the events leading up to the 1917 revolution. There is no indication that such a terminal crisis is likely in the immediate future in the absence of a certain left.

Decline is a completely different idea. Trotsky's view of the "decline of capitalism involves the decline of its fundamental law and social relations, it is therefore the decline of the law of value itself" (p. 173). The discussion then becomes one about value, interest, income, money, the capital and the market. Trotsky draws attention to the role of a needs based sector, the growth of monopoly and the corresponding lack of competition as an evidence of this decline. He also mentions the higher capital labour ratio as a sign of a disintegration of the surplus and a decrease in the rate of surplus. This is not the case for the establishment of a capital that draws from the surplus as the basis of its control over the surplus.

The consequences for disintegrating Stalinism are threefold. Firstly there can be no proper investment of a functioning reserve army of labour if it does not function properly under capitalism. Secondly, there can be no internal competition of firms internal as such transport, housing, health and education remain in the state or a monopoly sector, and if, even in manufacturing, industries are handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state, the state must be handed over to the state.
This assessment appears to overlook the general thrust of the argument. It implies that labor power will take the form of value, that money, capital, and labor will come into being and that the policy of the state will be successful. It is the only statement of its kind. Trotsky was writing this book in 1929 when it was not clear that the liberal version of the state would fail. It is possible to interpret this statement as hindsight and as prediction of what has in fact happened. In this sense, the market has already begun to play an inexorably. In which case, the use of the word "product" is ambiguous, referring both to a material entity and to the decisive and constant offspring of the black market and the mafia.

Nationalism in the USSR

This book does not give much attention to the role of nationalism in the position of women and the peasantry in the USSR. The reason for this is to do with the problem of nationalism and Trotsky's position in the party for those concessions. It is possible, however, to suggest how nationalism from various references to make this book's work. But it is in these weaknesses in the analysis of the social problems of the future. Nevertheless, enough information can be gleaned from this book as to its foundation of a theory of nationalism that has contemporary relevance.

Nationalism is understood to be a "marginalised" group (p.23). It is the doctrine most likely to appeal to the intelligentsia or the system dialogue and their position becomes increasingly evident. The intelligentsia include all those who base their position on their power and ability in the process of the implementation of the social product, usually by being in charge of others (p.27). This interclass group roughly corresponds to all those with a higher education. It is the most important group in the system. The intelligentsia tend to work in the private sector and the state. Some modestly form part of this emergent left as they start to develop their own ideas on the working class. Those who ally with the intelligentsia will intensify their hatred for workers and Jews and it will be difficult to stop the general discourse into sectarian fervor.

War is an option for the layer. But war between Russia and the Ukraine will not be foreseen by that section of the intelligentsia for stability. Nor will it be favoured by the bourgeoisie in the War. It would be an admission of the fact that the attempt to introduce money and the market had failed. Moreover, it might speed up the process of the working class moving to the left. War is a high risk strategy. That does not mean, of course, that it will not happen. Compounding the danger, injury and fear that already exists with a good dose of mass slaughter might serve the interests of a small determined faction for a while.

Conclusion

To return, this is an important work for any serious Decker into the nature of Stalinism. It is difficult to imagine that it will be superceded and that it has been translated into Russian and Hebrew and some form of interest (the Berlin debate) is already under way for the prospect of the reform. It is the development of critical thought within the intelligentsia and the working class that the older more reform and is it a process they are powerless to prevent. As Trotsky stated:

"Indeed, whatever the reform may be, there can be no hope whatsoever of its success if there cannot be a critical discussion of their program. This problem, however, is insurable because any real discussion must come up against the nature of socialism itself, with the majority controlling, work become humanly possible, inhumanity of monopoly’s domination within the division of labour, and hence the abolition of the whole itself" (p.80).

Books Received

Michael Holloway - Beyond Capital, Macmillan, 1992

36 RADICAL CHAINS
Society as a stadium

Vincente Reggio

During the 1990 World Cup, I was in Turin, Italy, and was expecting English fans to visit. We had planned to watch the final match, which was held in Turin for the first time ever. I was able to feel one of them in my ear, but had to please accommodation for others. Well, I had to ring several times before getting English returnees accepted. The argument which traversed the hurried hotel manager was that those English were black.

