"...the formation of a class with radical chains...a class which is the dissolution of all classes, a sphere which has a universal character because of its universal suffering and which lays claim to no particular right because the wrong it suffers is not a particular wrong but wrong in general...and finally a sphere which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating itself from - and thereby emancipating - all the other spheres of society, which is, in a word, the total loss of humanity and which can therefore redeem itself only through the total redemption of humanity. This dissolution of society as a particular class is the proletariat."

KARL MARX
STATEMENT OF INTENT

The working class is based on radical classes: it experiences suffering and dehumanisation of global significance, yet the "success" of the "active" working class is evidenced by expressions of class solidarity. This process is seldom understood and rarely enacted, yet the working class is a collective force that, when united, can effect social change. The aim of the working class is to achieve a world in which the working class is in control of its own destiny, and to work towards a society that is free from exploitation and oppression.

The world in which we live is driven by a constant struggle between the forces of production and the forces of consumption. The working class is constantly adapting to these forces, and is constantly changing. This struggle is not only about economic gain, but is also about social and political change.

Yet this determination can only be a starting point. The actualisation of the world is a process of plugging and the world transforms itself. Within the context of capitalism, the working class can only achieve its goals through collective action. The working class must organise itself and unite in order to achieve its goals.

The working class is a dynamic force, constantly evolving and adapting to its environment. It must be prepared to face new challenges and to take new forms. The working class must be resilient and adaptable.

The working class is a collective force that can change the world. It must be united and organised in order to achieve its goals. The working class must be prepared to take new forms and to adapt to its environment. The working class is a force for change, and it must be prepared to face new challenges.
We are confronted with the reality of collapse, of the post-war world consensus, of the notion that, of the cold war. All the systems that had assured stability for accumulation, all collapse. The core of the left itself, which has in one way or another been implicated in the various forms, especially administrative, set up over the working class. This whole change, the left falls apart, to pursue quantified.

The Gulf war offers the left salvation through submission in a classic issue, opposition to war. The issues not clear enough the usual analysis stands on some forms of anti-imperialism. Empirical, it can be argued, has declined in an imperative system of redrawn powers compelled by falling profiteers ultimately to go in war over the division of the world. These imperial powers are the reactionary necessities of decline and their defeat would weaken the forces opposing the proletariat. Anti-imperialism this as the common position and support progressive forces that are not necessarily the proletariat, in so far as they weaken imperialism. All this amounts to a powerful argument which should not be dropped without serious debate.

The logic of the argument should seem to suggest "Victory in Iraq!" This latter power, distinguished by its subaltern role, became the ostensible progressive power that helps in crack imperialism. The position is implicit in the left's response but it has pretty well assumed anti-war position of "Hands off the Gulf!"

There is no question against the view. The real question is whether the old arguments are adequate or need to be re-examined. This is particularly important in light of changes since 1914. The most real of these, and one which has been inadequately theorized, is the development of the working class in some cases referred to as the "dark world." Solidarity of workers internationally has a remarkable width back then to Lenin's day. In fact itself, the 1918 revolution made a decisive appearance of the proletariat quite impossible in Lenin's time. Despite apparent ideological differences, Iraq and Iran have much in common: they are founded on the cornerstone of proletarian revolution. This is itself given no reason to doubt whether an Iraqi victory would constitute a weakening of the imperialism system.

Military victory, yes by the USA, does not directly translate into social victory. It may solve one set of problems by dragging the USA deeper into others. Defeat of Hussein may in fact provuce a yet more radical opposition within the regime.

Saddam Hussein has played an important role for the USA, is in a way similar to other names. Victory over Hussein would simply require another USG slogan "Long Live Saddam Hussein!" The USA needs an image to engineer justified reasons for sanctions compatible with the USA, requiring to remove the bomb power.

The situation is complicated by the collapse of the cold war. In old or post-war assumption of the West having gone, the USA finds in the Gulf, which is aligned to its strategic importance. This becomes more important given the occurrence of economic news and the potential for breakdown into civil wars before than the supposed world trade rules (the GATT Uruguay round). The crisis might appear to offer the USA an opportunity to subdue countries against the major nations in its own league. This, however, there is no power of the Bi-anio region. Iraq's in post-war war and we would have a devastating impact on the USA (the Gulf war). Even if working-class opposition does not prevent war, it will certainly have to resist, setting this massive victory of defeat. A further complicating factor in this, is increasingly ideological necessity. We are approaching the "Age of the Husband Chickens," a right living ideological thread, and a left position that either pushes out the old line or reassessment to the market.

It cannot be predicted whether the USA will go to war. It needs an escalation of threats to threaten Hussein that it does mean war, in order to get his partial withdrawal. But there is little reason to believe that Hussein will come to the rescue. His dog is now aware that the expected military and domestic political reasons are so great that force as an option is scarcely even a last resort. This leaves the USA in a worse impossible situation.

So evolving course of this means the left has waited, since the 1990s, to have been paralleled at the political level. Disenchantment and complacent reaction, this inevitably has allowed blurring of the distinction between the communist project and "progress." The nature of "progress" the left has supported a regimes ideology after another. From the early years of the Comintern, support for "progressive" forces has essentially subordinated the proletariat to alien interests. For the working class, typically, the results have been devastating.

This perspective found its highest expression in the phenomenon of the USSR at some variety of workers state, despite the total absence of any collective forms of the working class. Thus the left has held on an objectively isolated form and actually opposed to the historical subjectivity of the working class.

The ruling class has everywhere pursued progress to communism. Progress itself is a project that has evolved from the need of the bureaucracy to delay confrontation. The left, far from it, after years of popular frustration and accommodation to administrative comfort, has lost the perspective of communism and recognition of the practical need for the supercession of exchange relations.

The widest content of the left must reaffirm our attitude to the Gulf. The basis helpssubmenu the origin of the left. It offers the left a perspective division, one that concretely inifies the interest of the proletariat, and involves them the urgency of the immediate situation. A world of immediate moments here, in favor of organizational priorities, subverted through the guise of "national liberation." Repositioning of the left requires survival of the consciousness perspective.

Towards this conclusion, this is the issue in this article. The point is to suggest that David Graeber. This takes us up an open contradiction between commodity fetishism and proletarian emancipation. Graeber identifies an element in left thinking that this is has been replicated unchanged. And, often treated, for the assumption of the necessity of the working class. Failing to advance its political power to the present period, the left has collapsed community foundations and What It's All About into a narrative for analysis. Against this central alp of the left's loss of a pyramid perspective, Graeber presents the material process of class conflict.

Our second article, by Bob Shepherd, on Anton Pannekoek's theory of transition, also continues to this project of survival. Politically, Shepherd argues, founded his analysis on the point of view of the class as it emerged within the developing social isolation of German prov and post-WW I. Pannekoek could have observed that the workers' own struggle necessitated continuously to break down systems and forms resulting from previous struggles. This gave him a powerful analysis of opportunism and enabled him to perceive the depths of mere representation of the working class. His understanding of communism as a means allowed him to comprehend the period of transition as one of discontinuity. This is in stark contrast with Lenin's belief that it was enough to "cross out" the word "bourgeois-revolutionary imperialism" from his description of German large-scale engineering and planned economy and replace it with a novel state. This last but helped foresee liberal notions of "socialism.

As usual we also present features covering aspects of the history of the left. We welcome a report by Baran Hine on a conference called in the 50th anniversary of the murder of Leon Trotsky by a GPU agent. Here Hine vividly re-creates the different aspect that today Trotsky is being put. In addition we have an essay on our relations to Gay Akron on trade union and the class struggle. This first appeared in 1971 at the height of black and police discrimination, dominated by syndicalism, but taken a critical attitude to trade unions, seeing them as having evolved into a tool of the system. We must also remember the sad death of Wolfran Bennington. David Office on Our New Back Page gives us a summary of Benjamin's life as he strived intelligently to become a socialist, and records his tragic suicide in west occupied Europe.

In the enshrined world of capital the emancipation of the working class can only be won by the working class itself. To say this, however, is to make assumptions and raise questions about the nature of commodity relations and ideology, the meaning, class and party, and about the nature of the transition to communism itself. These assumptions have often been approached through the theory of fetishism and, as its most extreme, this theory has been appropriated in such a way as to be positied as an absolute barrier to understanding and so, by implication, to self-emancipation. This form of its appropriation is however erroneous. There is in fact an incompatibility between the theory of fetishism and the principle of proletarian self-emancipation.

To show this, however, it is first necessary to outline the nature of the assumptions underlying the notion that fetishism is an absolute barrier to communism. These assumptions, it will be argued, involve the distortion of communism from the base of real and fundamentally, the conception of working class passivity. This is followed by a close reading of Marx which attempts to specify the wider context of which the theory of fetishism is a part. This means, it is argued, includes not just the law of value but the entire law of planning and the self-formation of the working class through the conscious determination of needs. Finally, it is necessary to look at the evens since the death of Marx which appear to contradict this analysis. By linking these errors to the assumptions about the prevention of communism (Davie Brown, 'The Gibson Oracle' chap 11) it is possible to avoid the conclusion of working class passivity in the face of bourgeois ideology.

It should be stressed that what follows is not intended as a definitive answer to these questions. For one thing, it fails to take up the question of politics and ideology discussed by Lipietz for example (see his The Engelsian World, Julian Price and World Comm. 1965) for another, through the analysis outlined here has implications for questions of organization which are not drawn out. Finally, I shall be aware of the evolution of Marx's own thought on the subject. It is hoped that some issues will be taken up at a later date.

Abstraction and Passivity

The core of the theory of fetishism - as give an initial characterization - is that under capitalist social labour cannot appear as social labour but only in the form of the exchange of things as equivalents. This has implications for the nature of bourgeois ideology. Contemporary discussion of fetishism and it shows these implications. The focus is on two intertwined features of bourgeois ideological forms. First, in such coercion, social relations appear in the form of (or are combined with) things. Second, what is social and historical appears to be (or to be taken to be) natural and eternal. It is because social relations appear in the form of things (or are taken to be things) that capitalist social relations appear to be (or are taken to be) natural. Commodity fetishism is then presented as the basis of ideological mystification in bourgeois society.

It can hardly be said that there has been an extensive debate on the subject. However, in contemporary discussions of fetishism, two apparently opposed interpretations can be discerned which might be thought to imply very different political strategies. On the one hand, "subjectivism" such as Engels' view that fetishism can only be removed by the political solution of the material conditions which give rise to it. On the other hand, "objectivism" such as Gilman suggest that fetishism is an institutional error attributable to corruption by material interests alone. In fact, these apparently opposed positions converge and their convergence can be traced back to mutual assumptions about the nature of the working class. Labour and Gilman are united only in their interpretation of fetishism as an apparently opposed understandings of commodity relations on the left.

An example of the "subjective" account can be found in Engels, according to whom: "By commodity fetishism Marx means: the objective appearance of the social relations of commodity production. In other words, men's own mutual relations appear to them in the form of facts of nature characterized by material objects, the products of their own labour" (Of Engels, Marxism and the Class Struggle, New York, 1975). This conception of fetishism, Engels argues, gives "the actual appearance to the producers by the system of capitalist production and not just the determination of their class consciousness." (Gilman). fetishism is in the Engels, a question of organisation as well as of mystification. But the question of mystification is as important for Engels, a question for Marx, a question for the consciousness of the workers within the limitations of the trade union consciousness (Gilman). Class struggle, as in that conclusion becomes reduced to a struggle between bourgeois ideology and worker theory for hegemony over the consciousness of the working class: "even though the mass of workers experience exploitation, it is necessary for a struggle to take place between their existing consciousness on the one hand, and Marxism on the other" (Gilman). "Consciousness," in the form of Marxist theory, means, Engels argues, therefore be brought to the workers "from outside".

As an example of the apparently opposed view - the "objectivist" account - can be found in Gilman, The theory of commodity fetishism here: "if people's misrecognition of the products of labour once they enter exchange, a misrecognition which accords these forms of value looking point in what is still a human discourse" (Booth, Gilman, Alienation, Cambridge, 1971). Workers experience exploitation, but in the course of the experience, "are prone to confuse the means with the ends of their experiences, to attribute to inanimate objects the social characteristic of an exploiting agency" (ibid).

By consisting of means of production as means of exploitation, Engels argues, workers grant their institutions in conflict with the demands of a particular situation but "they consistently misunderstand and are incapable of responding to it in ways that would produce their intentions" (ibid).

Elsewhere Gilman spells out the political implications more fully, although he makes no explicit reference to the theory of fetishism. Conditions have been the successful results since 1946: "If it was not conditions which failed Marx, they have been the working class" (Rudi Gilman, Social and Sexual Revolution, Paris, 1979). The task for socialism is, therefore education. Workers need not forty are effectively lost for revolution and socialism mean focus their efforts on "wage and even younger members of the working class" (ibid). The task is "to help the class conscious of the new generation of workers" (ibid). Gilman's strategy for social revolution rests on the highest expressions of his brand game Class Struggle.

"Objectivation" and "subjectivation" tend to converge in achieving consciousness from, and encompassing in the domain of social reality. This creatively conveys the need to deliver "emancipation" to the workers. The project itself, however, stands a result. If fetishism is in the hierarchy to workers' consciousness, it must also be a barrier to the emancipation of the proletariat. This obliviousness must themselves
be educated. Two possibilities follow. Either there is no need to bring consciousness to the workers if it is impossible. The ‘solution’ to the problem is a pseudo-solution and this is because the problem, as we see, is infeasible.

