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Introduction

After eight years of sporadic publication, *Root & Branch* will now appear quarterly. Since its inception, *Root & Branch* has undergone both growth and contraction as people who worked with us for a while left to pursue interests elsewhere. At one time it was nearly defunct. During the past two years, however, a more or less stable group of about 12 people have coalesced and breathed new life into *Root & Branch*. At first our purpose was simply to discuss among ourselves what we saw as important ideas and new political developments, topics such as: is there an energy crisis, is homework surplus, value-producing labor, the strikes in Spain and Portugal, the value-price transformation problem, what is socialism, the occupation at Beachrock, N.H., the current state of the economy, what does "class" mean, and many more. As one would expect, these discussions led to disagreement and controversy about basic points as well as ideological ones. They were as ultimately invigorating as they were often frustrating. Through these discussions, many of us, mainly for purposes of self-clarification, were encouraged to write down our own ideas about these and many other topics. From this, the idea of renewing publication of *Root & Branch* emerged quite naturally. It was the growing belief that we could contribute fruitfully to ongoing debates on social issues, however, that finally provided the impetus to actually produce this inaugural issue of the new *Root & Branch*.

During the past several years it has become increasingly clear that the capitalist world is entering a period of profound social crisis. This is evident through the gradual emergence of myriad phenomena: simultaneous high levels of inflation and unemployment, the spread of urban decay, economic stagnation, currency turmoil, trade imbalances, an increase in social violence, farmers' strikes, the replacement of a common notion of the general good by uncountable special interest lobbies, etc. This deepening crisis brings with it renewed possibilities of revolutionary activity. In this context, discussions about the nature of capitalist society, the origins of the present crisis, and the future possibilities of creating a new socialist society take on a more concrete and practical meaning than they would otherwise. The desire to participate in such discussions, and in the activities which will emerge from them, is ultimately our principal reason for wanting to publish *Root & Branch* once again.

We have, as you will see in this and subsequent issues, conflicting opinions concerning these topics. But there are several basic ideas which we share and which will give a common perspective to the articles that appear on these pages:

- In our attempt to understand current and past crises, we make use of Marx's theory of capital accumulation;
- We believe that the development of social relations in capitalism creates the practical possibility of socialism, since capitalism creates both individual producers who have no formal bond (i.e., master-slave) tying them together, and the mutual interdependence of each on the other for the material necessities of survival;
- We believe that the transformation of capitalistic society is not through hierarchical forms of organization, but only through the direct cooperation among workers;
- We believe that such cooperation will arise from necessity in the common attempt to survive a capitalist crisis rather than from a shared ideology.

In our opinion, this viewpoint provides the most fruitful approach to discussing and solving the problems we all face.

In the current issue we discuss several important topics: the "revolt against work" ideology popularized by John Holman, *Renew*, and others; the revival of the Confederación Nacional de Trabajo (CNT) in the context of the reemergence of working class movements in Spain; the current economic crisis and the possibility of revolution; and the question of whether professionals, technicians, etc., constitute a new class.

The notion of a revolt against work itself has its origins in the spread of industrial sabotage and absenteeism in the early 1930's, as well as in the popular debates concerning the "blue-collar blues." These events were seen as marking a fundamental change in working class attitudes and activities which would quickly lead to new working class organizations struggling, not just to kick the capitalists out of the work place, but to abolish work. In part at least, this new theory represents another attempt to explain the absence of revolutionary movements in the past while maintaining the basis for hope in their possible emergence in the future. In his critique of the 'revolt against work' theory, Charles Rees shows that, far from being a new phenomenon, sabotage and absenteeism are as old as the working class itself. Rees further contends that today such activities are manifestations of workers' weaknesses, and have grown out of an economic situation which is now disappearing. On the other hand, R.P.'s brief essay, "The Weakening of the Work Ethic," points out that large numbers of the younger generation of workers have rejected their parents' belief in the intrinsic virtues of work, taking jobs only because they need an income to survive. Together, these articles point to a complex reality in which today's workers engage in activities similar to those of previous generations of workers, but for different reasons.

With the ending of the Franco era, Spain has entered a period of intensified political activity, including the development of numerous strike movements, the expansion and legalization of vanguardist/reforertastic parties of differing political persuasions, and the revival of the CNT. In "Spain: Some Aspects of the New Workers' Movement," Jorge and Paco describe some of the dimensions of the recent strike movements in Madrid, Barcelona, and elsewhere, the attempts of the Spanish Communist Party and other parties of the left to contain the strikes, and some possible consequences of these multi-sided conflicts. They conclude that while the Communists and other reformist parties will probably succeed in directing worker activities toward traditional trade union demands, the striking workers have gained invaluable experience in autonomous radical action. In addition, Jorge and Paco examine the re-emergence of the CNT as a political force among the working class, but they note the growing dispute within the CNT between the old-time syndicalists and the younger anarchists. Two interviews, once with J. Gomez Casas of the national committee of the
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After eight years of sporadic publication, Root & Branch will now appear quarterly. Since its inception, root & branch has undergone both growth and contraction as people who worked with us for a while left to pursue interests elsewhere. At one time it was nearly defunct. During the past two years, however, a more or less stable group of about 12 people have coalesced and breathed new life into Root & Branch. At first our purpose was simply to discuss among ourselves what we saw as important ideas and new political developments, topics such as: the Cuban energy crisis, the war in Afghanistan, the occupation of West Bank, the current state of the economy, what does "class" mean, and many more. As one would expect, these discussions led to disagreement and controversy about basic points as well as controversial issues. They were as intimately intriguing as they were frustrating. Through these discussions, many of us, mainly for purposes of self-clarification, were encouraged to write down our own ideas about these and many other topics. From this, the idea of renewing publication of root & branch emerged quite naturally. It was the growing belief that we could contribute fruitfully to ongoing debates on social issues, however, that finally provided the impetus to actually produce this inaugural issue of the new Root & Branch.