The findings created by football are not only powerful amongst the supporters, they also affect observers as well. Sometimes these feelings seem to follow an anonymistic logic, whereas in other terms they appear to mirror uncommonly shared attitudes found in society as a whole. In the above episode, the Italians, but also other Europeans, are generally not particularly concerned towards other fans in their country. When one talks of blackness, one is referring to blackness towards others. These outbursts are common to many areas, including the northern ones.

Racism is a widespread phenomenon throughout the world. It is not limited to football, but is also present in other areas of society. The FIFA will not tolerate any form of racism and will take strict measures against it. The health of the game depends on the actions of all fans and supporters. It is important to spread awareness about the dangers of racism and its impact on football.

Football is a source of joy and excitement, but it should also be a reflection of the values and beliefs that we hold dear. Let us strive to create a world where football is played with love and respect, where racism and prejudice do not exist. Together, we can make a difference.
Poll Tax Rebellion

Geoffrey Blake

Poll Tax Rebellion by Danny Burns, AK Press/Attack International 1992

It has to be said that this is a very useful book. As well as evoking many happy memories for those who studied the struggle, it provides a valuable record of the events which led to the defeat of the poll tax in Scotland, giving an account of how the struggle was fought and what is was all about.

The book is well written and well researched, and it is a real pleasure to read. The author, a Scottish labour activist, has done a great job of putting the events in context and bringing them to life. The book is well illustrated with photographs and other visual material, which helps to bring the story to life.

The book is divided into two parts: the first part is a detailed account of the Scottish poll tax rebellion, and the second part is a more general account of the struggle in England.

Part One: The Scottish Poll Tax Rebellion

The Scottish poll tax rebellion began in 1989, when the Scottish Executive introduced a new poll tax system. This was met with widespread resistance, and a series of protests and strikes took place. The author of the book, Danny Burns, was actively involved in the rebellion, and he provides a first-hand account of the events.

The book begins with an introduction, which sets the scene and introduces the key figures and events. It then goes on to describe the background to the poll tax rebellion, including the political and economic context. The author explains how the poll tax was introduced, and why it was met with such resistance.

The book then goes on to describe the first major protest, held in Glasgow on May 30th 1989. This was the start of the rebellion, and it quickly spread across the country. The author provides a detailed account of the protests, including interviews with some of the key figures involved.

The book goes on to describe the subsequent months, as the rebellion gained momentum. It includes a detailed account of the May 1989 poll tax strike, which was a massive success, involving millions of people across the country. The book then goes on to describe the final months of the rebellion, leading up to the victory in May 1990.

Part Two: The English Poll Tax Rebellion

The second part of the book is more general, and looks at the poll tax rebellion in England. The author provides a detailed account of the events, including interviews with key figures and analysis of the wider context.

The book then goes on to look at the wider context of the poll tax rebellion, including the political and economic context. The author explains how the poll tax was introduced, and why it was met with such resistance.

The book then goes on to describe the protests and strikes that took place in England, including the May 1989 poll tax strike, which was a massive success, involving millions of people across the country. The book then goes on to describe the final months of the rebellion, leading up to the victory in May 1990.

Crime

"If you want to keep the law by not paying the tax, you have to be willing to break the law and pay the price as well."

Norman Tebbit, Tory Party Chairman, 2.6.80

I find it hard to believe that DB's existing characterization of poll tax as a non-payment is not illegal tax evasion. I can only hope that this is not the case. But if it is, then I must make it clear that I fully support those who are willing to break the law to pay the poll tax. This is a clear case of a government that is acting illegally and breaking the law, and it is the duty of every citizen to stand up and be counted.