In fact the problem is itself a pseudo-problem. Underlying the assertion of consciousness from the rest of social reality the assumption is severely overestimated, that the working class is essentially passive. While workers struggle against this or that aspect of capitalism, it is assumed they never struggle against the whole. Their struggles therefore have no impact upon the social masses and so have no tendency towards communism.

The supposed ‘passivity’ has to be explained and the explanation has been in terms of ideology to consciousness. Passive consciousness is an objectivising aspect of the social production of alienation but when the working class is assumed to be passive for the question of whether Feuchtwanger is ‘objective’ or ‘subjective’ loses its significance. Rather, consciousness is understood to be ‘objective’ or ‘subjective’ is accessory to the assumption of working class passivity.

The Fallacy of ‘What is to be Done?’

It is necessary to understand the terms of reference within which such a conclusion might be reached. The principle work to be examined in this context is What Is to Be Done? The essay, written in 1902, provides a particular ‘model’ of the relations between class and party and hence consciousness and ideology to which the assumption of working class passivity is central. Even those who reject or oppose ‘Invasion’ have often taken it on board as the assumption of working class passivity. What Is to Be Done? has become a potential source of fascination for the left. This is because it appears to address contemporary concerns. Some of its assumptions have become a taken-for-granted frame of reference within which the left moves; they have indeed paled into the ‘common sense’ of the left.

The central concern of ‘What is to be Done?’ is the supposed containment of the working class within the ‘economic struggle’ through which, with the help of socialists agitation, workers learn to ‘feel their necessity and enter with mind and fight their employers over a petty commercial deal’ (Mcalc). This ‘containment’ is attributed to the influence of bourgeois ideology: ‘The working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism, but the more widespread (and continually revised in the more diverse forms) bourgeois ideology neutralises, spontaneously imposes itself still more’ (Mcal).

To be faced with the influence of bourgeois ideology workers must acquire knowledge of the identity of bourgeois social relations: ‘class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only if their whole, that is only from outside of the economic struggle, from outside of the sphere of relations between masters and employers. The sphere outside which alone it is possible to throw that knowledge to the sphere of relationships between all the class and inside and the state and the government, the sphere of the latter relations between all the classes’ (Mcal).

Because the influence of bourgeois ideology is so strong, the knowledge necessary for revolutionary change and indeed socialist consciousness itself, can only be ‘brought’ to the working class ‘from without’. ‘The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only mere trade consciousness, is the consciousness that is it necessary to criticize in itself, fight the employers and strive to get the government to pass necessary labour legislation, etc. The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophism, historical and economic doctrine that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the proper classes, the intellectuals’ (Mcal).

A number of critiques can be made. First, the category of the ‘economic struggle’ corresponds to no known social reality. The struggle over the length of the working day in the nineteenth century bears capital into crisis, necessitating the transition to another form of capital accumulation. Second, if history ‘speaks’ anything, it is that workers are quite capable of going beyond, ‘beyond consciousness’. 1848 and 1917 are examples - one of which Lenin should have been aware (indeed the concern of 1848 was to discuss fascism, not autonomously from some of the same ramifications of the working class consciousness. Finally, if the impact of bourgeois ideology is such that it ‘spontaneously’ imposes itself on the working class, it ‘must spontaneously’ impose itself on the socialist party. Again, the project of bringing consciousness to the workers ‘from the outside’ is either customary or impossible. The most important point, however, concerns the distinction between consciousness and ideology from political economy. What is to be Done? might be a response to a real problem. Although it effectively deals with only the superficial phenomena, it deals with them in such a way that it has been able to pass into the common sense of the left as a set of taken-for-granted assumptions. These assumptions have become so ingrained that they are often read into Marx’s discussion of commodity fetishism. In turn, the theory of commodity fetishism is used to explain the phenomenon observed in What Is to Be Done? One commentator has put it: ‘The classical expression of the Marxist revolutionary ideology, Lenin’s What Is to Be Done? was not so much a theory of ideology as such, and Lenin does not explicitly account for the rise of bourgeois ideology in industrial consciousness in terms of the political economy of capitalist society. Nevertheless, her conception of a ‘learned organization of revolutionary thought’ is fundamental to any serious analysis of the dynamic, stability and continuity of the revolutionary struggle, derives its initial impact from the Stalinist party line, and its ultimate endorsement in paked society’ (David Harvey, Beyond the Sociology of Capital, Macmillan 1977).

Standing Marx on his Feet: Class Consciousness and Class Formation

This contrast with the self-activity of the working class is brought out clearly in Marx’s analysis of the process of class formation. This is the process by which living labour overcomes the dominance of social division and consciousness itself as a social force capable of organizing production in accordance with consciously determined need, it is a process of political economy with an inherent tendency towards communism. It is out of this process that class consciousness develops. The analysis of class formation first appears in the Poverty of Philosophy (1847) and The Communist Manifesto (1848). It re-appears in Marx’s Taunus writings in a more developed form.

For Marx, the subordination of living labor to capital is not given, but is conditioned by the struggle of the working class. In the
urge of this struggle, which is in turn economic and political - as in the Chartist movement, for example - the working class develops itself as a social form. The accumulation resulting from the competition over the sale of labour power and from the power of capital forms workers in order to maintain their wages. In so doing they both alienate competition among themselves and unite against their employers. In time, and especially with the experience of capitalist oppression, the maintenance of competition becomes more important than the maintenance of workers. Combinations that have become persistent associations, in the preservation of which wages might be satisfactory.

A form of self-organization developed for this purpose takes on many forms. Indeed, for Marx, the form of these combinations is part of the process of the formation of the class itself, not merely something accidental, but an integral part of the development of the capitalist mode of production. On the one hand, of a significant number of individuals, united in a simple association to maintain their wages. Here, Marx speaks of "volumes, combinations, and other forms in which the tendencies carry not before their own eyes their organization as a class." (Kautsky’s Philosophy)

Combinations grow out of the struggles of the workers themselves. In the course of the struggle, this predisposition is held by individuals "who have found for themselves the whole process of self-organization (the historical movement) as a whole" (Kautsky’s Marxism). The "bourgeois" society forms this "intellect," in no way based on ideas or principles never, or discovered by this or that would-be-reformer. They merely express, in general terms, social relations springing from an existing class struggle, from an historical movement going on under their very eyes" (Kautsky). Theory is descriptive and explanatory rather than prescriptive. It describes, generally, makes explicit what is already implied by the consciousness struggle and organization of the workers themselves. The emphasis is on the self-activity of the working class, on the consciousness of the working class. How does the revolutionary intellect work? Marx argues that the revolutionary intellect works only "at a time when the class struggle is the decisive hour" (Kautsky).

Booting Marx: Capitalism, Class Formation and Commodity fetishism

Marx’s concern with the self-activity of the working class and the process of class formation is not ignored in the Populist Pluralist and the Capitalist-Materialist. It is clear from the discussions of labor and in Capital and elsewhere. Thus, however, has been obscured by the influence of the assumptions embedded in What Is, If It's Real, and the best accounts of labor, including the most recent, are based on the influence of the assumptions embedded in What Is, If It’s Real, and are based on the experience of labor. The theory of fetishism constitutes part of a theory which includes not only the law of value but also the law of value. The law of value is the basic for working class formation and is the process of class formation which determines the material form of commodity fetishism. Marx’s theory of fetishism is developed in connection with an account of these classes.

Commodity fetishism is no more the expression of working class "passivity", but is actively understood in the process of working class self-formation. Capital has been used, not read, and read political., and yet this point remains unstated.

The theory of commodity fetishism refers to the inverted appearance of the social forms and relations of trade previously production and of the forms and relations of its dissolution and recuperations. Marx, fetishism is not static or unchanging but

Universal exchange requires the existence of the universal equivalent, money. Because of its physical divisibility, gold is well suited for this function. Its monetary role is not an intrinsic property of gold, but is merely the form under which certain social relations manifest themselves. (Capital, vol. I) Gold becomes money because all other commodities have come to express it (Kautsky volume 1). But the social process appears as an inherent form: it appears that "all other commodities express (hold) value in, because it is money" (Friedrich). In other words, "a social relation, a definite relation between individuals, here appears as a mental, a fixed, a purely physical, external thing, which can be found, as such, in nature, and where it is identified (translated from its natural essence) (Kautsky, 1984, p. 239.) That is who Marx calls "the magic of money." (Capital, vol. I).
Because of their essential role in mediating social relations, things take on a life of their own, and this, Marx argues, is best understood by analogy with religion. (This analogy is, however, generally misunderstood.) In the religious world, the production of the human body appears as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relations with both one another and with the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men’s hands. (Capital vol. I). In religions, these appear as independent, living beings. In ancient Greek religion and mythology, for example, the concept of “wonders” becomes personified by the goddess Athena and in this form enters into relations with other such beings. Zeus, for example, and with human beings, such as Olympos. In the world of commodities, Marx argues, the products of human labour appear as autonomous entities with a life and will of their own, and which enter into relations with each other and with humanity. Commodities exchange in quantities which vary independently of the will of their producers. To the producers themselves, “their own social action takes the form of the action of objects, which raise the producers instead of being ruled by them.” (Capital vol. III).

Commodity fetishism is “irresponsible from the production of commodities” (Ibid). Similarly, commodities “does not strip off its unity until it is revealed as production by freely associated men, and is consequently theEndPoint of the process of separation known as social production” (Capital vol. I). But fetishism is not just a natural but transitional with the development of the capital form itself. Thus, Marx argues, the fetish association with the commodity and money are common in all societies in which forms appear, but with the emergence of the capital form as the distinct form of production, “this parvenu and exchanged world develops still more.” (Capital vol. III, 1894).

In pre-capitalist societies fetishism developed only in relation to money and “money-bearing capital” (Capital vol. II). The basic relations of pre-capitalist society were not, however, subject to fetishism. These relations were direct, based on reciprocities, not on exchange. Under relations of “personal dependence” (Grundrisse, p107) the fact of exploitation is evident, the reality of unpaid surplus labour being entirely visible. In the transition to capitalism, however, relations of personal dependence come to be increasingly hidden by relations of personal independence “traded on objective (mediated) dependence” (Ibid, p178). Absent labour, which entered in early in previous societies, is, in the course of this transition, developed to its fullest form through the formal separation of labour from the conditions of labour. Through the creation of absolute poverty in which money exposes to opposition labour as a commodity, the externalization of the commodity form becomes possible. With this externalization of commodity production, fetishism is unmasked and transformed.

In the early stages of capitalist production, however, where the extraction of absolute surplus value predominates, the capital-labour relationship is “still very simple and the actual connection impressed upon the hearts of this process, the capitalistic personality, and remains in their consciousness. The visible struggle over the working day demonstrated the struggle” (Capital vol. III). In this period, while the historically contingent nature of capitalism might be obscured, the fact of exploitation is not. The magnitude of surplus value is increased by extending the length of the working day and labour power that appears as the source of surplus value. It is only with the transition to the exhaustion of relative surplus value, in response to the resistance of the working day, that capital, “becomes a very mystic being since all of labour’s social productive properties appear to be due to capital, rather than labour as such, and serve to issue from the forms of capital” (Capital vol. III).

The developed capitalist monopoly is organized around a unified process of production in which capital pumps out the direct productivity unpaid surplus labour in the form of surplus value. Surplus value itself does, however appear except as profit, interest or rent. The product of a unified process is differentiated into categories according to function in the process of production, but these differentiated portions of surplus value appear as independent resources (profit, interest, rent). The reality of exploitation is hidden. In appearance three distinct categories of producers draw three distinct lines of revenue from these distinct functional categories of production.

The separation of capital into “industrial” and “financial” functions of the economy of surplus value into “profits of employment” and “interest”. Profit of enterprise appears to be generated by the capital working with the routine of production independently of the capital relation, however, on the other hand, appears to result from more extensive of capital independently of the process of production. To the industrial capitalist profits of employment appears not as the unpaid labour of others, but as the fruit of his own labour. He creates profit only because he exploits, “that because he this works...” (Capital vol. III). Appearing as a force paid worker (earning “wages of the labour of superintendence”), his increase appears identical to those of other workers in those of lesser interest-bearing capital.

At the same time, in interest, the connection between surplus value and labour values, and, with it, the antithesis between capital and labour, interest-bearing capital appears to produce money out of money and is “the most complete fetish” or the “destitute of all automatic form” (Theses of Surplus Value vol. 3 1861). The same connections of surplus value disappear; conflict over the division of the product appears to be accidental rather than essential to the relationship.

The class relationship appears, moreover, to be a necessary condition of production. It appears that labour must take the form of wage labour and that access to life must be secured by the wage. The conditions of wage labour appear as the conditions of labour in general and capital comes to be identified with “produced means of production” (Capital vol. III p 843). Is it a thing and not a social relation. Absence poverty appears as a natural condition of production and not one of social or historical origin. Poverty appears to be, necessarily, capitalist production.
This tendency is evident with the emergence of workers' co-operative and capitalist post-war occupations. It is in both cases the function of suppression of a "residual surplus" in the sense of surplus value. Labour appears as an independent force. A thorough investigation of labour and capital will show what is the difference between the two, as the appropriation of surplus value by capital is the core of the class struggle. The development of the capital form reaches the stage where it no longer hides behind appearances.