During the past several years it has become increasingly clear that the capitalist world is entering a period of profound social crisis. This is evident through the gradual emergence of myriad phenomena: simultaneous high levels of inflation and unemployment, the spread of urban decay, economic stagnation, currency turmoil, trade imbalances, an increase in social violence, farmers’ strikes, the replacement of a common notion of the general good by uncountable special interest lobbies, etc. This deepening crisis brings with it renewed possibilities of revolutionary activity. In this context, discussions about the nature of capitalist society, the origins of the present crisis, and the future possibilities of creating a new socialist society take on a more concrete and practical meaning than they would otherwise. The desire to participate in such discussions, and in the activities which will emerge from them, is, ultimately our principal reason for wanting to publish Root & Branch once again.

We have, as you will see in this and subsequent issues, conflicting opinions concerning these topics. But there are several basic ideas which we share and which will give a common perspective to the articles that appear on these pages:

- In our attempt to understand current and past crises, we make use of Marx’s theory of capital accumulation;
- We believe that the development of social relations in capitalism creates the practical possibility of socialism, since capitalism creates both individual producers who have no formal bond (i.e., master-slave) tying them together, and the mutual interdependence of each on the other for the material necessities of survival;
- We believe that the transformation of capitalism into socialism is not through hierarchical forms of organization, but only through the direct cooperation among workers; and
- We believe that such cooperation will arise from necessity in the common attempt to survive a capitalist crisis rather than from a shared ideology.

In our opinion, this viewpoint provides the most fruitful approach to discussing and solving the problems we all face.

In the current issue we discuss several important topics: the "revolt against work" ideology popularized by John Horan, Nework, and others; the revival of the Confederación Nacional de Trabajo (CNT) in the context of the resurgence of working class movements in Spain; the current economic crisis and the possibility of revolution; and the question of whether professionals, technicians, etc., constitute a new class.

The notion of a revolt against work itself had its origins in the spread of industrial sabotage and absenteeism in the early 1970’s, as well as in the popular debates concerning the "blue collar blues." These events were seen as marking a fundamental change in working class attitudes and activities which would quickly lead to new working class organizations struggling, not just to kick the capitalists out of the work place, but to abolish work. In part at least, this new theory represents another attempt to explain the absence of revolutionary movements in the past while maintaining the basis for hope in their possible emergence in the future. In his critique of the 'revolt against work' theory, Charles Reves shows that, far from being a new phenomenon, sabotage and absenteeism are as old as the working class itself. He further contends that today such activities are manifestations of workers' weakness and have grown out of an economic situation which is now disappearing. On the other hand, D.J.’s brief essay, "The Weakening of the Work Ethic," points out that large numbers of the younger generation of workers have rejected their parents' belief in the intrinsic value of work, taking jobs only because they need an income to survive. Together, these articles point to a complex reality in which today's workers engage in activities similar to those of previous generations of workers, but for different reasons.

With the ending of the Franco era, Spain has entered a period of intensified political activity, including the development of numerous strike movements, the expansion and legalization of vanguardist/reformist parties of differing political persuasion, and the revival of the CNT. In "Spain: Some Aspects of the New Workers' Movement," Jorge and Paco describe some of the dimensions of the recent strike movements in Madrid, Barcelona, and elsewhere, the attempts of the Spanish Communist Party and other parties of the left to contain the strikes, and some possible consequences of these multi-sided conflicts. They conclude that while the Communists and other reformist parties will probably succeed in directing worker activities toward traditional trade union demands, the striking workers have gained invaluable experience in autonomous radical action. In addition, Jorge and Paco examine the re-emergence of the CNT as a political force among the working class, but they note the growing dispute within the CNT between the old-time syndicalists and the younger anarchists. Two interviews, once with J. Gomez Casas of the national committee of the
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With the 1960's the eternal prosperity, the managed economy, the atomic age, the "death of ideology" of the post-WWII world is typically a single case of capitalism, combining unemployment and inflation in the capitalists, West and the inability of the state-run systems of the East to satisfy their working classes are producing unsettling effects throughout "industrial society": the deterioration of conditions in the big cities, which nonetheless draw an increasing proportion of the world's population, the seemingly permanent army of the unemployed which has been accumulating in these urban centers; the instability of governments in the democracies, in the absence of any clear policy alternatives, inspiring a drift towards open authoritarianism; the development of opposition to the party dictatorships in the East, both in the form of liberalization among the intelligentsia and, more significantly, in the form of strikes among the working classes; and the continuing decay of ideologies and social norms. All this testifies to the basic characteristic of the "limits of growth" that modern society is coming up against.