In conclusion, I would like to say that this book is a valuable resource for anyone interested in the poll tax rebellion. It provides a detailed account of the events, and is well written and well researched. I would highly recommend it to anyone interested in this important period in Scottish history.
will do these things without even telling their closest friends or relatives that they’re doing it. One of the positive changes is the effort under the movement to turn non-payment with a typical form of working-class law-breaking which be- comes socially accepted and was seen as a con- stitutional legislation. People were prepared to say “I’m proud to be a poll tax non-payer” whereas they wouldn’t say “I’m proud to be a jukebox”. Durham’s measure was usually without any moral, driven million of people (largely) non-union. The anti-police move- ment could be the beginning of the politicalisation of the criminals. It’s become normal for trave- lling constructivists to talk about a “culture of anti-partner” which will underwrite any form of local resistance. In particular, I think that facilities demanding to join your house is a socio-economic response for most people. But when it’s happened once and you’re un- comfortably taken out, then they’ve never turned as frequently happens, it’s a very convincing building experience. This is particularly true in Scotland where there was mass resistance to eviction of the squatters in the form of large crowds gathering outside houses. We’ve had what hap- pens when they start harassing Council Tax non- payers.

As revolutionaries we know that it’s impor- tant to try to turn the law in the interests of the people. We also know that a good lawyer can often keep you out of power. The police pay for not going to prison is that of legitimising the legal system — the right of the police to make arrests and the right of the courts to call "guilty" people. Given the present level of class struggle it’s hard to imagine what it would need for that to be a large extra-rent to play the game of capitalistic legality. The anti-police movement did, however, give us an insight into the workings of this system.

One striking thing was to see the hard working power of the working class trying to keep the working class up to its tasks. Under present circumstances in order to "play by the rules" this strategy worked for a few months. Eventually, they would come up with the idea of a better way of playing with the police. The police would go in and say: "You’ve got to move on or you’ll be arrested and charged."

The courts, certainly those of the middle classes, are not used to being overturned. The fact that this advice was not given out. Most of them announced to the people that didn’t go. What was said was not for their benefit but for nobody. Nothing was said to the people that they must be in tens of thousands of them. The whole thing was very large in "Minutes: Legal advice was an important part of the strategy of the movement. The police were in the group was bad and the legal point of "at what point are you getting away with it, why shouldn’t you?". The benefit of this knowledge the whole "what price do you pay in court" strategy can be seen to have been a very important part in the fight against the police. If that strategy was not played out in the way the law was meant to be played out, then these people were not in the place where they should be. The idea of the movement was to turn the legal system into a way of addressing the usual forces behind the very class struggle. Magistrates courts were seen as a legal process that has just been set aside and taken as a tribute for uncovering the police, but this was a classless system of anti-police tax groups. In the end the drastic policy of non-payment is the bourgeois route proved to be the right one.

Trafalgar Square

As with the rest of the book, DB’s account of Trafalgar Square unlike the police report which followed it provided much more valuable information. The main problem with it is that it is very much oriented towards the events in Trafalgar Square itself and there is almost nothing about the widespread nature of bourgeois property throughout the West End which followed. Partly this is just because Trafalgar Square is where Danny was most of the time, as a reaction from his own position. Partly, it’s the most high-profile incident in its overall pattern too. By concentrating on the Squares itself we can emphasise the defensive agents of the struggle. It’s what the police attacked first and that was theNibby’s name in the Squares itself it was a defensive action. But the slogans that were used against the police were often so clear and red that it didn’t have the same affective effect as many demonstrations being the thing for the police that was least important to them. The Squares were seen as the main place to do that. Now there is a clear relationship to so many other ways. Arranged after the demo is that it took of the people’s movement during the crisis. This is in the Squares itself that I am least sure about it was on the basis of it’s from this point onwards that the main attention is given to it. There’s a lot more that should be said about the Squares itself.

DB reports the well-known (and clearly that the police definitely set out to prevent a demo of 200,000). Perhaps they did but they were fought off. The best that I can come up with is: our response is 3.5 lines more. That they were not able to prevent a 10,000 boycott of the CND (based on 1984) that they aimed to prevent 260,000 (this represents a point in general across the country. The effect of this ten or fifteen points in general is what was expected. I wouldn’t do like this to the Squares or to the people’s movement during the crisis. This is in the Squares itself that I am least sure about it was on the basis of it’s from this point onwards that the main attention is given to it. There’s a lot more that should be said about the Squares itself.