Earlier we noted that exploitation becomes increasingly obscured with the transition to the stage of surplus value. The interdependence of the components of surplus value is a source of all capital's power. The forms of socially developed labor - cooperation, transformation, the factory, machinery and science - are the basis of individual workers as powers of capital. Labour appears as an independent force. In machinery, sophisticated labour creates continuous value exchange within the labour process as a power which rises, as the appropriation of labour, in the form of capital (Kapital, p. 605).

What is evident is "the essential aspect of capital" (Kapital, p. 605) to the point where it is central. The development of the forces of production is a function of capital's power. It is the development of productive forces that enables capital to realize its surplus value. This is synonymous with the concept of surplus value and the appropriation of surplus value. The development of the productive forces under capital proceeds through the reduction of unnecessary labour time and the conversion of disposable time into surplus labour time. Capital itself is the driving contradiction, in that it proceeds to reduce labour time to a minimum, which is police labour time, on the other side, an absolute measure and source of value (Kapital, p. 605). The contradiction between the creation of surplus value and its conversion into surplus value is the basis for the formation of capital. The factor that contradiction developed the more, as it becomes evident that the general flow of production can no longer be traced by the appropriation of surplus value. It arises from the fact that the main commodity "the workers must themselves appropriate" is the surplus labour (Kapital, p. 605).

The development of combined labour as a social force manifests itself in the "contingent" form of workers' co-operative and capitalist joint stock companies. These forms, Marx argues, point beyond bourgeois economy. The co-operative form of the workers' act is to create the capitalist with regard to bourgeois production (Kapital, p. 605). They are, in other words, proof that working class self-formation has reached the point in which the specifically capitalist organization of the immediate process of production has become necessary. In the joint stock company, moreover, a product of the same process, capital is here directly endowed with the form of social capital (capital of directly associated individuals) as distinct from private capital, and its understanding (Kapital, p. 605). The point of the joint stock company is to spread "risk", but as Marx observes, the shareholder is taking risks with his own property and with social property. In this form, the opposition of class becomes more evident as social forces and social forces are unified.

In the course of working class self-formation, the struggle against production itself seems to have become progressively internalized. On the other hand, those relating to the sphere of circulation and especially finance capital have been left untouched and have even begun to intensify as finance capital begins to change into a (particularly) formal form. The development of finance capital is itself the result of the entire form of the working class - a process by which capital is reified and internalized in capital (Kapital, p. 605).

In 1863, Marx writes, "The essence of the matter is that the working man is no longer an underclass in the struggle, he is no longer a party of the struggle. It is necessary to organize the working class as an independent organizing body. The working class forms a new social force." (Kapital, p. 605).

The political economy of the working class is underdeveloped to the point of the middle class. Marx refers to it as the "great crime between the haves and the have-nots" and it is the political economy of the middle class, and the social production ruled by the state, which forms the political economy of the working class (Kapital, p. 605). In essence, Marx is speaking of the struggle between the two classes in this way: the law of value is undermined by the state in such a way that the law of value is undermined by the state. This law of value is undermined by the state in such a way that the law of value is undermined by the state. Marx asserts, "The law of value is undermined by the state in such a way that the law of value is undermined by the state. This law of value is undermined by the state in such a way that the law of value is undermined by the state. The law of value is undermined by the state in such a way that the law of value is undermined by the state."
Corporatism, Fisshad and the Promotion of Communist

In Marx, communism is seen to be the expression of the working class because this suppression is not ended. The theory of corporatism is not necessarily the principle of the self-sacrosanctification.

Events since Marx's death, however, might be taken as grounds for doubt. The 20th century has witnessed the apparent depoliticisation of the workers' movement, the growing incorporation of the trade unions, the intimate accommodation to reforms, the outlook of the world crisis, the rise of fascism, the growth of corporatism and the emergence of nationalist movements, all of which seem to point to the appearance of the world corporatism. These developments have been described by many as the result of a shift in the politics of industrial organisation.

This situation appears to justify the assumption of working class passivity which lies at the heart of 20th century socialist ideology.

What can be the basis for the reality of that passivity, the workers' acceptance of the new situation? The economic momentum is not exhausted, the experience of working class passivity seems to be irrevocable. What is wrong with this description? The rise of corporatism seems to be the reason for this situation. But the rise of corporatism has been due to the economic change in the world economy. The rise of corporatism is not a result of the workers' acceptance of the new situation. The rise of corporatism is a result of the economic change in the world economy.
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the working class conscious. Workers are aware that they are exploited and their exploitation is so real and painful that the historically existing "alternatives" do not solve the problem. In so far as the forms of the prevention of consumption appear as alternatives, by appearing to be the only possible alternatives, they seem to indicate that these alternatives are in fact alternatives. The prevention of consumption paralyzes the revolutionary recognition of needs within the wider context of a world market economy, this rationalized recognition of needs being the base for the global preservation of capital. The law of value is supposed to determine the degree within the specific national locations in order for it to be preserved globally through finance capital. Involuntary financial capital thus becomes the source of external discipline which is transferred to the working class within specific national locations, through the forms of the prevention of consumption. Through the movement of financial capital, speculative poverty and abstract 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.

Again, there is a sense in which social production has become increasingly "dis-integrated": to the extent that the law of value always imposes bureaucratic/administrative social relations being more "transparent": Nationalization, government subsidization of industries (from the standpoint of value) and the welfare state ("full employment") are indices that the distribution of social labor can 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. On this side, people and not things are the source of the problem. On the other hand, these new value forms of control themselves are subordinate to value globally and function to preserve it. Social democracy and socialism, thus combine with finance capital to sustain the illusion of the necessity of the value form.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that much of the left has needed to present the forms of the prevention of consumption as being traditional to consumption. This is not only of concern to relative location but also of certain strands of modernism. For some of the latter, "the Socialist experience, despite its very specific character, was nevertheless a great laboratory for establishing the possibility of planning over the market exchange economy of capital, and from learning from the gross mistakes of the "vertical bureaucracy" (Anonymous "Forward" to the New Park edition of Thorin's "Twentieth Century Capitalism or Socialism, 1978,p70). By presenting illusions as being

with whatever critical reservations, an advance on capitalism, each statement only abounds 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 urged back into line by the self-proclaimed "ennemies of the existing order": not only by the social demons and the revolutionaries but also by those who claim to have developed the revolutionary critique. Workers injection of the forms of the prevention of consumption is that taken as evidence of contrasted possibility in the face of bourgeois ideology. The active intervention of class organization into the consumption economies of the working class itself obstructs that movement.

Consumation has thus become identified with the prevention of consumption. Thus Distillationism with the prevention of consumption; thus the forms of disaffiliation with communism itself. This does not imply a simple logical reversal: consumption can be understood only in the relation to social economy and the political economy of the working class is conscious determinism of itself. Having been forced to recognize needs, even if only formally and bureaucratically, is to institute their desecration when the needs arise. It has not been possible, with the exception of the left, so dramatically, consumption is impossible in consumer society. The political economy of the working class has not been, and cannot be so deflected.

Imported Ideologies and Practical Needs

Consumation is not an ethical ideal to be realized by means of proletarian revolution. As the reality of the freely associating producers, consumption is a practical need and can emerge only out of the struggles of the working class. Proletarian revolution is not one possible means amongst others by which to bring into being a desired end, but the necessary outcome of a real social process.

This process is the process of self-formation of the working class. Marx observed in the measures of the (partial) victory of the political economy of the working class over the political economy of the bourgeoisie, and recognized it as a process tending towards communism. Since Marx, however, the intervention of the bourgeoisie into its own political economy has appeared to undermine the possibility of proletariat self- consumption. The results of this intervention have been understood in terms of consensus and ideology alone and thus the communist perspective has been lost.

If we are to retrieve this perspective, we must pursue our analysis on the movement of the working class itself: the critique of the "democracy" and "rationalism" cannot be developed by the opposition but must begin from the analysis of working class consciousness. Our task is not to assertative tauts but to re-examine meanings on the basis of an analysis of class consciousness and class formation within the political economy of the working class. Failing to do this, the left has been unable to face itself from the shadowed shadow of working class passivity. Looking outside the political economy of the working class, the left is reduced to making assertions about consciousness, which must degenerate into sectarianism.

It is unlikely that many of those who have struggled the reality of proletariat self-activity have done so in a rather crude fashion. This is true of certain strands of autonomism. This Chipper, for example, sometimes, but not always, presents the struggle of the working class as a process without end (Larry Chipp, "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 "autonoms" and "liberators" itself becomes a polar opposition which entirely reproduce each other.

The crucial thing is to recognize the problem. Included in this is the intransigent age between the project outlined in "What Is To Be Done" and the principle of proletariat self-formation which formed the backdrop of the International Working Men's Association. We must return to Marx. More importantly, however, we must return to the process of developing political economy of the working class. Crucially, we must examine the conditions which are the outcome of 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, meaning in mind the different contexts in which they were written and dissecting their gender specificity, reflecting on "how men fight and how the battle and the things that they fought for come across to spite of their defeat, and when it comes about turn-out 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 to be achieved, one can only be our starting point.

David Graeber
Under the name of Trade Unionism, knights of labour, self-styled industrialists, Henry George "backed shillings," free-samans, anti-urbanists, etc., etc., are in the same dilemma as the conservatives who were apprehended in one of our western States in diverse ways and means to erect a new jail. After a counsel deliberation they passed from resolution: 1st. That we erect a new jail. 2nd. That the new jail be built out of the material of the old one. 3rd. That the old jail stand until the new one is built. Finding upon reflection that this was impossible to accomplish they passed a fourth. Resolved, that we unanimously recommend that the old jail be whitewashed.
Anton Pannekoek and the Theory of the Transition

Chairman building is poor historical reasonableness and leads to an impoverishment history and yet it has been the source of holist's tradition's homogeneity. Linked to this is a substitution that refers to the writings of the pamphleteer to resolve all questions and disputes either in the manner that fundamentalist christians refer to the Old Testament. It severely reduces the range of explicit analysis of historical events, even of the events around which the pamphleteer has been built. While Isaiah and Tennyson are of course mutually exclusive the pamphleteer is otherwise common to all wings of the tradition and apart from Luxembourg (whose actual views are ignored) is restricted to the Bolshevism revolution. This innate understanding of the dynamics of capital society in the period of view of men from an economically backward country, who despite extensive exile played little or no part in the workers movement in advanced capitalism has concentrated on building an effective revolutionary organization in a country naturally disposed by the possession with an enlightened and authoritarian regime.

Lenin's famous condemnation of the Social International and all its works has led to a neglect of its history and its theorist. And yet, it is the organization that gave voice to and realized in its many ways industrial the politics of the modern era. It is the organization that united the members of the intellectual proletariat and the men from which the trade union movement was a branch and is linked to its category and world view. The world war in the 1910s was a turning point in the history of the international and its interaction with the ruling class and capitalists alike.

Anton Pannekoek is one of the most important revolutionaries coming from the Dutch socialist tradition, perhaps the most early others. The reason is obvious. Pannekoek was the first Honorary of the Communist International, an International League and a leading theorist of western European communism and in particular of the Communist Workers Party of Germany (KAPD) whose separate organisation from the German Communist Party and tactics generally were the chief cause of Lenin writing against the "Island direct method".
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Joseph Dietzgen

(Dietzgen 1826-1896) was a German and self-taught philosopher from Germany. He participated in the horticultural and was founded in 1844 and was focused on the needs of the United States. Thereafter he researched the Atlantic coast and travelled widely in America, often on foot. He was active in the movements on both sides of the Atlantic. He also worked in Russia for several years. Towards the end of his life he took over the editorship of several prominent newspapers in Chicago in the aftermath of the Haymarket demonstration and the Haymarket massacre that followed. He corresponded with Marx, who personally introduced him to a meeting of the International and visited him during a journey to Germany. His first and best book was "The Science of Human Behavior" which presents an inclusive theory of knowledge and bypasses Hume's dilemma by simply accepting that all theories are relative and contingent. As thought and thought derived from behavior, a laborious process, they were as useful as physical objects. Pankow described Dietzgen's theory of knowledge as: "primarily materialist ... it starts from material, materializing being. Not that it regards mere physical matter as its basis; it is rather opposed to crude materialism, and matter is it means everything that exists and embodies matter for thought, including thoughts and imagination. Its foundation is the unity of all concepts living. Engel critically evaluated Dietzgen with the independent discovery of dialectical materialism but in Dietzgen's theories there were no absolute opposites or contradictions but a mutual separation of the particular from the general, giving rise to contradictory categories, together with generalization from the particular. Like Pankow, Dietzgen has been considerably better known worldwide than he is now. In British Dietzgen's works provided the background to the working class movement of such as Fred Copley (see Capitalist and Class) 7 and Noah Adam (see the last issue of Radical Change) working in the Fields Long and Labor College movement."
superficial emphasis. When our recently taken accounts of the present, the immediate, apparently inevitable prove despair and originates upon solid foundations is regarded as the working group Kreisky consistently. However, together with Rudolph Hilferding, Barclay prevented from teaching at the school by the Prussian minister of education. Instead, he became involved in an anti-monarchical and anti-war federation for the future. Concerning took off through Paragraph 4 protecting the existence of Kaiser.