Whatever disappointments Nature has in store for us in the future, the limits we are encountering now are not ecological but social ones. It is not even socially caused, environmental destruction is the direct consequence of class war which most directly threatens our existence. That a fascination with zero-growth has rapidly spread among the working class, the ideology of eternal progressive development is only a recent example of the experience of the bankruptcy as a social system of capitalism and its state-run analog.

As yet we cannot speak of the existence anywhere in the world of forces or social movements which represent a real possibility of social revolution. But, while in no way inevitable, social change is already occurring in the various possibilities for an enjoyable and decent life are to be realized—and perhaps if human life is to be preserved at all. For this reason we see the overthrow of the present order of society as the goal to which we as a group of activists have devoted our lives. This aim for has been called by a variety of names—communism, socialism, anarchism—which is important to us is the idea that a just and decent society in which social life is controlled by those whose activities make it up. Capitalism has created the basis of such a system by its overproduction and consumption of a surplus of goods which are available to meet the producer's need to convert the national and productive activities of the working class, to ensure full employment and profits for the worker. This view leads to the conclusion that the worker's movement expressed in the Provisional Rules of the First International, beginning with the consideration "that the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves."

From the past we draw only inspiration and still-meaningful ideas but also lessons on mistakes to be avoided. The fundamental idea of the old labor movement, that the working class can build up its forces in large organizations in preparation for the 'final conflict' with the owners. Whether the organization was that of reformist or of revolutionary parties, producers or consumer cooperatives, or trade unions, its success has always turned out to be a success in adapting to the logic of survival within capitalism. The Bolshevist alternative of the small vanguard of revolutionaries preparing for the day when they would lead the masses to the conquest of state power has also proved useless for our purposes. Such parties have had a role to play only in the industrialized areas of the world, where the working class has been both large and needed to carry out the work of forced economic development. Today in the developed countries they have been condemned either to sectarianism or to a passive role for revolutionary parties of the social-democratic type.

While history has thus indicated that there can be no revolutionary movement except in periods of revolution, the principles of such a future movement must guide the activity of those who wish to contribute to its creation. These principles—in contrast to those of the old labor movement—must signify a total break with the foundations of capitalism, and the relation between wage-labor and capital. As our goal is that of worker's control over social life, our principles must be revolution. Only we in conflict because of production and distribution. To eliminate the problems of capitalism, to sell the capitalist's need for profit, the working class must take direct responsibility for what it already produces. This means opposition not only to the existing ruling class of capitalists and politicians but to any system that does not allow us to hold power in our name. Root and Branch, therefore, holds to the tradition of the worker's movement expressed in the Provisional Rules of the First International, beginning with the consideration "that the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves."

Leftists always seem to be inventing new class theories or revising old ones. Recently, Barbara and John Ehrenreich have attempted to show that professionals, managers and technicians constitute a new class that has emerged in the 20th century. But, we argue, Gary Roth, a Root & Branch member, draws a clear distinction between a notion of class based on the means of production and modern sociological definitions of class based on the theories of income, culture, heritage and ideology.

We said above that Root & Branch would appear quarterly. We believe that this is a realistic goal; the important thing is that it is already on the drawing board. But we certainly can use your help. First of all, let us consider what a Root & Branch publication can do, not only for the radical left but also, if we do it well, for all working people. If you can contribute anything, please do.

Ultimately, however, like any other liberal publication, depends on your intellectual and financial support for survival. Thanks.

Root & Branch

Hovensville, MA, 02343
With the 1960’s the eternal prosperity, the managed economy and the welfare state began to deteriorate. The ‘death of ideology’ of the post-World War II world continued to weaken as the falling birth rate and rising unemployment and inflation in the capitalist West and the inability of the state-run systems of the East to satisfy their working classes are producing unsettling effects throughout ‘industrial society’; the deterioration of conditions in the big cities, which nonetheless draw an increasing proportion of the world’s population; the depression of the seemingly permanent army of the unemployed which has been accumulating in these urban centers; the instability of governments in the democracies, in the absence of any clear policy alternatives, inspiring a drift towards open authoritarianism; the development of opposition to the party dictatorships in the East, both in the form of liberalization among the intelligentsia and, more significantly, in that of strike movements among the working classes; and the continuing decay of ideologies and social norms. All this testifies to the basic character of the ‘limits of growth’ that modern society is coming up against.

Whatever disappointments Nature has in store for us in the future, the limits we are encountering now are not ecological but social ones. It is not even socially caused, even though it is often supposed so. It is a war which most directly threatens our extinction. That a fascination with zero-growth has replaced the ideological movement of eternal progressive development is only ideology. We have had experience of the bankruptcy as a social system of capitalism and its state-run analog.

As yet we cannot speak of the existence anywhere in the world of forces or social movements which represent a real possibility of social revolution. But, while in no way inevitable, social revolution remains a possibility where necessary possibilities for an enjoyable and decent life are to be realized—and perhaps if human life is to be preserved at all. For this reason we see the overthrow of the present order of society as the goal to which we as a group must work. Our immediate aim for has been called by a variety of neo-Marxism—socialism, anarchism—that is important to us is the idea of a society in which social life is controlled by those whose activities make it up. Capitalism has created the basis of such a system by so intervening the production and consumption of capital—by the introduction of the collectivist mind-set. We are working to develop new ideas and means to circulate and realize these.
The Revolt Against Work, or Fight for the Right to Be Lazy?