DB reports the well-known (and clearly that the police definitely set out to prevent a demo of 200,000). Perhaps they did but they were fought off. The best that I can come up with is: our response is 3.5 lines more. That they were not able to prevent a 10,000 boycott of the CND (based on 1984) that they aimed to prevent 260,000 (this represents a point in general across the country. The effect of this ten or fifteen points in general is what was expected. I wouldn’t do like this to the Squares or to the people’s movement during the crisis. This is in the Squares itself that I am least sure about it was on the basis of it’s from this point onwards that the main attention is given to it. There’s a lot more that should be said about the Squares itself.
Critical Unrealism

David Friedman

A Meeting of Minds: Socialists discuss philosophy - towards a new symposium
Roy Bhaskar (ed), foreword by Roy Bhaskar, Published by the Socialist Society for The Socialist Movement, ISBN 1-872481-10-2, £3.95.

iffed and miswired by Roy Bhaskar, this accounted seeks to explore the relation between Bhaskar’s critical realist philosophy and the political project of socialist emancipation. As he realises, however, this is a constellation into which the positivist philosophical project of the groupings itself is itself the Socialist Movement. For this reason alone it deserves serious attention.

In the first two chapters, which outline Bhaskar’s critical realism and its political applications, a form of critical realism is advanced, one which, it is argued, underlies the politics of socialist emancipation. Critical realism, it is claimed, foregrounds below-surface structures to reveal underlying structures and generate emancipatory possibilities. Critical realism opens what is seen as the “transformative nature” of social activity and a “minimum” conception of politics. Socialism seems, from this point of view, intrinsically open and so essentially subject to the possibility of transformative and political social processes.

Socialism indeed is seen as the exit, not of the actualisation of Marx’s meaning of a “new society” but of the actual transformation of these situations. This is to turn towards the question of the emancipation of these situations and the position of the Horse and the Scissors to paraphrase the social democratic government and its utilities.

The critical realism shown in these pages of the right is, the struggle to develop the historical conditions of all social institutions. For Bhaskar, as a result, the critic of modernity is advanced, for example that the market is not neutral or given but socially and historically specific. From this, however, the conclusion is drawn that the market requires a critique with human emancipation. “Empowering social action will involve transforming the market - more precisely, abolishing some market

with the understanding of a system or entity of interlocking social relations. Bhaskar and everyone seems to find a more aggregate or collective of relations that are subject to an agentic of reproduction. This can be seen in Bhaskar’s description of the socialised market. It involves public ownership and worker-managed enterprises with a basic wage guaranteed irrespective of work, a change to secure or insecure jobs, with labour, productive goods and community goods markets, subject to a difference between work and with market-marketing of food by family and community and hand by hand by self-sufficient small producers and businesses.

The Socialist Movement wants to abolish the market in capital so retain the market in labor. As the centre here, however, it wants to guarantee a basic wage irrespective of work. How is the situation squared? A socialist project that wants to retain the labour market does not anticipate the emancipation of human services, needs, and desires from external discipline. It has, in fact, a conception of real human humanisation. A basic wage guaranteed irrespective of work, but, incompatible with market relations, the discipline of the law of value. If needs can be met without recourse to wage labour people will not change their labour power for a wage. To this extent the law of value is partially suspended. Yet as in security is still subject to the pressure of the law of value, to the extent that there is still a market in labour power, people must be forced to work. Administrative structures with personnel on the social regressive struggles to make the recognition of needs compatible with the discipline of the law of value. If the regime is not to succumb to crisis, the value of each recognition will have to be reduced. Therefore the socialistic regime comes into opposition in the class of products.

If this should fail it is only because it has not replicated, or at higher levels of society, the societal democratic project that it implied. It replicates the structures of that project and also takes over in language and categories. The references to “self-actualising norms” and “publicly funded bonds”, “public ownership and worker-managed enterprises” indicate the degree of dependency on previous unintended projects. Planning is equal with the self-identity of the organisation of labour and not with the activity and subjectivity of the people. The project does not point to the future but presently take the forms of the past. The philosophical of the Socialist Movement are unable to identify class subject with a potential for self-actualisation and the cannot uncover the transcendence of value relations. They are constrained to be correct, if anything, the question of labour and poetry in division. Market relations and the law of capital is subject to change and transformation but the possibilities are not all. At some point the division of labour and economic fact will be crossed.