Mass Action and the Departure from Orthodoxy

It is possible that Pannekok was prepared to have academy by the 1909 Russian revolution. The reception of news events in Europe then was different to our perception of them today. Mass strikes had taken place all over Europe, and continued to take place regularly until the outbreak of war, and all discussion of the Russian events took place in the context of a debate on "mass actions" and the "mass strike." The revolution in such as not early disposed of in the meeting of the International. In Germany the debate signified the hardening of divisions in the party no longer between revolution and orthodoxy but between "radicals" and "orthodoxy." Orthodoxy, virtually anti-revolutionary and anti-revolutionary in organization, discipline and "practicable", acted at the same time and particularly at the universal region in a more militant politics getting ground.

From 1907 to 1909 Germany suffered a general economic crisis, and in 1908 a campaign was started for national suffrage in Prussia. Political actions were organized and began with at least social democratic discipline was maintained. Pannekok was beginning to have doubts about the utility of traditional working class organizations and propaganda. In a factional document in the Daily Socialist Party he questioned the standard strategy of revolutionary parliamentarianists for subjective efforts on the basis that "Politics teaches us not to doubt the truth but to doubt about the absolute validity of a truth." "This rash is not absurdist" he said of parliamentarianism "it is the absurd." The labor movement had been able to adapt itself to the strategy of parliamentarism more than is really necessary and it is impossible to unite these goals through three elements. A revolutionary struggle with more powerful forces is necessary.

The general debate on "Massebautz" and the "Massestrahl", followed by the highly controversial "Ironclad Press" suffrage campaign seems to have precipitated Pannekok to reconsider the whole social democratic project during 1909 (this was also the year of the split in the Social Party). He published Social Democracy: Non-Communist Officers and the German Revolution. In this he went beyond the framework of the mass strike debates to call into question the whole basis of the existing organization because there was an "immemorial opposition between revolution and orthodoxy, between Subversion and order." In the suffrage campaign, "the social-democratic non-communist officers do what the Prussian non-communist officers cannot do, they split the petty masonry, acquaint them to discipline and drown them from revolution." The corruption of the movement was "the main hope of the bourgeoisie.

In another shock on orthodoxy in 1909, Marxism and Revolution. Pannekok argued that the subjugation of the working class was not merely due to economic and force but also to the "spiritual capacity of the ruling minority" which controlled schools, churches, press and "diversse all spiritual development of the whole society." The main cause of the weakness of the proletariat was the "spiritual dependence of the proletariat on the bourgeoisie," involving an "organizational spirit" as a way of breaking this dependence. Pannekok blamed against Kaiser's earlier accusations of revolutionaries, but this was "not something abstract, but forward in place of the real concrete organization of the existing organizational forms, but it is in fact something just as real and concrete as these forms. It breaks individuals just as firmly together in any principles and points of view so that even if the external bond of principles and points of view were removed these individuals would no longer be loose stones among each other.

Pannekok's most important development of his theory of justice (collective conscience) also came in 1909 in Karl Marx, and Universal Workers' Movement (see his for context). In this long and clearly argued work he discusses the material and social origins, mediated through human struggle, of conceptions of justice (revolutionaries, giving rise to references and concoctions) that give rise to past revolutions. Both had their works in harmoniously represented middle class attitudes dating from the time of the bourgeois revolution and entered the working class movement even by a variety of routes: the parliamentary deputies and trade union bureaucrats for their jobs, the new perspective forming in small manufacturing as capitalism developed in every region and the lower middle class for its position in a world increasingly dominated by large capital. To adopt one of these positions is the exclusion of the other as an idealized error. But the distant political of the large factories and heavily industrialized regions were capable of seeing both as necessary to develop the pace and social of their development due to their social and material outlook. Nevertheless one would be always present in the movement depending on the development of capital. In front of all the growth reform would be worked for, when until his revolutions would come to the fore. Pannekok defined reform as a position of power for the class rather than as useless power, the strength gained in fighting for and winning reform being more important than the return itself. There was no issue that reform through socialism as reform, such as the limitation of working hours, would be such a practical use in post-capitalist society where workers run production. Finally he noted that because socialism is an ideology rather than as a science it could be adopted by virtually anybody and given content derived from their own experience, it was possible that the greatest threat that Europe countries as a response to the bankruptcy of liberal ideology. Lenin advocated all this in his works, whereas German socialist concepts cannot be detailed even though the exact theory on which it was based completely contrivased his own theory of communism as represented as, for instance, Manuscript and Emile deKock.

Organic Connection

In April 1910 Pannekok settled in Berlin. He had twice visited the town in 1885 to support local radicals in a debate over adulation. This debate revolved around the suggestion for joint work with the Liberals (the parliamentary alliance that had been proposed by the SPD deputies in 1893). The radicals defended the suggestion, a theory that horrified their setting domination of the area. This proposal later, until that decade around Berlin (later known locally as "the Institute of Social Democracy") it was based for Berlin, by which he effectively took over the leadership of the national party from August Bebel in 1912. During Pannekok's brief period at the Berlin party school he had made some of the Berlin radicals, Heinrich Schütz, and then on his articles were regularly published in the local party newspaper, the Börsegramat. By this time the radicals controlled not only the newspaper, but the newly formed local sociological party education and researcher as well. Berlin as a town was a result of what was happening all over industrial Germany. Over a commercial town of the Hessian Lippe it had been heavily industrialized in the period from 1800, the working class grew from 8,900 in 1833 to 33,625 in 1873 becoming a mass workers' town. By that time 60% of the workforce worked in factories of more than 200 employees and 57% of the workforce had been conservative.

Pacifical struggle had broken out in SPD in the context of street fighting during the removed suffrage campaign in Prussia. Despite violent turbulence and pitched battles the SPD leadership re-entered in control and discipline. The organization was by all accounts a Pacifical experience. On one occasion the venue for a demonstration in Berlin was changed at the last moment to evade the police and avoiding 500,000 people go on a "suffrage strike." Kautsky published his defence of orthodoxy and the priority of party discipline The Road to Power in this context, but Lutherberg was also last allowed to criticize the tactics of the party via a critique of Kautsky. Faith in the orthodox battle of "revolutionary parliamentarians" was beginning to break down as the party apparatus and its discipline became more involved with "practical" matters. In the Opposition in Kampf Pannekok began to
In the autumn of 1910, Pannekoek devoted an essay to the "social-democratic" organization of the working class, and its condition. A direct connection between the Social Democratic Party and the Social Democratic Labor Party, in particular, was perceived as the main obstacle to the development of the labor movement in Russia. Pannekoek's essay was titled "The Social-Democratic Movement in Russia and Its Tasks," and it was published in 1910. The essay was a response to the growing political and social unrest in Russia at the time, and it called for a more radical approach to the workers' movement.

Pannekoek's essay was a significant contribution to the discussion of the role of the labor movement in Russia. It was a call to action for the workers to unite and fight for their rights, and it emphasized the need for a more democratic and egalitarian society. Pannekoek's ideas were ahead of their time, and they paved the way for future generations of social democrats in Russia.

Pannekoek's essay was also a response to the主义思想 of the time, which was characterized by a strong emphasis on the role of the state in the development of society. Pannekoek argued that the state was not the solution to the workers' problems, but rather a barrier to their development. He believed that the workers should take control of the means of production and use them to create a more just and equitable society.

Pannekoek's essay was a significant contribution to the development of the labor movement in Russia, and it continues to be read and studied by social democrats and leftists around the world today. It is a testament to Pannekoek's vision and commitment to the workers' movement, and it continues to inspire new generations of social democrats to fight for a more just and equitable society.
first event thinking on the transition period, as are usually suggested by theories of the Second International.

Penskoy was always aware of the importance of the issues developed in the working class in struggle and the necessity of incorporating anything new into its theory of development towards revolution. The official party control of the works and its failure to support the workers’ struggle transformed Penskoy’s view of the developed trade union into a discipline against the insurance opposition, armed by capital, finance, and the "people's capacity for autonomous action... But it is precisely this question that poses the problem of the struggle for freedom, that is, the question of what revolutionaries in the mass of workers discipline... Penskoy was now aware that this would lead the workers to "take different paths" and was able to face this with equanimity.

**War and Revolution**

At the outbreak of war in 1914 Penskoy was expelled from Berlin back to Holland. His SPD leadership, having signed an armistice with Russia in 1913 on the basis that a world war would break in 1914 and that the SPD would be the first to form a new one, was in line with the Bolsheviks and Social Democrats in the Dutch Workers' party. Exiled from Berlin, Penskoy was able to take the lead in forming the "Socialist League" in the Netherlands which he then led into the "Proletariat" and the "International Socialist" in the conference journal.

In December 1914 the German government, which had made sure the International Socialist (ISD), broke all connections with the two wings of exiled fascism that were later to become the FPO-A and the UPO (see below). In order, Adolph Hitler, was open to speakers such as Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Penskoy. Describing its political line, it stated: "the most effective form of mass action under the fire of fascism, as in the Spartacus League in Germany, and thereby ensures a proletarian policy". Similarly in Holland, the group around Orman and Roland-Holst of the Internationale Socialists, in August 1917 Penskoy noted that in Russia the revolutionary means are forming a powerful organization. As in 1905, the deputies of Socialists and revolutionary socialists are still in the form of workers and soldiers councils, a people's representation which speaks out vigorously against tsarist government and exploitation!

**Common knowledge of the German revolution is often limited to the "Spartacist" uprising, the failures of which saw the murder of Landsberg and Liebknecht, but the revolution's roots extend much farther back.**

Despite the actions of the SPD in depriving their own comrades of the rights of workers and their demands for the revolutionaries to work in support of the war, the SPD did not completely defeat trade unionism. It was in the context of the Berlinisation and Kolts to the Zimmerman clause. Lenin had been unable to prevent the Bremen SPD to slight worker autonomy at this stage. Then when they were excluded from the workers' group, the Socialists, led with Kolts's group, also expelled, and against the wishes of both sides, formed the Unbroken SPD (USPD). With the example of Russia before then the SPD condoned this as a return to the "old leader's politics".
breakthrough of the current phase of development toward communism. In a slightly earlier article in the journal of the International Vienna Center, Kondratieff, he described the writer's council as "the organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat in which the bourgeoisie cannot participate. The bourgeoisie will not be excluded in any arbitrary way from government, for instance, by losing its right to vote; quite simply, it will be barred from the organization, which is built not on people but on labour... As these councils remain in close personal contact with the masses, their membership cannot remain reduced and replaced. The formation of a new bureaucracy is thus prevented, and a monarchy in administrative functions is broken." (Bolsheviks and the Demarcation, 1919, Bolshevik 1917-1954: 33-35.)

Panfilov was not much given to quoting chapter and verse from Marx, but saying that it was politically orthodox speech nonetheless. He prefixed "WEBKUT, however, with an epithet from Marx's Introduction to the Critique of Human..." Theory itself becomes a material force in history on the masses... no longer radical." Furthermore, his two sentences reveal the foundation of his analysis: The transformation of capitalist into communism is brought about by the forces, not material and other rational, of the latter having its origins in the former. The moral development of the economy generates consciousness, and consciousness shapes the will to revolution. The "decadence of science" which arises from the "general traditions of capitalist development" provokes the revolutionary movement with irrationality. On the one side this theory is generally probabilistic of the working masses while on the other side their experience begins to convince them that explanation no longer holds. But, "world-wide and increased" collapse now makes revolution objectively necessary before the masses have gained consciousness directionally; this contradiction is the root of the world-wide and increased collapse which makes the revolution a long and painful process. In a sense, a communist revolution requires not only social revolution but also an awareness among conscious communist individuals, united through socialist or communist political organizations. But a communist consciousness and organization are necessary but insufficiently defined. (Bolsheviks and the Demarcation, 1919, Bolshevik 1917-1954: 33-35.)

Panfilov believed that he was an actor. Europe is concerned, the development of revolutions is strongly determined by Europe, the collapse of the capitalist economy and the absence of Soviet Russia? Kondratieff, the proletariat organization (meaning the councils and what Panfilov calls the "overall state", had been relatively easy to destroy. And so therefore had the revolution. Capitalists were relatively successful, the ruling classes were divided and the bourgeoisie were weak (plus the peasant revolution paralleled the proletariat revolution). In western Europe, on the other hand, capitalism was long-established, the ruling class was united (by and against the working class) and the bourgeoisie very strong. In addition the pauperism, by virtue of its economic position, was itself not anti-working class. The long history of capitalism in western Europe explained the grind of the masses which in turn explained the source of the German revolution. "Because the proletarian masses were still completely governed by a bourgeois mentality, they restored the hegemony of the bourgeoisie with their own hands after it had collapsed." Economic collapse had in fact happened; not only the commodity prices, but the spectacular collapse of the "booming" commodity, but an actual acute social breakdown. It was possible to stage in Germany in 1929: "Economic collapse is the most powerful spur to revolution." The grinding of the working masses, "the revolution in western Europe will be a slow, arduous process." Under Russia, power will not fall into the hands of the impoverished masses as a result of a financial-economic collapse; the proletariat will have to fight hard for it and will thus have obtained a higher degree of maturity when it is won.