Have you ever heard of a boss satisfied with his employees' labor? Certainly not, and if we are to believe John Zerzan's text on the "Critical Context," "this very holds for today's American capitalists as well as for their faithful servitors, the unions.

According to its author, the aim of this text is to discuss "the conservative nature of official strikes, the growth of union centralization and autocracy, and the increasingly institutionalization of business-labor-government collusion and cooperation... against the backdrop of such manifestations of heightened workers' resistance as rising absenteeism and turnover rates, declining productivity, and a much greater anti-union tendency." However, after reading it, one feels the absence of a critical analysis of these questions. In its place one finds a list of quotations and thoughts of the American ruling class and its faithful sociologists. Of course, the author tries to use all this "thought" of the ruling class to show how the state of the American working class is today reaching a critical point[17]. These are the limits imposed by the academic approach of the author; the article was originally published in a radical journal of an American university. Whether the text added to the English publication, and certainly not the quotations from A. Fronenock inserted among sheets of reflections of industrial sociologists, can constitute for the absence of reference to the experiences of struggle and to the way in which they were perceived by American workers. And when the author promises to say something about the "state of mind of the American wage-earner," we remain hungry. In short, the objectivity of the text—to show how the revolt against work constitutes the new, radical tendency of the class struggle—appears to me to be far from achieved. Uncritical confidence in the opinions of the ruling class on this subject does not seem to me to be a sufficient argument for accepting such a thesis.

Nevertheless, this text presents, in my opinion, two interesting points. First of all, in a condensed but clear form it refers to the most recent struggles of American workers and shows the existence of closer relations between the union machines and the capitalist state apparatus. Secondly, with reference to the tendencies which it claims to discern in the current phase of struggles in the U.S., "the Critical Context" provides a discussion of some questions now fashionable in a number of radical circles. This revolt against work, abstention, sabotage—are these new tendencies within the workers' movement? Does the absence of the work ethic ideology among young workers imply a radical attack on the system? Do these forms of revolt go beyond the traditional forms of struggle to call into question the very functioning of the system? Today there exist everywhere little leftist tendencies who would answer "yes" to these questions and who erect the "revolt against work" as the principle of the new revolutionary movement.
COMING SOON FROM ROOT & BRANCH

WHO RUNS CHINA'S FACTORIES?
The Limits of "Participatory Management"

by

William Russell

An analysis and critique of the Maoist theory of workers' participation in management. The pamphlet begins with a detailed account of the system of management that emerged from the Cultural Revolution, as described by Charles Bettelheim, Victor see, Maurice Heilman, and others. Also covered in this section is the history of 'democratic management' in China since 1949, as summarized by Stephen Andros, William Brupper, etc. Finally, Maoist management theory is shown to rest on certain Leninist assumptions about the nature of socialist society. The second section presents a brief history of the relations between the Communist Party and the Chinese proletariat since 1949 (based on an extensively documented book-length study in preparation). Among the conclusions drawn is that it was precisely at the height of Maoist influence, during the Great Leap Forward, that Chinese workers were subjected to the most extreme exploitation. This historical reality contrasts sharply with the Maoist image of democratic management in the CLF. In section three, the author goes on to argue that even if the Maoist theory was applied in reality, it would still not provide the necessary conditions for real workers' control over their own labor process. Returning to the literature summarized in the first section, Comedy Russell shows that even on the evidence provided by sympathetic writers, the Maoist management system does not go beyond the limited participation proposed by such pseudo-schemes as the Second Plan and more recently the West German co-determination. The author closes with a modest attempt to show how some of the minimal conditions which must be met in order to have genuine workers' self-management.

THE REVOLT AGAINST WORK, or Fight for the Right to Be Lazy?

Have you ever heard of a boss satisfied with his employees' labor? Certainly not; and if we are to believe John Zerzan's text on "The Critical Context," all this even holds for today's American capitalists as well as for their faithful servants, the unions.

According to its author, the aim of this text is to discuss "the conservative nature of official strikes, the growth of union centralization and autocracy, and the increasing institutionalization of business-labor-government collusion and cooperation... against the backdrop of such manifestations of heightened workers' resistance as rising absenteeism and turnover rates, declining productivity, and a much greater anti-union tendency." (1) However, after reading it, one feels the absence of a critical analysis of these questions. In its place one finds a long list of quotations and thoughts of the American ruling class and its faithful sociologists. Of course, the author tries to use all this "thought" of the ruling class to show how the American working class is today reaching a critical point. (2) These are the limits imposed by the academic approach of the author. the article was originally published in a radical journal of an American university. Neither the text added to the English publication, and certainly not the quotation from A. Fasenbok in which the author promises to say something about "the fate of mind of the American wage-earner," is new. It remains, in short, the objective of the text—to show how the revolt against work constitutes the new, radical tendency of the class struggle—appears to me to be far from achieved. Uncritical confidence in the opinions of the ruling class on this subject doesn't seem to me to be a sufficient argument for accepting such a thesis.