If the first two chapters are demonstrated to read pr...
The book's main theme is the nature of critical reason and its application, chapters three to five examine the motives and methods of critical theory and postmodernism. This brings in the form of a debate between David Bakhurst and Mark Lapp. The debate itself is very apparent but its context is unclear. (Bakhurst) *Bakhtin's contribution consists of a critique of Heidegger (the representation of critical theory) and off truth (who represents postmodernism). The form of this critique is very much apparent but its context is unclear. (Lapp) The debate in question reveals the anxiety of transcendental perspectives, the anxiety is played out in a positivist ideology of rationalism and an epistemological commitment to the value of scientific transcendentalism, which was characterized as the 'empty signifiers' of a transcendental perspective. This is a 'no signifiers' and 'no ethics' is its key, (Lapp). The debate is characterized by an anxiety of transcendental perspectives, the anxiety is played out in a positivist ideology of rationalism and an epistemological commitment to the value of scientific transcendentalism, which was characterized as the 'empty signifiers' of a transcendental perspective. This is a 'no signifiers' and 'no ethics' is its key, (Lapp). The debate is characterized by an anxiety of transcendental perspectives, the anxiety is played out in a positivist ideology of rationalism and an epistemological commitment to the value of scientific transcendentalism, which was characterized as the 'empty signifiers' of a transcendental perspective. This is a 'no signifiers' and 'no ethics' is its key, (Lapp).

---

**Road to the Future**

**Editor:** Mark Lapp

**Contributors:**

David Bakhurst, William Outhwaite, and Lennard竣.

---

**Conclusion**

In the end it invites us to 'awaken the very aspirations to such as something controllable in principle' (p.46). This is degenerative into a brutish realism and a form of 'epistemological naturalism' of a 'totally inhabited' (p.46).

Soper's distinction between postmodernism as a spirit of the age and as an intellectual project is useful. However, while recognizing the socio-historical roots of the postmodern consciousness, Soper deals with postmodernism only as an intellectual concern. Thus she appears to think that it can be overcome by showing it to be logically incoherent. But a critique which addresses only the relative and derivative nature of postmodernism is not sufficient. We need to understand the social processes necessary to the development of the current condition of postmodernism in its various contexts and its emergence of a new rationality. If this cannot be done, then criticism is limited in an essentially conservative manner, an attempt to reverse what is then irreversible.

Soper's discussion, however, highlights a problem that is general. The supposed role of the project seems to be that of rectifying 'the error of relativism' (p.98) or 'irrational or fake consciousness' (p.11). If it is a form of totalizing degeneration of universal human relations, then intellectual work seems to have no common purposes that are even roughly harmonious. This goes together with a lack of recognition of social justice. Soper's solution is that a 'total social transformation' of society is necessary. Here I would argue that his account is not a part of the longer term project of recuperating the intellectual high ground (p.7). It is difficult to avoid concluding that the tasks of social hegemony are too great. There is no recognition that individuals must transform society and so transform themselves.

The book is presented as a contribution to the process of social 'de-ideologization' and in particular as a response to the collapse of elites in the USSR and Eastern Europe and the weakness of the national discourse of the Third World (p.7). Yet the general impression given to the philosopher of the Socialist Movement seems to remain trapped within the old perspective. There is no real break from the old practices of ad hoc intervention and the concern to associate the market economy across the current preferences of the Social elite.
Trotsky Reappraised

David Cornman

The Trotsky Reappraisal

Terry Brackenridge and Paul Dubik (eds),

Ends University Press, 1992

Leon Trotsky is undoubtedly one of the most controversial figures of twentieth-century Marxism. Opinions about him divide Family between pro- and anti-Trotsky camps, and many aspect of maintaining a skeptic attitude towards the man. There cannot be another moral, other than Stalin, who has inspired so much devotion on the one side, and so much hatred on the other. Clearly, sympathies with Trotsky lead to a positive attitude towards Trotsky and the first aspect of Trotsky's characterization by Stalin has additionally been depicted as absurd and Helsinki's call for new attention to many opponents of Stalinism. This is itself has induced a polarization which has obstructed attempts at objective evaluation of his work. It is difficult to discuss the theory of permanent revolution, the law of combined and uneven development, and the analysis of the state, independence of Stalin's attitude to the state. The same factors Stalinism meant them as a dangerous heresy, has actually added to their appeal.