The example of Soviet Russia is important, the Soviet state envisaged a modern state of the working masses is the ruling class, where they have abolished capitalism and are engaged in building communism, could tell (if I were to make the point) how impressive were the proletariat of the whole world! But this is not expected of us, "the higher this mass is most strongly influenced by the effects of its own environment." The environment of the German proletariat was one where society was accepting to escape in its role after social collapse and the proletariat was engaged in a struggle against imperialism. This was seen by Panfilov as being "modern" since "since the revolution's struggle has been that in fact they did not essentially rely on a convention of revolutionaries." Panfilov did not believe that the bourgeoisie were capable of the social revolutionary consciousness that was necessary after the war. The bourgeoisie (together with the consciousness bourgeoisie united in a characteristic bourgeoisie environment; such that they fought only of making as much as possible for possible consciousness and as a consequence, there "is no increase in the frequency of strikes and social agitation and, hence, a consequence, in the number of strikes and social agitation to work among the proletariat." The bourgeoisie may have, individually, been incapable of revolution, but Panfilov believed that they had learned more from the Russian revolution than the working class, the bourgeoisie "learned much out of it..." (and immediately began to reform the regime of property), giving the only party that had any chance of disciplining the working class, the SPD, the chance to do so in the name of the bourgeoisie mass. In effect, the relative party had to deliver the revolutionary working class in order to bring about order for the revolution's participation (supposed) benefit of that class. But the bourgeoisie was only forced to rely on the SPD because of the strength of the working class. The revolution was not yet over. It was still going to be a long process. Under the circumstances the SPD could only rule with the consent of the working class. It was in itself a government of worker's bureaucracy. Panfilov foresees a classic series of these worker's bureaucracies, not necessarily parliamentary, but they were learnt that it itself had to take over the running of the economy. Each new phase of the revolution brings a new layer of new usional leaders to the surface in the representative of particular forms of organization, and the overthrow of each of these in turn represents a higher stage in the proletariat's self-organization. It will take time; it will take decades to overcome the infirmities, paralyzing influence of the bourgeoisie culture upon the proletariat in the old capitalist countries" for revolution requires social revolution to be understood, difficult decisions to be made, the whole proletariat involved in making the decision... this is difficult and laborious, that, in long for the working class thinks it is an easy way only way out of them through overtime working on its behalf... the old habits of thought will make it a measure and remote passive". This with the objective circumstances and subjective affects, perhaps, progress towards communism, "a revolutionary consciousness is brought to grips in the masses thinking, it creates the revolutionaries this, and is itself conditioned by it." A revolution in the realm of the working class was excessively necessary. Where else did the proletariat find its "self"? It could not build in their numbers, the proletariat was not a class. Their own of the "whole of economic life" was important but fading (under the influence of even the existing unions and working class unions). Their "control of the men, with all of means of control" was important but did not collapse in 1917 and the working class was too small be able to press in resurrect it. The working men were impressed with bourgeois ideas, they believed that the bourgeoisie was interested in the general interest. The ideology was instilled by the intelligentsia. The press, the courts and the church all played their part, "press, schools, films, journalism, arts, politics... form a conscious whole, the function of which is to form, develop and propagate bourgeois culture... the hegemony of capital is social in this group's intellectual leadership of the masses. These groups continue to resist bourgeois culture which "entails" in the proletariat primarily as a traditional cost of thought, long, creative process, even the workers themselves, intransitively linked with, their society so as to win. The proletariat has in every past had to build up methods, theme and wish to struggle corresponding to the contemporary stage of capital development. The workers have not subsequently become fitter upon the development which had to be broken. Every stage of the development of the class crisis, everyone oppose the tradition of the previous stage."
With a temporary victory hailed in the German Revolution, Panizkotz could not see that it was the workers' movement's own traditions that now embodied "the hegemony of bourgeois concepts". The problem, in part derived from the belief in a "national" and, especially, parliamentary leadership. During the long development of the working class these beliefs united the class, "social democracy" originally sought to realize this class unity" but "the firm solidarity and discipline which developed in the often acute class struggle of half a century did not bring capitalism, for it represented the power of leadership and organization over the masses." This power was a concrete form of "morality for absolute slogans like 'democracy', old habits of thought and perceptions, points, such as the realization of socialism through parliamentary bodies and a socialist government, for the lack of revolutionary self-confidence... lack of faith in their own power; but above all in their trust in the party, in the organization and in the leaders who for decades had incited them to struggle, their revolutionary goals, their idealism." The leaders and the party, "those monstrous machines painstakingly created by the masses themselves", now exalted the revolutionary incense over mere firing up in the masses'.

Dependency on the party was the problem. But this party or that, but all part, a "revolution can no more be made by a big party or a coalition of parties than by a small radical party. It breaks out spontaneously among the masses, the party can activate it only off a rare occasion", but the "involvement in the thought and the psychological forces deeply cherished in the masses led to the great events of world politics". "No 'national' or "people's government" can solve the problems which can only be resolved by the action of the class as a whole." This was a direct criticism of the KPD and the International's representative, Radek, at that time looking for a reconciliation with the communist mass party, the USPD.

Opportunism Again

Proximity because there was a long process in going through the war and the European revolution, there was time for some sort of social alignment to appear. Revolutionary development didn't take in that period of rightist conspiracies at once, "the masses anything but a trend without question and revolutionary slogans no longer seem to catch the imagination" and especially when the communist party remained weak, different perspectives emerge. Panizkotz identifies two main trends, "one cannot speak of revolutionaries and clearly perceive roads to world and deed, and this set times to press the new principles in the sharpest possible contrast to the old, received conceptions. The other aspect expresses to draw the masses still on the solitude into practical activity, and therefore emphasizes points of agreement rather than points of difference in an attempt to avoid or in the possibility that anything might come down. This first strikes a clear, sharp separation among the masses, the second for unity, the first current may be termed the radical tendency, the second the opportunism one."

Opportunism did not come second quickly, however, "on the contrary, lack of clear, principled tactics is too oftenclouded in stiflingly verbose language; and, indeed, in revolutionary situations, it is characteristic of opportunism to suddenly set all the hopes on the general revolutionary idea."

The real problem with opportunism was its concentration on immediate success, defined in an unrealistic way, at the expense of lasting achievement and the final victory. Panizkotz describes opportunism as a tendency towards the behavior of the SPD before the rulings of the war, it sought alliances with other "progressive" groups, hoping to help the ruling class. But this merely undermined the working class and any power gained was literally in the bourgeois' hands, and this was "sharply curbed" against the working class.

The reason for opportunism is in the period of the Second International was historically explainable. But it was now making an application in the Third International. With the split of the Left International the SPD left the KPD, the KPD had approached, as the USPD, the Reichstag and the USPD. In the same sense, under the name of the SPD, "radical" workers still and in the USPD were pushing it towards the Third International. The KPD had opened up between conscious socialist organization and the "bureaucracy" of the KPD, and the "radical" what still did and in the USPD were pushing it towards the Third International. The gap that had opened up between conscious socialist organization and the party was closing again. The specifically sectarian nature of the international movement was being filled, even, overshadowed, for the sake of membership numbers. What many communists "tended to see as only the increased strength existing". Panizkotz saw "the increase in vulnerability." "Firearms of principle was vital, for despite the Russian example, revolution was an 'extremely complex and arduous process'."

Now, radical, practical was essential because "opportunities in the Third International relate as far as possible upon forces of struggle taken over from the Second International", it had to be combined, "revolution theory, through the process of integral struggle. It is the problem itself that the revolution must be conscious, in overcoming ideas, the proletarian environment its own limitations and norms towards consciousness." For Panizkotz the party had a very specific role based on the fact that "the economic conjuncture between the rapid economic collapse of capitalism and the immensity of spirit represented by the power of bourgeois tradition over the proletariat - a contradiction which has not since faded, in fact, is that the proletariat cannot achieve the unity of spirit required for hegemony and therefore while a leveling egalitarianism - can only be resolved by the process of revolutionary development, in which spontaneous upsurge and advance of power advances with setbacks."

Panizkotz's "awakening period of social and political change became inevitable", "it cannot be the task of the Communist Party to set the administration in this upheaval and make vain attempts to turn it in a smug jacket of traditional form, in task is to suggest the form of the proletarian movement everywhere, to connect the spontaneous actions together, to give them a broad idea of how they are related to one another, and therefore prepare the utilization of the diction actions and thus put itself at the head of the movement as a whole."

Although it was possible that the communist party would be forced to take power permanently and then lose it again (as in France), "the consciousness of the political reality, the mercilessness of the logic, inevitably difficult as it will be, is not the main problem for the Communist party. When the proletariat becomes aware of its intellectual and moral potential in the full, they will realize themselves. The private duty of the Communist party is to arouse and foster the potential," it had to conduct "the struggle for a strong and principled fight against all unprincipled, superficial, false, any government of social-rational forms, party leaders and group leaders." The function of a revolutionary party lies in properly understanding an objective, so that through the masses there will be a knowledge of what must be done and who are capable of judging the situation for themselves.

The party needs to solve the struggle because its propaganda, slogans, programs and structure are recognized by the masses as expressing their own acute. Panizkotz recognized the propaganda could serve as "a chink under which a period of mass uncertainty by the starting principle that could only happen in the inevitable period of struggle. The party saw the need to principles at such times. It makes no attempt to revolutionize the union which in the perspective for gaining power. For the most important element of the revolution cannot in the remains taking their own affairs - the management of society and production - in their hands, then any form of organization which does not permit control and direction by the masses themselves is rejection revolutionary and harmful." There is no place for ideas of taking over stilted, traditional, organizations or even of working within them, "it was recently argued in Germany that communism must go into parliament to control the workers that the proletarian struggle is wages - but you don't take a voting ticket to show other people that you are fighting, you go the right way from the sound."

Exclusion of the Communists

The KPD was formally excluded from the Third International in September 1920 having already suffered its first serious split. By the time Hitler came to power it had already split. Panizkotz returned to Holland to take up his personal career. He was still important enough during his 'Ruhlig' days when he was remitted the war in holding this time to his career lengthy work.

Social-Guild

Paul Levi, having himself split the KPD, opposed the expulsion of the Italian Socialist Party by the International in January 1921 and resigned from the KPD Central Committee. The International pushed the KPD into the "March Action" in 1921. It was
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Trade Unionism and The Class War

AUTHOR'S NOTE (1914 Edition)

Trade Unionism and The Class War was published first in 1911. It met with a great deal of criticism and received one complimentary notice. This was from "Dingle" in The Claws. It was reprinted in 1914 in the Herald of Revolt.

The present edition is revised. The introductory section is expanded into a chapter. The third section of the original pamphlet—which would have been the fourth in the essay now—treated with the question of representation is omitted. This property belongs to the comparative essay, Representation and the State, and will be embodied in it when that pamphlet is revised.

Many persons object to the renaming of this essay because they consider its light touch to all idea of action. This criticism is based on a misunderstanding. I do not deny that men and women must function under capitalism and engage constantly in petty disputes. I only insist that such disputes are not vital. By pressing up to individualization, I am arguing the tendency to engage in workable palliative effort, and hamstringing the class. After all, action which accomplishes nothing, is far less of moment. And trade unionism has accomplished nothing so far as the well-being of the entire working-class is concerned. The plans for revolution is not pedantry. It is a simple statement of fact. The second and third chapters are unaltered, except for a passing word here and there, from the original pamphlet.

London, W., June 1914.

G. A. A.

I—TRADE UNIONISM AND REVOLUTION.

The struggle of the Tolpuddle Martyrs for the right of combination under the Reform and Extension Bills of 1832, marks the beginning of British Trade Unionism. The glamour of romance which belongs to its origin has contributed to its successful development as a social institution. Eight years after the Repeal of the Combination laws, Trade Unionism was deemed an illegal conspiracy. Tuesday, it is a bulwark of the capitalist system. Something more than tradition is necessary to explain this passage from ordinary to pernicious. The explanation is an economic one. Trade Unionism has competitive social power and commands influence in so far as it is able, and draws from the social necessities of the capitalist epoch. Because it has answered capitalist needs, the Trade Union has qualified for its modern position as the sign manual of skilled labour.

But the growth in social and political importance of the Trade Union leader has not measured the foundations of capitalist society. He has been more and more the friend of reform and the enemy of revolution. It has been argued that he is a selfish and responsible member of capitalist society. Consequently, capitalist apologists have been obliged to acknowledge that he disturbed useful and important functions in society.

This admission has forced them to assert that the law of supply and demand does not determine, with exactness, the normal or even the actual—price of the commodity. They have, therefore, it has been allowed that Trade Unions enable their members to increase the amount of the price received for their labour power, without being harmful to the interests of the community—i.e., the capitalist class—when conducted with moderation and fairness.

Modern Trade Unionism enjoys this respectable reputation to a very large extent because it has sacrificed its original vitality. This was inevitable, since, in its very origin, it was unscientific and not revolutionary. Trade Unionism has sacrificed no economic principle during its century's development. It has surrendered no industrial or political consistency. But it has not capitalized its
entry earnestness or sentiment of solidarity. Had it done so, it would have been compelled to have evolved socially and politically. Instead of stagnating in reform, it would have had to progress towards revolution.

The Trade Union apologist, consistently with his reformist outlook, has had to defend the restrictive tendencies of sectional organization. He has had to deny the revolutionary solidarity of labour in order to defend the Union machinery of blacklegs. He has required in a craft organization that materially inhibits the interests of labour as a whole, without even bending it slightly. He has shown no qualms about supporting a representative system of administration which betrays the worker to capitalist interests.

All this activity proceeds inevitably from the belief that Trade Unions benefit the worker economically. It follows naturally from the notion that the worker can improve his social and economic status under capitalism.