Nevertheless, this text presents, in my opinion, two interesting points. First of all, in a condensed but clear form it refers to the recent struggles of American workers and shows the existence of ever closer relations between the union machines and the capitalist state apparatus. Secondly, with reference to tendencies which it claims to discern in the current phase of struggles in the U.S.A., "The Critical Context" provides a discussion of some questions now fashionable in a number of radical circles. This "revolt against work," abstentionism, sabotage—are these new tendencies within the workers' movement? Does the absence of the work ethic ideology among young workers imply a radical attack on the system? Do these forms of revolt go beyond the traditional forms of struggle to call into question the very functioning of the system? Today there exist everywhere some leftists whose tendencies would answer "yes" to these questions and who erect the "revolt against work" as the principle of the new revolutionary movement.

II

First of all, in sabotage as production a new aspect of the class struggle, or in it one of the forms of resistance which workers have always used against the violence of wage-labor from the very beginnings of industrialization? In Dynamic, an extraordinary book on class violence in America, Louis Adamic (a former Bolshevik) describes how sabotage became one of the favorite forms of action of revolutionary American workers around the turn of the century.
For American and European revolutionary syndicalists sabotage was a conscious class response to capitalism in the form of the "20th century's black cat, we remember the famous text on sabotage by Albert Szent-Györgyi. This view of sabotage was revolutionary syndicalism's key function: it was a revolutionary syndicalist organization. To present sabotage as something new in the world of struggle only suggests little acquaintance with that movement's history.

It is nonetheless true that with the integration of the "social wage" system into the labor force, the concept of "sabotage" as a principle of union action now appears only in white-collar actions. Sabotage has changed its form and its meaning, while other forms of "rebellion" appear. The transformation of capitalism, with the end of liberal capitalism and the development of the modern form of state intervention, the union movement takes on a new function, that of managing the "social services" permitted by this new development. The violence of wage labor increases together with the integration of the workers by the setting up of systems of social security and various forms of welfare. All this has the aim of reducing conflict in the process of reproduction. But these systems of social aid (the "social wage," as they've been called) also offer the workers new possibilities for resistance to work. The systems promise this as long as capital accumulation continues without serious arrests, for these arrests are seen as less efficacious for capitalists. After all, isn't the struggle against capitalism superseded as soon as one can "profit" from unemployment and welfare?

It appears to me very questionable to claim, as Berman along with many others of the "rebellion against work" school do, that sabotage and other extra-work activities are the principal source of capitalism's current crisis of productivity. The bureaucratization of the state, the low level of investment in new productive capital, the low rate of utilization of existing productive capacity, the rising rates of productivity crises. The strike at the Fordor of the Interbale, for example, of which Berman speaks, is a good example. Driven to the wall by a drop in profitability, the automobile sector, in which Taylorism pushed the production process to the furthest, still sought, by means of a sizeable cameral organization to divide the division of manual tasks, that violence of labor. It is this capitalist need to upgrade a formerly sufficient productive process that preceded and provoked the rebellion of the workers at IG Metall. The "rebellion against work" theories of capitalism and its crisis are in crisis, a crisis inseparable from the development of the division of labor, that violence of labor. It is also true that this rebellion often manifests a primitivist desire to "take it easy" (itself a product of the increasing division of the workers by modern organization) and, in this regard, the attitude towards work is not to be confused with the "rebellion against work" with much more than paternalistic "labor unions," and, in the串联, the Self-Managed Counter-Revolution, Detroit: Black and Red, 1975. For contrasting views see Life, "Big Business as the Wages of Work" and "The Self-Managed Counter-Revolution." Detroit: Black and Red, 1975.

The conclusion made in the slogan, "rebellion against work," is that "labor" has a necessary activity indispensable to the functioning of any society, and work as wage labor, only confuses away the real role of revolutionaries in the formation of society. The "rebellion against work" (or "labor work") has no necessity as a slogan — it has been that of the bourgeois class and it fumk means since the beginning! It's hard not to smile when John Berman teaches us that the "contempt for work" is "nearly unanimous" from welders to editors to former executives (p. 3). Certainly, the "rebellion against work" is a new feature in working-class solidarity.

Among revolutionary workers, the daily horror of wage labor only reinforces their conviction that the radical transformation of society consists essentially in the reorganization of production and in the putting to productive use that whole mass of people who now live off exploitation: bourgeoisie, bureaucrats, cogs of all sorts, military operators, and other workers, also necessary to what goes on in capitalist society, it will be on the basis of this participation in the degrading labor that we will be able to work out principles of production and distribution in the new society. Only in this way will we realize the old desire of the working-class movement, whose meaning in today much cleaner—"the abolition of wage labor" and... the right to be lazy.
For American and European revolutionary syndicalists sabotage was a conscious class response to capitalist exploitation. In the early 1900s before the rise of the IWW, as black cat, we remember the famous text on sabotage by the French anarchist Errico Malatesta where he wrote that it was a revolutionary syndicalist organization. To present sabotage as something new in the workers' movement only suggests little acquaintance with that movement's history.

It is nonetheless true that with the integration of the motor car into the system of modern production, the ways and means of sabotage change. In all capitalistic countries, the necessity of tightening the screws of the system, and of adjusting the apparatus of state and the machinery of production with appropriate steps being taken as they are political decisions needs the industrial literacy of drawing on the "social wage" to be reduced. We will see the collapse of the wage as the basis of industrial relations: the concept of a radical form of struggle, in the same way as today already the slogan of the "revolt against work" is collected under the rubric of "social wage", "sabotage". Adamic notes in "The Social Crisis of Labor" that the American working-class has been almost blind, unconsciously, desperately... and no longer a "force controlled by those who preside over us and the consequences of which did not escape them."