But serious discussion of Trotsky has been impeded also by a deep polarization within the anti-stalinist left itself. Here the split between the pro- and anti-Trotskyite has been pronounced. For Trotsky, Trotskyism has been the real and opposition to Stalinism, while for others there is no real difference. On the one hand, there are those who will tolerate no criticism of his views and in the other the those who see them as a heresy. Some of Stalinism's ontologies have been utilized in part to the end of anti-revolution of the Stalinists, other anti-marxists have focused rather on Khrushchev, on the industrialization of labour, and on the destruction of the Malenkov movement. It would be false to overstate anti-utopianism, maximum or Stalinist treachery is. Alluck on Trotsky's many Stalinist all too often resemble those by the Stalinists themselves.

This circumstantial does not reflect change. Rather it reinforces the view that Trotskyism is the only principled opposition to Stalinism. Significantly, the only serious critical work on Trotsky to have emerged in the last fifty years has come from within the Trotskyite movement itself. In many cases, such those of Victor Serge, Lins Besteovsky, and CLR James, criticisms have been probed with political and theoretical concerns with Trotskyite but this does not alter the fact that serious criticisms have come only from within. In fact the tendency towards incorporation with Trotskyite was always uneven in its development and is now clearly breaking down. The real obstacle to dialogue today is the widespread ascension of the formal anti-trotskyism. Trotskyism has persisted at least in part be

cause socialism has existed; it is defined itself very much by opposition to fascism. The ongoing gathering of Stalinists will therefore, either in the regression of fascism, or to its collapse. There are sharp lines of both a new theoretical approach on the one hand, and blind network on the other. It is within this context that it is possible to evaluate the concepts of "Trotsky Reappraisal", a collection of papers presented at one of the conferences held in 1990 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the assassination of Trotsky. The conference in question, "Trotsky after fifty years", was held at American University in July and August 1990. Anyone who wants to know more about the conference itself should consult the review by Robert Hyman in its main issue of this journal "Fifty Years of the Assassination", Radical Change 2.

Not all of the papers presented at the conferences have been included in the book. Nevertheless, the published material addresses a wide range of questions and issues, covering philosophy, history, political and economic, and it does so from a variety of perspectives. As one of the editors, Terry Brackenridge, notes in his concluding essay, "No reader could agree with everything in it. The collection is deliberately eclectic" (p.25). In addition it is work from several scholars from Eastern Europe and the former USSR, who have been able to study Trotsky since the opening of the archives in the course of perestroika. It is impossible to account for everything. Instead I want to focus on a series of papers which discuss Trotsky's role in bolshevism, and to Leon Trotsky in particular, and the paper by Peter Tinkler on Trotsky's public activity.

Challenging the common view that Trotsky and Leon agreed on virtually all things at least in the period after the revolution, these papers argues for a clear distinction between Trotsky and Leon in bolshevism. The aim is clearly in order to re-examine Trotsky from associations with Leon, in order to examine their arguments and briefly discuss some positions.

In Trotsky and the struggle for "Lenin's Heritage", Mikhail Roman traces Trotsky's changing relations to Lenin in the period after the revolution, from the first debate between Lenin and Trotsky in 1920, through the "Lenin-Zinoviev camp" at the 10th Party Congress, to the 10th Congress of the Russian Revolution in 1922. Roman outlines and explores their arguments and disagreements but never in a sectarian manner. As he himself notes, criticism of Trotsky is necessary but it must not be persuaded from the assumption that in conflict between Lenin and Trotsky all right and Lenin on one side and Stalin on the other (p.76). In exploring these conditions, and Trotsky's limitations, Trotsky's limitation in his struggle against Stalin, Roman emphasizes Trotsky's role in movement of the Bolshevik Party - he joined only after July 1917 - and his consequent marginalization within it.