Trade Unions, therefore, is instillable only on the ground that reform is possible and revolution unnecessary. Industrial legislation, like political legislation, is based on the understanding that no epoch ever attains to a crisis. This is the base that can be said for the necessity of Trade Unions.

But suppose that the law of supply and demand does determine, with exactness, the nominal as well as the actual price of the commodity, labour power?

Then the best that can be said for the necessity of Trade Unions as opposed to revolutionary communitarian organization and action has ceased to possess any meaning.

To develop this economic argument in favour of the social revolution, and against Trade Union reform, is my purpose in writing the present brochure.

II.—THE CASE FOR TRADE UNIONISM.

Nominal wages are actually received in cash, irrespective of the conditions of employment. Actual wages are nominal wages, plus the conditions of employment, hours of labour, etc.

What is the basis of wages?

 Marx has asked us to suppose that no average hour of labour be realized in a value equal to stipend, or twelve average hours of labour realized in six shillings. If, then, in the raw material, machinery and so forth, used up in a commodity, twenty-four hours of average labour were realized, the value would amount to twelve shillings. If, moreover, the workman employed by the capitalist added twelve hours of labour to these in products these twelve hours would be realized in an additional value of six shillings. The total value of the production would, therefore, amount to thirty-six hours of realised labour-power, and be equal to eighteen shillings. But as the value of labour-power, or the wages paid to the workman, would be three shillings only, no equivalent would have been paid by the capitalist for the six hours of surplus value worked by the workman and realized in the value of the commodity. By selling this commodity at its value (£ eighteen shillings, the capitalist would, therefore, realise a value of three shillings for which he had paid no equivalent. These three shillings would constitute the surplus value or profit pocketed by him.

Any increase in the wages of the worker must reduce the amount of his surplus value, since that is the only fund out of which such increase could be obtained. It is possible for the wages of the workman to rise as high as not only approximately to equal the value of his product, but actually to equal it. It is, in fact, if the law of supply and demand works with the necessities assumed by the Trade Unions, to be the case. Evolution is not merely insensible on the ground of expediency; it is the direct path to emancipation.

Is it true that the law of supply and demand from the price with so little exactness, that supply and demand become price not at any point of price? May it be that several prices, or a range of prices, will satisfy the requirements of the law? That

the marginal labour theory of value of the Preacher League. The importance of "educating" the working class was such that bourgeois ideologues of the calibre of Alfred Marshall, H.L.William Smith and J.A.Robson, among many others, were interested.

While Alfred's analysis, founded on the independent viewpoint of the working class itself; has a great validity in simetimes cannot be wholly accepted today. Alfred was writing in 1911 when the idea of revolutionary solidarity was very real. Today we have to look back on many decades of trade union activity within union bounds. The overall success of this approach from the point of view of the bourgeoisie depends on the ability of the trade unions to achieve a degree of coordination between accommodation and the regime of power. They ensure that the monetary wages are not reduced to the level of pauperism.

The publication of this article in 1911 was almost certainly a contribution to the debate on the role of trade unions stimulated by the tremendous developments for industrial union. Alfred's views parallel that of European movements such as the IWW in the same period espoused the Anarchism of Bakunin out of which developed an anti-capitalist perspective of the European revolutionary period. Alfred broadly shared these perspectives and was certainly in commune with the European revolutionaries until he decided to reprint his article in 1919. Whether he was aware of European developments and the positions of the various factions he was originally with it he surely write but if not without direct confrontation it is obvious that the concerns were international in scope even if bourgeois state repression to the working class took different forms in that period.

Guy Aldred was born in Clerkenwell, London on 5th November 1880. His father, a naval officer, had deserted his mother immediately after the marriage ceremony and Guy was brought up in the house of his maternal grandfather, Charles Holme, a bookbinder and Victorian radical. Although Charles was an atheist, his wife Emma was a High-Church Anglist, and Aldred was given a religious upbringing.

At the age of 16, Aldred joined an Anti-Racism League among his classmates and later took upon them to sign a pledge not to indulge in street drags. His grandfather opposed the Boer War and took Guy to political meetings carrying placards. His religious connections led Guy to become the "Holborn Boy Poucher"; he opposed war from a religious standpoint, protesting in June 1902, Dr. Pankhurst, The Last Days War at Addis Ababa. This placard was produced after the end of the Boer War in anticipation of a new war breaking out.

Over the next four years he progressed from High Church conformity, through humanism, agnosticism, Humanism, to absolute atheism. He met George Bernard Shaw, an ascetic Anglican priest, who worked as a writer in Brighthelmstow and advanced Gay's education in theology and philosophy.
there is, or may be, a kind of table-land within which the law does not act. Let us take the Trade Union political economists' typical example. A half-crown of fish is sold by Dutch auction, i.e., the seller bidding down instead of the buyers bidding up. One buyer may be willing to give 2s. for the lot, and another buyer willing to give more than 1s., and the man who is willing to give 2s. will get the fish at 1s. or a farthing over it. So this in the same market, with the same quantity of fish for sale, and with customers in number and every other respect the same, the same lot of fish might fetch two very different prices, the law of supply and demand being equally and completely fulfilled by either of these prices. Within a limit of 2s. the law is inapplicable.

It is claimed, that in a case such as this, much depends on the man who has the initiative in bargaining. In this instance, given the possession of the initiative given to the seller a distinct gain of 1s., and accounted for by the law of supply and demand. Supposing the price of labour-power to be within a sufficiently limited category, the same principle is applied as against the buyer in the case of the Dutch auction. The seller has an advantage over the buyer in the labour market. It is the buyer who has the initiative in fixing the price. The employer, the purchaser of labour-power, is the buyer and his decision, i.e., the hour, money, or goods, to employ. From these circumstances, it is seen, that the law of supply and demand, as a measure of the value of its product, within limits not covered by the law of supply and demand, may, therefore, secure the economic equivalent of culture by virtue of its organised status.

Outside of this table-land the law of supply and demand remains intact. The more numerous the competitors for employment the lower will the wages be, other things being equal. This fact forms the basis of the gain of the Trade Unionist as the basis for restrictive rules, forbidding the employment of non-unions and limiting the number of apprentices. Such rules are indispensable to the complete efficacy of Trade Unions. They make the Trade Union the supplier of an ordinary of skilled labour.

Trade Unionism's final refuge is Multinomism. Its specific position is that the ignorant and untrained part of the proletariat will put up to the point that will keep their wages at all tolerable rate which the law can of their ideas and habits makes inapplicable to them. As long as their minds remain in such a state, the Unions claim that they do not see no real injury in preventing them from competing with him for employment. He only saves himself from being brought down to their level. So does not avoid by entrusting himself behind a barrier to exclude those whose competition would bring down his wages, without most of the constantly raising them.

Again, even were it to be shown that Trade Unionism did not increase the nominal rate of wages, it has to be admitted (says the Unions) that it is able to do much by raising the actual rate of wages. Its least accomplishment is accordingly least irritating, arbitrary, and oppressive condition of employment.

But the power of the organisation of labour in this direction turns upon its recognition. In times of distress there may be room for negotiations between employers and employed upon the question of minimum or maximum demands. For the Trade Union to be able to do the same must be able to compete with employers upon the question of recognising the Union and receiving the Union official representatives. This limits all need on the part of an employer to such recognition. So that the right of recognition recognised, the union's demands become a matter of remunerative arrangement.

Such is the case for Trade Unions. We now propose to expose its fallacies, and lay bare its hypocrisies.

III.—THE WORKERS' CASE AGAINST TRADE UNIONISM.

The reply to the argument which I have developed in defence of Trade Unionism in the foregoing section, naturally divides itself into the following division—
(1) The operation of the economic law against the possibility of starvation, so far as the entire working-class is concerned—Although it is true that the law of supply and demand does not fit in the terms of any particular bargain, the operation of that law does not fail with the conclusion of that particular bargain. This has been clearly demonstrated by Cross in his reply to Mill. According to whether buyer or seller secures what is termed "a bargain," demand or supply is checked or stimulated. This applies to the Dutch Auction Fish Sale. A sale of 30s. would tend to stimulate future supply and check demand. The consequent tendency would be towards a fall in price. A sale of 4s. would tend to bring out more buyers and reduce the inflow to go to sea. The consequent tendency would be towards a rise in price. This would bring out more sellers and reduce the number of buyers even more. This is true also of the wages of labour. Higher wages bring out more workers but reduce the employer's profits. So that the employer becomes less anxious to secure workers. A lower wage has the reverse effect. The worker now becomes less anxious to be employed. But the employer is more willing to employ. Once more there is a repetition. Working by tendency only, the economic law approaches exactitude over a multiplicity of cases, but not in any particular case. The means of the oscillations of price is now an exact point, not a range of prices. The terms of any particular bargain are, consequently, only of the most transient importance even to those immediately concerned. But they are of little or no importance to the workers or employers as a class, since they are constantly being brought back to their true economic point. The corresponding influence, being inevitable and periodic, it will be seen that, in its position as a class, the working-class has nothing to gain from Trade Union Palliative. Its only practical hope, as well as its beautiful dream, is, first, fast, and all-German socialism—the Communist Individualism of which Oscar Wilde made himself the prophet in that magnificent book, The Soul of Man.

(2) The impossibility of raising actual wages without regard to nominal wages—What has put the case in a nutshell. If a reduction of the hours of labour results in decreased production, wages will fall, other things being equal. If reduction of hours results in increases of production per man there will be no additional employment, other things being equal. The equality of other things wane upon the law of supply and demand which palliative combination does not affect. Consequently, Trade Unions cannot effect higher wages nor yet the question of employment.

(3) The impossibility of organizing the whole of labour as the basis of Trade Unions.—The Trade Unions, when enrolling the bulk and manufacturing him, pretend to look forward to a complete federation of labour. But if all labour stands upon the platform of palliative combination—a very different thing from revolutionary solidarity—the effect will be nil, in view of the operations of the law of supply and demand. A union of all labour is so grand as no union at all from the palliattion viewpoint. Even a "minimum wage" of higher rate than at present established cannot only the decreased purchasing power of money. Between labour power as a commodity and other commodities there exists a definite ratio of exchange. So that a "minimum wage" is meaningless. But a union of all labour on the basis of Trade Unions is impossible. With all trades organized on a restricted basis it would be impossible for any trade to bid itself of its surplus by causing them to be absorbed into my other trade. But for Trade Unions to succeed—what the increasing rate of monopoly and the consequent reduction of skill in specialized labour—must also organize massed specialized labour. Such combination to succeed may be more restrictive that is the case of skilled labour. Unskilled labour, therefore,abd the surplus bears all the skilled traders. Not only block, but in this respect it would add an enormous surplus of it's own. So that restrictive combination can only result in first disturbing the working-class, they bringing it, and finally reducing the greater portion of it to following in the present and future.

(4) The menace of Trade Union Representation. A doctrine of Labour Leading.—Trade Union embolden the menace of the representative system in that it is no less certainly than the legislative machine. For elected leaders conclude strikes and dissolve union with still further, what Aldred held had disastrous revolutionary results and became the pretext of "drawing-room socialism." In 1897 Aldred, together with John Turner and other members of the Voice of Labour, formed the Industrial Union of Labour. The name of the I.R.U. was to express the ideal of social revolution in order to bring in a decentralized federation of communities. Its weapons were to be the general strike and violence was to be used only as a last resort. However, Aldred quarrelled with Turner, causing him of forming the ordinary trade action. He simultaneously started the Federation group on similar grounds.

While involved with the I.R.U. Aldred was also busy promoting various organisations, the Communist Propaganda Group (C.P.G.). This was the first organisation to use the word "communism" in its title. In later years Aldred was to reflect: "the reader will understand that the author termed himself a communist in 1896. He used the term in the sense he employed it, in the sense that William Morris employed it, the sense of world harmony, social, labor, and communal" (Speech on "Commutation." The C.P.G. published a 21 page programme which opposed palliative action in being or remaining as palliative political societies, both equally diverting the workers from communism. Rejecting both industrial action and representation, the C.P.G. called for "the organisation of the workers into one International Communist Party within, its antagonist to, the capitalist state." A pamphlet published in 1906, "International Commune," Aldred also called for a "New Communist Invention." In another pamphlet published in 1899, "Organisation," he again called for a "new International," arguing that following the fall of the First International, the existing organisations had been supplanted primarily by London Social-Democracy.

From his grandfather Aldred gained an awareness of the early 19th century struggle of liberators for freedom to organise, and in spite of widespread attacks on the person of the ideas, he was able to publish in 1899 The Industrial Federation: the origin of the F.A.I. Society, which was very well received when the Indian states, Material Changes by Cooper, which was appropriated by Indian freemasons. While Aldred opposed political associations, nationalistic and in consequence, he also opposed the suppression of voting. In good faith, he thought that the working-class from the social movement and only Rudolf Rocker defended him against allegations about his views. He did however hold the support of the workers involved, as an opponent of imperialism. This publication was Aldred's second important work.

On the release from prison in 1910, Aldred published a new paper, The World's Review of Social Democracy, a regular periodical. The first issue appeared in
December, 1912, he spoke in Glasgow to wanna audiences, including the Anarchist group in that city, which had sprung from the collapse of William Morris's Socialistic Union in 1888. Under Atkinson's influence, a split from the anarcho-syndicalist set itself up as the Glasgow Revolutionary Society.