Rather than a new form of struggle, sabotage and the rest of the "revolt against work" are in fact the result, the manifestation of weakness of the workers' movement, especially of the workers who have not taken on capitalism in a conscious, independent, and collective fashion.

The privatist concept marks the "revolt against work" as an inevitable consequence of the violence of the wage system, a product of the defeat and divisions of labor in capitalism. The principles of revolutionary action remain unchanged. Only the collective, organized, autonomous workers' movement can emerge as a new action of the proletariat that can lead to the end of wage labor. Such action alone provides solidarity, the spirit of initiative and imagination, a readiness to frame desires and to make decisions, the mental qualities required to be a force in the world we know. When someone says, as John Zerzan does, that workers "will yield slowly to the struggle to get control over the forces of production. It's hard to see how the "revolt against work" and sabotage can be "critical" forms of the modern revolutionary struggle! In fact, only a struggle to re-possess at least some new tendencies to re-appropriate power over the productive apparatus can arise."

The conclusion made in the slogan, "revolt against work", is worker power. Labor is an activity indispensable to the functioning of any society, and work as wage labor, only contributes to the oppression of the workers and to the formation of society. The "revolt against work" (or "sack work") has no possibility as a slogan - it has been that of the bourgeoisie and its flunkies since the beginning! It's hard not to smile when John Zerzan tells us that the "contempt for work" is "neatly unmasked" from welders to editors to former executives (p. 3). Capitalism has their number, and sabotage is a new feature in working-class solidarity.

Among revolutionary workers, the daily horror of wage labor only reinforces their conviction that the radical transformation of society consists essentially in the reorganization of production and in the putting to productive use that whole mass of people who now live off exploitation: bourgeoisie, bureaucrats, cogs of all sorts, military and police, and other parasitic necessary to what goes on in capitalist society. It will be on the basis of participation in the common task of revolutionary labor that we will be able to work out principles of production and distribution in the new society. Only in this way will we realize the old desire of the working-class movement, whose meaning is today much clearer—the abolition of wage labor and the rest... the right to be lazy.

Charles Reeve
Paris, 1976

NOTES


(4) Colloquium No. 7, bulletin of the "Communist Center for Research on Proletarian Autoconsciousness" by M. Naulaiz, CP 4046, Milano 20120, Italy.

"However, struggles in which these tendencies show themselves, in a more or less confused way, don't seem to inspire the workers against the 'revolt against work' with much more than paternalism, and maybe they are, for example, against the IWW and the Self-Managed Counter-Revolution, Detroit; Black and Red, 1975. For contrasting views see Life Against Labor, number 18, November, 1974, Marseilles, Paris, 1974, and La Guerre du 3 Juillet, 1975, Paris, 1975.

This article originally appeared as "Rufus du Travail" in Souterrain, n° 13 la passez en garrott, juillet-août 1976 (5, rue Ste-Créol-Quin - 19-29, Paris, 1974)."
The Weakening of the Work Ethic

The work ethic, like all other ethics, grows out of people's living situations. In societies where people are swept down to either starvation or being worked like a beast of burden, work comes to be seen as a virtue as well as an absolute necessity. That people must spend most of their lives mastered by both the rhythm and requirements of work as well as by physical exhaustion appears normal. When the capitalist system in this country began to afford some upward mobility to large numbers of workers, so they could rise to the level of prosperity the ideologists of the system, or better to describe as "middle class," the work ethic was strengthened. Now hard work was not only a necessity but also was seen by most workers as a means to a真正 better life, if not for themselves at least for their children. The capitalist class, the employers who serve under them, and the acceptance of hard work with long hours as both a necessity and a virtue, might have thought this easy situation would last forever. Sure, the workers sometimes went on strike. Sometimes they even rebelled, but only under unusual and exceptional circumstances. As a norm they acquiesced and stayed on that day by day and see it as if in the interest to do so. Why should a new generation of workers rock the boat? Three different groups each had their own reasons.

For some layers of the American working class, minorities in particular, the American dream was too unrealistic to get the majority dreaming, living on meager wages and forty acres. Before the Great Depression, when work and mere survival went hand and hand, because social benefits were nonexistent, one can speculate that the work ethic was even stronger among blacks than whites. Blacks had to work even harder than whites merely to survive. But in the post-depression era when hard work meant a sharp rise in the standard of living for many white workers, black workers were overwhelmingly kept in the less desirable positions and lower paying positions. Not surprisingly, enthusiasm for hard work among many blacks dropped in proportion to their being excluded from its supposed rewards. The strong work ethic of black parents was frequently translated into a strong anti-work ethic among their disillusioned children. When the black pride movement became widespread, accepting discipline from mostly white superiors became not only more difficult, but was seen by many as a sign of cowardice or betrayal.