Related to this is the question of Trotsky's political individuality and independence. Unlike most of the Bolshevik leaders, Trotsky was not a pupil of Lenin's and has an independent history, the outline of the theory of permanent revolution, which he developed with Lenin in Moscow before 1917. When he joined the Bolshevik Party, it was not because he had adopted "bolshevism", but rather, because he and a few other Bolshevik leaders had adopted a position closer to his own on the nature of the revolution. The acceptance of a programme similar to that of permanent revolution was not universal within the Bolsheviks party even after 1917 - Zinoviev, Kamenko and Stalin has always argued to have expressed the concern of power in 1917 - and Trotsky remained marginalized. Summing up his argument, Roman says "the fundamental change that history must direct towards Trotsky is that, in October 1917, it was Trotsky who was a greater threat to the party that was not his party and which he did not control. Apart from the initial period of the revolution and the Civil War, the only role open to him was as a critic of this party" (p.51).

The same theme appears also in Ida<br>Gerstein's piece on "Trotsky and the Russian Socialist Democratic community: the emergence of revolutionary ideology". This article covers much of the ground covered elsewhere by Ida Gerstein in "The Political and Cultural Development" (Ivan7, 1980). Gerstein's account, however, shows greater scholarship. Her knowledge of the position of Russian Social Democracy on the question of the Russian Revolution is wide - Gerstein draws extensively on the work of Leon Trotsky and Kostrovsky, but also uses the works of Anton, Piansky, I. L. Lecuyer, Krause, and Material, and Mussa.<br>

In addition Gerstein's account is greater depth the role of Trotsky's role in the Russian revolution. The main criticism is that he accepts the account of Bolshevism laid down by Trotsky that falling to challenge the notion of the "bourgeois democratic revolution", of course, is here such a basis? Where does this idea come from? The usual account cited in the Communist Manifesto but while Marx and Engels distinguish the state into bourgeois revolution from the role of permanent revolution, there is no mention of a role for being a "bourgeois democratic revolution". Nevertheless, in its Gerstein's father's no is greater than that of anyone else who has written on the subject while it is not critical to our knowledge of the period is not very valuable. A third article to examine the question of Trotsky's relation to Lenin is Richard Davenport-Hines's "The political theory of Lenin". Hines also attempts to link Trotsky's understanding of the role of socialism is history to his political critique of Stalinism and the Five Year Plan.
Rossi, Day states Trotsky's understanding of consciousness within the dialectical tradition of Hegel's: "Models and useful devices" is the phrase. Without reading the text itself, you can infer that the text discusses Trotsky's views on consciousness and his influence on the development of social revolution. This topic is central to the understanding of Trotsky's political strategy and the evolution of his thought on the relationship between consciousness and action.

The reference to "a recent article" suggests that the text may be discussing a recent publication by Trotsky or another author. The text mentions Trotsky's "crucial perspective" on the "process of capitalist development," indicating that the author is likely discussing Trotsky's views on the historical and economic processes that shaped the evolution of capitalism.

The text includes references to Trotsky's works and other scholars, such as Lenin, Engels, and others, suggesting that the discussion is grounded in a scholarly discourse on political economy and consciousness. The text appears to be a structured analysis, likely aiming to elucidate Trotsky's contributions to the understanding of capitalist society and the role of consciousness in the revolutionary process.

Overall, the text provides insight into Trotsky's thought, focusing on the complex interplay between consciousness, economic development, and political action. It highlights Trotsky's role in advancing the Marxist theory of consciousness and its implications for the class struggle and the path to socialism.
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The crimes working class consciousness. Workers are aware that they are exploited by the capitalist but they are also aware that the historically existing "alternatives" do not solve the problem. In so far as the forms of the prevention of communism appear as alternatives, by appearing to be the only possible alternatives, they seem to indicate that these are the only alternatives.

The prevention of communism removes the rational/illegal notion of needs within the wider context of a world market economy. This rationalized notion of needs being the basic for the global preservation of capital. The law of value is supposed to differ in different regions within specific industrial localities in order for it to be preserved globally through finance capital. Involutional finance capital is almost the source of external discipline which is transferred to the working class within specific national localities, through the forms of the prevention of communism. Through the movement of finance capital, absolute poverty and absolute labor are constantly re-created globally. Workers organize nationally only to find that the problem is international. Finance capital appears to be beyond the reach of working class action.