In May of 1914 the threat of war changed its name to The Banner. Because the workers needed a paper. This took an anti-war position. Atkinson even opposed the Clyde Workers' Committee on the grounds that it sought only to improve the workers' economic position, and did not develop any kind of class opposition to the war. He was arrested on April 13th, 1914 for failing to report for military service (although he had not in fact been called-up). He spent most of the war in prison, some of it in 'open salutary' at Aylesbury. Here, together with Norman Thomson and E.T. Jones, he set up a Men's Committee to try to change the form of work and published the Great Eight as the 'organ of the Great Eight'. Alfred managed to speak at public meetings and his paper was sold only in the camp but in Aberdeen, Glasgow and London. He was in prison when the news of the October Revolution arrived. Here he met Trotsky, whom he was to oppose Russian representative in England. Trotsky explained that the revolution was not an anarchist-communist uprising but the work of an organization called the Bolsheviks who had a leader named Lenin.

On his release from prison it is January 1919 (after a six-year detention), Alfred went to the country with Harry Salt calling for a union of anti-parliamentary groups and the left of the R.S.P. to form a British Communist Party. He fully agreed with the 'democraticism of the proletariat' as a 'socialist' and opposed 'war conscription'. He read Lenin's State and Revolution on this line (December 1918). Reviewing it, he wrote

"I was conscious of a certain anxiety brought on by Capitalistic MInisters for Labour, and Presidents of the Board of Trade. To pretend that such terms of agreement are antagonistic to capitalist interests, is to be hysteria. On the other hand, for what does the strike leader generally strive? To get his authority recognized. This is the first step to position and power. It is pretended that the greater the power given to the strike-leader, the greater the consent he can wring from the capitalist class. It is forgotten that the greater the wealth exposed in film, the more effectiely he can betray that confidence. Consequently, your 'official' strike-leader is always for 'continuance and permanence' of the 'peace and security'. His idea is for caution, which means that he is to be allowed to do the bargaining but not to be submitted to criticism. Criticism he regards as a menace to his authority. It certainly reduces his status in value."

3. The Initiative - The Union argument that the impoverished worker suffers from not having initiative is nonsense. Rather, if it is a case, which I propose the exploitation of the unions by the trade leaders. If the trade leaders are made to succeed in misrepresenting the enemy. Everyone knows that employers often throw the blame on initiative of the workers, a stagger back, he looks at once to avoid it. "What do you want," says the buyer. "That is the question, what will you give me?" The seller. Such parties are desirable of securing a bargain, and consequently avoid the initiative. It has no advantage although it operates very little one way or the other in the labour market. So that Trade Union has nothing to offer the worker in this respect.

On these lessons, therefore, and for these reasons, Trade Union must go. The only hope of the workers on the industrial, as on the political field, is Revolutionary Socialism.

IV. THE QUESTION OF REPRESENTATION.

Much that has been urged in the present brochures has tended to negate the idea of majority rule, as also the representation principle. Like most rebels, for that matter, most students of history have looked in the majority, less utilitarian, the minority, and most reliance on the individual. Thos. Page regarded Government as being, like cliques, a badge of lost innocence. He also looked upon the abolition of formal government as the beginning of the society. This seems to me to be inconceivable. Consequently, if people are to be representative, as an expression of formal government, can have no weight, and must necessarily play a small part in the revolutionary struggle of the proletarians everywhere.

To bring this theory down to the realm of the practical, I want the reader to consider the following case which has often been put to me in the course of debates and discussions in which I have played the part of principal. It has been said that if a certain individual was working in a shop where sixty men were employed, and fifty wished to come out on strike whilst the other wished to remain in, the author of this hypothetical case was in favour of securing the ten and making them come out, whilst the fifty fought the "boss". Such coercion, it is urged, would rid the proletariat of their subjection to the capitalist and Capitalism.

From this opinion I venture to differ. Indeed, I repeat in what I have often urged on the platform is reply to the hypothetical case already enunciated that the majority have no more right to coerce a minority than the minority have to coerce a majority. The fifty have no more right to coerce the ten, than the ten have the right to coerce the fifty. Since in relation to society the hypothetical fifty are so few, but a small minority, and if it be true that many are right where the wrong is, then the presence of the fifty strike-breakers in the neighbourhood of the strike picks a majority would entitle the "majority" of 150 men, as opposed to the minority of fifty, to coerce them out of the neighborhood. Here we the capitalistic apology for Michellcasts, Featherstone, Hermione, Belfield, and every other scoundrel of the patriotic murder of the working-class by the hired henchmen of profit-mongers. For it must be remembered, that we are not treading on the ethics of
caution in relation to oppressed minorities, but of the economics of apparent majorities' rights to coerce a minority.

If we were to count to deal with probabilities rather than with facts, it would be urged that the one hundred and fifty men do not represent society, nor the whole working-class, for it is probable that the latter would stand by the fifty. Yet every worker, as also every employer, knows that the news of the strike could be flashed throughout the length and breadth of the land, without the official recognitions which imperial blacklegs being denounced to the extent of all the workers striking in sympathy would lessen; to coerce the blacklegs who were in a minority. With all their feelings of sympathy and faithful devotion to the cause of united endeavour it would be impossible for the whole working-class organisations to exhibit industrial solidarity.

If all the workers were willing to strike, they need only stay in work and take over the means and instruments of production for their own use. Revolution would replace a mere industrial struggle. The workers would not be concerned with craft or industrial divisional organisation, nor with the local concert of blacklegs, nor with the propaganda-strike even, but with the unification of their class only. The struggle would be constructive, not negative. There would be no necessity for "physical force" concert of blacklegs, since the economic existence of gentlemen of this fraternity would be impossible under such circumstances. If all the workers were united up to that stage of economic solidarity, that they were willing to strike in sympathy and organise blacklegs according to Unison-led regulations, the working-class revolution would be international and spontaneous. There would be no strike for higher nominal, or for higher actual, wages; only the coming together of the workers internationally for the political and industrial overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and the taking of whatever united industrial and political activity the Class War demanded by way of its culminating expression.

If the workers decided to strike in sympathy, it would be because they did not sympathise industrially with the revolting fifty. Yet, as consumers and follow wage slaves, by the logic of economic production and distribution, they would be affected alike by the existence of the strike and its termination. The question as to whether they were right in passively aiding with the employers does not enter into the problem as stated by the pseudo-parliamentary defender of representation. The only question is the right of the majority.

By refusal, the majority have shown that they are opposed to this gentleman and his forty-five imaginary colleagues. His position has altered slightly, and the members of the courtyard fifty now is addressed to the whole of the rest of the working-class, which is engaged not in striking in sympathy, but in pausing waiting with local minority of blacklegs and the Capitalist class. The members, therefore, should run: "Being in a shop where sixty men are at work, and fifty of us are to strike, and ten do not, I am in favour of coercing the ten and making them come out, while we fifty fight the fifty." As the rest of the working-class and the whole of the Capitalist class side with the "fifty and the ten non-strikers, I am in favour of coercing the majority of my own class and the whole of the Capitalist class also.

What would society's answer? Why, that of the Trade Union apologists or strike-believer in majority righteousness. Thus, a worker who was not in favour of the strike would say: "If I am in a society where a vast majority of the proletariat can have their present (being inanimate), and poverty called to their poverty, by fifty men going on strike, I am in favour of outvoting the fifty and making them go back to work, whilst we, the majority of the workers, meet the fifty" through our representatives on arbitration and conciliation boards, and through peaceable agencies, secure higher wages and better conditions.

"If the working-class federation was to turn aside, with his sturdy hand of followers, numbering fifty-nine all told, and, righ
together, unanimously, drive his feelings by giving assistance to the following piece of philosophy: "The majority have no more right to coerce a minority than the minority have to coerce a majority. The fifty have no more right to coerce the ten than the ten have to coerce the fifty. Society has no more right to coerce the fifty strikers than the fifty strikers to coerce society. But
My reply—since I own no arsenal, have no monopoly of...
BOOK REVIEWS


The recent publication of two collections of the writing of Tony Negri constitutes an important contribution to communist literature available in the English language. Negri’s work develops out of the workers’ autonomy struggles which developed in Italy during the 1960s and ‘70s as an attempt to understand the nature of class struggles in contemporary capitalism and the policies which they revealed for the communist project. These same struggles, which led to the没收 of factories, factories, and factories, to the expropriation of state capitalism, and to the socialist revolution, Capital’s response was to pressure workers with a radicalization of social relations, and Negri’s later work seeks to come to an understanding of that transformation. Negri insists that the mass worker has been transformed by a new class consciousness, that of the “social worker”. The fragmentation of the mass worker was the site of capitalist transformation during the 1970s, which diffused the large-scale factory into many small, encouraging small units, the use of new technologies, and other social relations that led to the transformation of society as a whole, in turn to an understanding of the new society. This transformation of society is seen as a new social subject whose struggles took place outside of the factory, and which included a range of groups regarded by orthodox Marxism as “bourgeois”.

The methodology of Negri’s discussion of the movement from mass worker to social worker, is based upon that of Marx in The Grundrisse. Negri draws much attention to Marx’s analysis of the role of money as the medium of the division of labour and the significance of these categories is an understanding of class formation. It is to this point that we can turn our attention to the relationship between the division of labour and organization, and the overall movements of these themes are repeatedly throughout both The Revolution Betrayed and The Politics of Subversion. In this essay, we will provide an overview of Negri’s analysis of “keynes and the capital theory of the state Post 1929”, which considers the relationship between the Keynesian State, the Bolshevik revolution, and the Maoist Worker, the Chinese Communist line and the Communist Party’s construction. In this essay, we will provide an analysis of the transformation of mass consciousness and the role of the worker in the development of a new social subject. The transformation of society, the transformation of society as a whole, in turn to an understanding of the new society, is seen as a new social subject whose struggles took place outside of the factory, and which included a range of groups regarded by orthodox Marxism as “bourgeois”.
All these essays appear in The Revolutionary Realist, which deals not only with Marx, Keynes and Schumpeter etc., but with the history of capitalism and class society as well. The present Paper, while not an essay on any of these topics, is an attempt to put these together in a new and original way.

First, let me summarize the main points of the present Paper:

1. Marx’s critique of capitalism is not just an economic theory, but a political theory as well. It is a critique of the class system and the way it is organized.

2. The problem of the working class is not just a question of economic exploitation, but a question of political power.

3. The working class cannot win its struggle for freedom by simply demanding better wages and working conditions. It must also fight for political power, for the right to participate in the governance of society.

4. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

5. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

6. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

7. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

8. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

9. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

10. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

11. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

12. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

13. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

14. The working class can only win its struggle for freedom by overthrowing the capitalist class and establishing a new system of society, one that is based on the principles of equality, freedom, and justice.

These are the main points of the present Paper. I hope that they are clear and that they make sense. If they do not, I hope that you will let me know so that I can make them clearer.

William Connolly - Political Theory and Modernity (Blackwell 1989)

On the nature of Marx’s critique of capitalism, as seen through the lens of modern political economy.


On the nature of Marx’s critique of capitalism, as seen through the lens of modern political economy.
an essential element of the ambiguity of modernity; traditional political theory, following Western culture in general, was always overloading and utilitarian.オリジナル的 political theory has been more deeply divided into a society in which we can be as with another society in the world. Nietzsche's critique of this is the politics of boredom.

Nietzsche gives a list of German philosophers, Heidegger, Kierkegaard, and Schopenhauer, on which Connolly adds Marx, who represents "the most fundamental form of alienation and homogeneity there has ever been." One is no longer at home anywhere, as one once was before the days in which alienation can be in herhen the Greek world" (Geddes by Connolly p.153). In "political theory homogeneity is the enforced alienation of man in man or man for man and which mediocrity necessarily desires in. Thus Marx's political theory is a combination of modern man's supposed and uncertain position in the world and Marx's sociological assumptions regarding means and means of livelihood.

Connolly therefore uses Nietzsche's in order to reject traditional political theory. His effort to place Marx firmly within this tradition, despite Marx's clear distance from it, is an attempt to fully clarify the grounds for his own post-modern politics which he finds in some parallels to the late-nineteenth century. This politics has his origins in Nietzsche's Nietzsche's notion of the ambiguity of political theory, characterized by his treatment of what is, is expected to consist of the essential differences within human beings (if we needed constructing) and to therefore seek ways of making these differences to be. For Nietzsche, this involves "giving up to each character", which Connolly sees in the late-nineteenth century as involving adjustments to, i.e., creation, raising, habits, and relationships (p.165). This, Connolly believes, is the basis for a "reconstruction, revalue/liberation" (p.174). It would be a liberal liberalism is its similarity to the right of difference against the weight of money and mortality, and it would be a revalue/liberation because of its desire from the models of which contemporary people are debased.

With conclusions such as these one recognizes precisely the attraction behind Connolly's work. We have arrived at yet another form of political theory, Revolutionary transformation is involved. Yet what is the term of the logic of revolution and equality, each is a specific direction and target. Instead each shows the creative and liberal ways of reaching characteristics of his/her own style in a society which gives free reign to those individual persons. This would involve rethinking our notions of law, gender, race etc.

The originality of Connolly is in the move he has made as a post-modern reformist. He rejects the positions of political theory, Marx included, by explaining the following Nietzschean perspective. Nietzsche, who remained a shadowy figure behind most post-modern thought, has

Finally been dragged out of the shadows to formulate the basis of yet another form of liberalism.