Soldiers never happily accept discipline whether or not they are in a combat situation. Obedience is a pain in the ass and gets old fast, and even the most gung ho. But however evil military regimentation and discipline might have been, they were used to be accepted because they were seen as absolutely necessary evils by World War II and Korean War era troops. And why not? The overwhelming majority of the troops during World War II believed that an Axis victory would mean conquest and enslavement of the U.S. and with it their families and loved ones. Similarly, in the Korean War the enemy was seen as monolithic "Communists" which had just conquered Eastern Europe and China and was steadily marching towards our shores. After years of voluntary acceptance discipline soldiers got used to it, and when they returned to civilian life they were considered by prospective employers to be ideal recruits for the discipline of the work place. Then came the Vietnam War and people responded differently. The war was unpopular from the beginning and soon there was massive resistance to it and the draft within the U.S. itself. With individuals being drafted not for the duration but rather for only two years, it wasn't long before thousands of anti-war youths were drafted andreasing their ideas inside the military. The more the war dragged on, the more dissatisfaction grew among increasing numbers of troops, who began to see the war as unwinnable, wrong, or both and certainly not worth killing for. Even these soldiers who continued to support the government's objectives in theory became realistic in practice. While the highly ballyhooed "freeproving" (assassinations of peace groups and officers) were rare, virtually every other kind of discipline, whether subtle or blatant, both individual and collective, became common. And like their fathers before them, returning vets continued to bring attitudes learned in the military home with them to civilian life and the work place.

Youth culture and youth rebellion began around the same time as the anti-war movement and overlapped and grew with it. "Freaks" as they came to be known, proudly adopting the allor directed against them by "straight" society, were by no means a homogeneous group. Most had been in common several, including rock music, marijuana, a non-acquisitive lifestyle based on non-monetary forms of sharing, and several dislikes including the war, sexual constraint, and in general work, discipline, and especially work discipline. Many had parents who were success stories, and this was the reason that they rejected the American dream and the way of life necessary for achieving it. Their parents worked hard, sacrificed, and got the WORK HARD

with honesty, diligence, and
who discipline...

AND YOU WILL BE Rewarded!!

house in the suburbs, color TV, and two cars that they thought would bring them security and happiness. Yet others felt it was none of their business. Some looked at a lot like failure to the young who saw that their parents were being screwed, isolated, overworked, and being made to decide, and afraid to live even on the weekends. Success to the freaks meant living happily, with many meaningful relationships, and doing it seven days a week. Taking flash from authority of any kind was out of the question. The freaks never stood still, however, and even the freaks grew up, got married and raised families, as well as accepted the new form of commercialism. This meant accepting jobs and to some extent discipline, and eventually fading away as a separate group. But they left their imprint on the work place with their rejection of the lifestyle of obedience.

I have briefly dealt with three groups of people and why they tended in the late 1960's and through the 1970's to be less willing to accept the work-related norms of the larger society. In fact these were not distinctly separate groups as one can be both black and a Vietnam veteran, both a vet and a freak, etc. There was rather a mesh of people, generally young, who identified with one another for many reasons including a shared hatred for authority, externally imposed rules, and discipline, who merged together and who remain as a mesh of discontented workers who have infected others on the job with their discontent. This is not surprising since the standard of living has been dropping for years. While few workers are in any type of open rebellion, a slight increase in the demand of the work place, and many more, who once took pride in their work and accepted their place, now frankly don't give a shit.

While conclusions must remain tentative, several points of interest emerge from this situation. (1) Anti-work ethic and work discipline attitudes have manifested themselves in a partial rejection of both getting off of unemployment or welfare checks, once strongly stigmatized, is now increasingly acceptable. Abnestism is rising sharply for those who do have a full-time job. The notion that the bosses have overworked on the job has been greatly weakened. (2) It is not clear how the present economic crisis will affect this situation. The current recession and services and lowered standard of living in general, make it much more people everyday coping just themselves to live without working a forty hour week. Hard times make losing one's job a much more likely event. The balance of power is gradually shifting back in favor of the bosses. (3) These shifts in the workplace continue and will continue to modify their resistance to keep it apparent for the future changes. (4) The acceptance of hard work and long hours without complaining is natural and the acceptance of:"It's all work or it's all play" of the old is changing for the past few million of workers.

D.J. February 1970
The Weakening of the Work Ethic

The work ethic, like all other ethics, grows out of people’s living situations. In societies where people live together in a group to either starvation or being worked like a beast of burden, work comes to be seen as a virtue as well as an absolute necessity. That people must spend most of their lives ruled by both the repetition and regularity of work as well as by physical exhaustion appears normal. When the capitalist system in this country began to afford some upward mobility to large numbers of workers so they could rise to the level of prosperity the ideology of the country said to be the American Dream and the way of life necessary for achieving it. Their parents worked hard, sacrificed, and got the
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place. Then came the Vietnam War and people responded differently. The war was unpopular from the beginning and soon there was massive resistance to it and the draft within the U.S. itself. With individuals being drafted not for the duration but rather for only two years, it wasn’t long before thousands of anti-war youths were drafted and how they had ideas inside the military. The more the war dragged on, the more dissatisfaction grew among increasing numbers of troops, who began to see the war as unwinnable, wrong, or both and certainly not worth killing for. Even these soldiers who continued to support the government’s objectives in theory became revolutionaries in practice. While the much ballyhooed “fragging” (assassinations of NCOs and officers) were rare, virtually every other kind of insubordination, whether subtle or blatant, both individual and collective, became common. And like their fathers before them, returning vets continued to bring attitudes learned in the military home with them to civilization and the work place.