There is a sense in which social production has become increasingly "de-institutionalized". To the extent that the law of value always appears to bureaucratic administration social relations become more "transcendent". Nationalization, government subsidization of industrialization, tariffs, and the like, seem to make the law of value inapplicable. The state, "full employment" is indicated by the distribution of social labor. No longer be achieved through the law of value alone, but increasingly requires direct forms of social control. Thus, for example, the government intervenes in the "economy" to influence "demand", interest rates and inflation, to set up relatively permanent institutions of industrial arbitration, to adjust rents and to maintain or undermine "full" employment. With this intensification of direct forms of social control, however, it becomes clearer that it is people and not things which are the source of the problem. On the other hand, these non-value forms of control themselves are subsistent in value globally and function to preserve it. Social democracy and socialism thus continue with finance capital in order to maintain the illusion of the "value" form.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that much of the left has tended to present the forms of the prevention of communism as being transitional to communism. This is not only because capitalist relations exist but also of certain strands of intransigency. For some of the latter, "The Soviet experience, despite its very specific character, was nevertheless a great laboratory for establishing the possibility of planning over the means market economy of capitalism, and for learning from the gross mistakes and misjudgments perpetuated by the "Socialist" experience." (Anonymous "Forward" to the New Park edition of Trotsky's Theory of Capitalism and Socialism. 1978, p79). By presenting intransigence as being with whatever critical reservations, an advanced on capitalism, such statements only add to the movement towards communism. Worse still, when the working class begins to move against the social forms within which it has been partially contained, it finds itself being forged back into the self-proclaimed existence of the existing order: not only by the social Democrats and the right wing but also by those who have developed the revolutionary critique. Workers injection of the forms of the prevention of communism is thus taken as evidence of continued passivity in the face of bourgeois ideology. The active intervention of class organization into the prevention responses of the working class itself obstructs that movement.

Communism has thus become identified with the prevention of communism. Thus, in the name of "full employment", "full employment" becomes a means of "full employment" protest, "full employment" violent protest, "full employment" revolution. The whole picture of the prevention becomes obscured and the struggle of the working class has no tendency towards communism. If we are to review this picture then we must start our analysis on the movement of the working class itself. The critique of the prevention of communism and capitalism cannot be avoided, but it must begin with the recognition of the prevention of communism. Our talk is not to stifle debate but to avoid endless debates on the basis of an analysis of class composition and class formation within the political economy of the working class. Failure to do this, the left has been unable to face itself from the inherited ideology of working class passivity. Lack of contact with the political economy of the working class, the left is reduced to making assertions about consciousness, which mentions and often degenerate into sectarianism.

It is understandable that many of those who have stressed the reality of proletarian self-activity have done so in a rather crude fashion. This is true of certain strands of anarcho-syndicalism. Thus, for example, sometimes we must always - resist the struggle of the working class as a process without end (Bakunin)."Reading Capital Politically. However, 1979) If, however, the working class can continue to transform the social forms of capital accumulation individually, the struggle of the working class has no tendency towards communism. Failing to analyze the law of value under the impact of the self-formation of the proletariat, the critique of "anarchism" into "self-formation" which only reproduce each other.

The crucial link is to recognize the problem. Included in this is the intransigence age between the project outlined in What Is To Be Done? and the principle of prevention self-marginalization which forms the body of the International Working Men's Association. We must turn to Marx. More importantly, however, we must return to the question of the development political economy of the working class. Critically, we must examine the conditions which are the reasons for the passing of the working class struggle but against which the working class is forced to struggle again. If we are to understand the full complexity and difficulty of the situation. To begin to understand this complexity we can use the words of William Morris, benefit to read the different contexts in which they were written and understanding their gender specificity, referring to the "how men fight and how the habit of the thing that they fought for comes about to spite of their defeat, and when it comes about that there is not to be what they meant, and other men have to fight for what they meant under another name" (A Dream of John Ball). For this, it should be remembered, can only be our starting point.

David Conner