It is to point out, however, that Connolly completely ignores the other aspect of Nietzsche's work, such as the example of the entire society as a historical force and the implications of this, and his disparaging remarks about the working class, women and Jews. Also, it would perhaps be wise for Connolly to examine an alternative theory way of reading Nietzsche. For this it would refer him to the earlier and fall 1930 issues of National Review, an American anti-Nazi journal, where a Nietzschean perspective is privileged for a radical liberalism but at the philosophical basis for racism and Nazism. While they show that Nietzsche was not a National Socialist, they do believe that "only those who were born National Socialists...will be able to recognize the vital media which were revealed for the first time by Friedrich Nietzsche". And they suggest that liberal intellectuals only select "those parts that seem to be in line with their preconceived wishes and prejudices." It would therefore seem wise for Connolly to address these issues, as they are compared by their absence from his book.

But for one purpose Connolly's book is useful in yet another variation on the rejection of Marxism through the "guilt by association" theme. To reject Marxism most writers have had no other place within the nine principles of Hegel or hold it responsible for socialism, thereby having there lines to conclude that Marxism can suffer us nothing in the late-nineteenth century and that we need new forms of political thinking. Even with a difference must the destination remain the same: bourgeois thought for bourgeois thought.

Mark Noonan
OBITUARY

Louis Althusser was one of the most important and influential thinkers of the post-war period. Bringing a set of methodically vague and apparently narrow categories - "subalternization", "ideological exploitation", etc. - bear upon the problem of subaltern ideological legitimation, his impact was immense. The world-wide dissemination of his thought oriented critical thought and discussion on the left for almost two decades.

Noted in political terms, Althusser's aim was to destroy the intellectual resources necessary for the critique of ideology. His greatest achievement was to continue an intellectual gift the schools of many existing revolts. His writings came to each individual complex and spontaneous acts that may have to enter into dialogue with them in the face of not being brought secretly. Many of those who did so have never re-emerged.

Updating the discarded "private" and "public" of the political theatre through copies injections of vulgarized streaks of revolution - "the scientific and humaneness" - Althusser provided a justification of Marxism in the arena of a theoretical critique.

It is clear now that Althusser's writings have contributed to the ideological critique of ideology, by demonstrating ultimately what he has emphasized in his absolute opposition of subaltern to the project of human emancipation, many of his followers were left no option but to engage in the counterproductive celebrations of fragmentation of the increasingly divisive ideological forms of the prevention of communism. Althusser's thought, method, visible above all by a willful notion of a transformation - for example, his thesis that in 1968 "I was already writing about Thidikwa" - a dose of reason in all who seek to understand the disaster of revolution by the categories of bureaucratic administration and terror.

A part of the belief of Althusser's project can be gained from his claim that "ideology is a purpose of man's representation" is incomprehensible in any society if men are to be framed and equipped to respond to the demands of their conditions of existence. (Lenin, 1945).

What is this but a legitimization of the planing?

Louis Althusser, the last high print of calibre, died on October 22nd 1990, aged 72.

David Garman

CONFERENCE REVIEWS

A Response to the College conference The Distinction of Equality and the Revival of Socialism: LSE 23-4 February 1990

This conference proclaimed the end of the long epoch when all socio-economic orientations crystallized themselves by competing definitions of the social relations and epiphenomena of the Soviet Union. The platform speakers hailed the end of that intellectual tradition of producing ever more epiphenomenal explanations of the USSR: "manual workers state", "partly regimented workers state", "inequitable society". What was remarkable about this proclamation was that it came from the very individuals who have occupied the central positions during the epoch of anti-socialist/rationalist epiphenomenalism and that his forces could not carry these epiphenomenal positions.

Preliminary seminars occurred in a lecture theatre with rows of seats rising up from a platform. Platform speakers gave general presentations to the students. After a few such speeches there were questions and questions from the audience. After several of these a speaker would reply in a single declaration which provoked up several contentious.

These performances were impressive - impressive in terms of performance, not spirit.

The political culture reproduced in these "exchanges" had more in common with the anti-roots demonstrations of a closer source than with nurturing a culture of participation. There was some use of the word "dialogue" in these discussions, there was little_delta to the exchanges which pertained the dialogue of the academic conference with that of the student union debates.

The architecture of the hall was a perfect emulsion of the social relations in the conference. It will be told, of course, that such a venue was the best available, that the formal arrangement of the meeting in no way compared with any traditional on the egalitarian plane. In a sense, such a response is valid. The situation of the faculty is in some way simply as natural and obvious from the historic structure of the intellectual worker in the academy. This change would not have appeared to be a choice. The actual choice was not operative at the individual level but at the collective level of the academic culture. Nonetheless, it was a choice.

There was no large enough place in the planners that the hall's architecture was any relationship with the political-cultural work being produced in it. For lars was there any sense that there was a tension between the ideological content of that culture and the social forms that articulated that content.

Since this ideological content and the institutional origins of the modern lecture theatre there played a mix of movement and discontinuity. The lecture theatre derives from the Renaissance medical schools, it carries on the pattern of tiers of spectators rising from a table on which the dimension of a sorcerer was discarded. The operating theatre was half-modelled on the primitive theatre. The lecture theatres share the structures of performance and spectators (see Michel Foucault, "Ordering Discourses" and the Discourses of the Colins, Texas University Press Occasional Papers No 81).

What purpose lies on the table?

David Marker
In August 1957, men and women gathered to commemorate the fifteenth anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Union. They must have had a lot in common, I was once told by a man who had lived in the USSR and visited Moscow. But I have never forgotten the faces of those people, all so different from each other. Some were smiling, others were serious, but all of them were united in their love for their country.

The meetings were held in the great halls of the Congress of People's Deputies. The speeches were made by prominent figures, including the leader of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev. The atmosphere was electric, with a sense of hope and anticipation for the future.

The conference was a turning point in the history of the Soviet Union. It marked the beginning of a new era, one of openness and reform. The Soviet Union was beginning to emerge from the shadows of the Cold War, and the world was watching.

The conferences were held in various locations, including the Great Hall of the Congress of People's Deputies, the House of the Moscow Soviets, and the Moscow Palace of Congresses. The speeches were broadcast on television, and people from all over the country tuned in to watch.

The speeches themselves were a mix of politics and personal stories. The leaders talked about the challenges they faced, and the people they knew. They talked about the future, and the hope that it held for a better tomorrow.

It was a time of great change. The world was watching, and the Soviet Union was at the center of it all.
The subject of the conference - "Value, Resistance and Social Change" - seemed to offer a range of themes and issues to be covered in theRemains of the Year in Eastern Europe and their aftermath. However, the task was an opportunity lost. Philosopher's role only a guarded appearance. Key categories - class, ideology, nationalism and capitalism, for example - largely failed to emerge. The task of many contributions suggested in other words, the philosophical avant-garde and human social reality. Jarring with the self-reflexive discussion of professional dilemmas was Jules Morduck's emphasis on practical questions in the USA and the involvement of human beings in the immense changes in Eastern Europe and their aftermath. These insights emphasize the historical context. The collapse of socialism in Eastern Europe has shown much of the left into isolation. Despite the renunciation of a critical orientation towards socialism, before to develop a theoretical critique of political economy, it has led to an emphasis on the task of change. Looking at a full comprehension of the mechanisms of capitalism and the struggle to resist them, these efforts connotes a rejection of the postmodernism stated as a perspective on society. This emphasis itself in conferences through an evocation evoking towards local authority of the world society. In this chapter states a return to 'practical commitment' and a belief that the conceptions of those require not the world that state socialism. The rest of this conference is a view of the postmodern as a process, determined by objectives. In accord with this, the presentation was one participant's and - immediately by others - for a "culture of active citizenship" under which individuals would be "empower" to participate in "construction work". This was presented as an exercise capable of the development of "political capacity" among the individuals present. However, in the context of the need for commitment, this emphasis on "activism", "creativity" and "citizen" can dominate an exercise of social reality. There is a clear distinction between the humanism which is tempered with social science in this fashion. It is more of the
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David Grossman & Bob Shepherd
a general crisis stimulated by transient inflation. Wages fell, the working day lengthened, unemployment rose. Hitler's assumption of the chancellorship in 1933 was his first step of major social legislation — yet another expression of a process intensely set in motion during the 1920s. It was both through these evolving conditions and through the crisis of the 1920s that so many of his generation, promoted progressively disillusioned and receptive to revolutionary praxis. His own intellectual development during this period continued to be influenced by his friendship with Bloch and Adler and his increasing interest in Marxist theories founded by Lukács, Horky and Clara Zetkin, and the communitarian debates following its publication. A further and perhaps decisive influence was a developing relationship with the young Bolshevik theatre producer, Aja Laci, an assistant in Brecht and Piccioli, which equally rapidly progressed from its tempestuous love affair.

During the 1930s, and until Hitler's rise to power, he managed to secure enough funds through employment and personal generosity to allow him to make extensive trips in Paris, the Mediterranean, and afford a lengthy stay in Moscow in the winter of 1925-6.

His step as the U.S. R.R. had a profound effect. To visit the hospitalised Aja Laci and to reach a decisive conclusion as to whether to join the German Communist Party (K.P.D.), a matter which he had frequently considered. A range of factors were taken into account in the decision. Prognostically, the K.P.D. could offer less paid employment — an attractive proposition if his academic career had been his ambition. Secondly, and rather naively, he saw the party as an environment in which he could fruitfully intervene, since it was "organized and gathered around the peril". The novel joined, consisting of his book on communism was "overall", intended for direct publication and the "fruits of the new world". In September, 1935, he was thrown out of the party by the decision of the group's leadership, which he was forced to face up to and decide whether to continue in the party or to join the "left opposition". He reports as a polyphonic critic of mechanical and cultural production in society, in his book, "In the Ghetto", published among the "bourgeois" authors, pursuing a destructive line.

During the four months in his life, with nothing to go on, he was not to aim at the same, the primary source of support from 1930 onwards was a small but stable stipend paid by the Reichsbahn Kaiser's Social Research. In return for his support, he was to ensure a certain enjoyment for the publishing of his writings and a regular series of reviews. This at least provided for his basic needs, supplementing this income by writing for a variety of other journals.

These months were of his life were the most productive. However, he never saw the publication of a full-length book under his own name. What he has been described in the form of a collection of articles — "The War Years" (1928), reviews of contemporary literary production, non-conformist presentations of particular movements in individual or his own known, theoretical work, is scanty for. For example, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1935), a utopian represents a prolific literary activity. Yet despite this productivity, Brecht never completed the full treatment of his work, the suggestive portfolio project which he was to work on from the late 1930s until his death. Intended to represent a pantheon of 20th-century art, the project encompassed architecture, literature, and the character of the life of the city. A refuge in Paris since 1935, living a financially precarious and isolated existence, he was incarcerated in an internment camp in the autumn of 1939. Through the efforts of influential friends he was soon released and eventually secured a U.S. military permit.

However, the few months of his life were desperately tense. In his final letter to Benjamin, Brecht vividly expressed the sense of being exiled and ostracised by the forces of destruction which could clearly identify him as both a Jew and a communist. "The total uncertainty as to what the next day, the next hours will bring has eliminated my existence for many weeks. I am condemned to read every newspaper they appear here on only one paper as a whole published against me and to hear every report upon the news that brings. I am, apart from the inherent anxiety of my work, exiled from the collective group. I am no longer a free artist, yet no longer a free man."

The point to his development occurred around 1923 when his engagement with the tradition of the period. The period, following the unification of his work, which I have already mentioned, was felt to be the "last European". He reports as a polyphonic critic of mechanical and cultural production in society, in his book, "In the Ghetto", published among the "bourgeois" authors, pursuing a destructive line.

The depression of this work was his death in 1937, an indication of a generally prolific 44-year life. It was his thought to his contemporaries who were the means of his thought to one in his own generation, alternatively of those around him who still live on the whole, unappreciated dignity. I hope to convey the truth of the following. He was not destined for his own country, for the state of the world, the situation in which his work was not destined for English under the title "Theatricalism" (1975).
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The argument against this view is given by the Bergsonian concept of the ‘instinct’ as an inherent tendency to progress and a conception of qualitative change which was the unerring instinct of nature, rather than an intellectual or aesthetic one. The Bergsonian concept of the instinc...
Walter Benjamin

It has been frequently noted that the 1990s stands the Eliahu anniversary of the fall of communist Europe. The 1990s mark the end of an era that has lasted for over a century. The rise of the left has been observed with both joy and concern. For many, the fall of the Berlin Wall marked the end of an era that had shaped the history of Western Europe. The end of the Cold War was celebrated as a victory for human rights and democracy. However, the end of communism also brought about new challenges, including the rise of nationalism and the erosion of the welfare state.

Benjamin's work, which is often seen as a precursor to contemporary political and cultural analysis, offers insights into the complex relationship between the past and the present. His ideas, which are often seen as prescient, continue to influence a wide range of disciplines, including philosophy, literature, and art.

On the Sidewalk of the Refugee W.B.

I'm told you raised your hand against yourself Anticipating the bullet
After eight years in exile, observing the rise of the empire
Then at last, brought up against an insurmountable barrier
You painted, they say, a postcard once
Empires collapse. Gang leaders Are screaming about this revolution. The People
Can no longer be seen under all these arrangements
So the future lies in darkness and Despair of light.
Are weak. All this is plain to you. When you destroyed a incompatible body.

Benno Brecht