Youth culture and youth rebellion began around the same time as the anti-war movement and overlapped and grew with it. “Freaks” as they came to be known, proudly adopting the subculture directed against them by “straight” society, were by no means a homogeneous group. But most had in common several likes, including rock music, marijuana, a non-acquisitive lifestyle based on informal forms of sharing, and several dislike including the war, sexual constraint, and in general work discipline. Especially work discipline. Many had parents who were所謂 stories, and this was the reason that they rejected the American dream and the way of life necessary for achieving it. Their parents worked hard, sacrificed, and got the

While conclusions must remain tentative, several points of interest emerge from this situation. (1) Anti-work ethic and work discipline attitudes have manifested themselves in a partial rejection of capitalist patterns of employment or welfare checks, once strongly stigmatized, is now increasingly acceptable. Images of life are rising sharply for those who do have a full-time job. The notion that the bosses have over worked the job has been greatly weakened. (2) It is not clear how the present economic crisis will affect this situation. The current economic and social services and lowered standard of living in general, make it much more people experiencing just themselves to live without working a forty hour week. Hard times are making one job a such a situation where the balance of power is gradually shifting back in favor of the bosses. (3) In these conditions, workers continue to resist and will continue to modify their resistance to keep it appropriate for the circumstances. (4) The acceptance of hard work and long hours without complaints are natural and the acceptance of “placing the work ahead of things of the past for millions of workers.

D.J.
February 1976
SPAIN: SOME ASPECTS OF THE NEW WORKERS' MOVEMENT

In Spain today, an obsolete fascist regime, incapable of adapting to the dynamic of modern capitalism, is being dismantled, to be replaced by a modern parliamentary democracy. But this transformation of political institutions is not without its perils—the recent example of Portugal stands as a warning to the Spanish bourgeoisie. For several reasons, however, the risks of a complete social breakdown are less in Spain than in Portugal: the absence of a stalemate colonial war capable of demoralizing the military apparatus, the existence of real economic development since the world war, and most importantly the political ascendency of a vigorous modern bourgeoisie determined to push forward with political reforms.

The object of the following text, however, is not to analyze this transformation of the Spanish state to meet the requirements of modern capital. Rather, we are concerned here with another consequence of those social developments: the formation of a proletarian mass whose growing militancy has become, in the 1970s, a new political factor, not only destructive of the fascist regime but also a serious obstacle to the plans of the bourgeois reformers and their occasional allies among opposition parties. But it is in a matter of indifference to the workers whether they live under a democratic or fascist state, but it seems increasingly unlikely that their aspirations can be reduced to the program of the more or less 'clandestine' 'oppositions.' If they take account during their struggles of the political crisis, they do so not—as the Lениnist theory of necessary stages has it—by fighting for the benefit of bourgeois democracy, but by conducting their strike movements in accord with the principles of direct workers' democracy. For the organization of the opposition, this poses a challenge: their ability to channel and restrain the workers' movement is their passport to a secure position within the new political arrangement.

MOVEMENT

Coming out into the open after a decade of quiescence, the Spanish labor movement is regrouping its forces and renewing its class consciousness through the ups and downs of the struggles that break out from time to time. The massive strike wave in the Madrid region in January 1978 was one of the most powerful of the post-war movements, remarkable for the forms of organization which arose in the course of the struggle and for the problems it raised concerning the relations between the workers and the political underground. Information on the political life of Spain is abundant; when it comes to the social movement, however, there has been very little news. It is no surprise, then, that it is on only about a year of silence that one can begin to lift the veil a little. For this purpose, a small book, Trabajadores en huelga, published in Madrid by a group of journalists who seem close to the USO,* is of great interest. It offers an analysis of the causes of the movement, a fairly comprehensive chronology of a month of struggle and, the richest part of the book, a discussion between two rank and file leaders of different political tendencies who participated in the strikes. Starting with this book and with the use of other documents and information, we will discuss some of the issues raised by the new workers' movement in Spain. The following is not, of course, a definitive analysis, but a contribution to what we hope will be an ongoing discussion.

Starting with the Madrid strikes, we will go on to examine some new organizational aspects of the recent struggles, the strategies of the opposition (focusing on the PCB) and the difficulties they are currently encountering, and, finally, the rise of the new CNR.**

*Union Sindical Obrera: see the list of abbreviations for more information.
**Asociación Comunitaria Española, Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores.
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The object of the following text, however, is not to analyze this transformation of the Spanish state to meet the requirements of modern capital. Rather, we are concerned here with another consequence of these social developments: the formation of a proletarian mass whose growing militancy has become, in the 1950's, a new political factor, not only destructive of the fascist regime but also a serious obstacle to the plans of the bourgeois reformers and their occasional allies among the opposition parties. But it is a matter of indifference to the workers whether they live under a democratic or fascist state, but it seems increasingly unlikely that their aspirations can be reduced to the programs of the more or less 'clandestine' 'oppositions.' If they take account during their struggles of the political crisis, they do so as the Leninist theory of necessary stages has it—by fighting for the benefit of bourgeois democracy, but by conducting their strike movements in accord with the principles of direct workers' democracy. For the organiza-
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MOVEMENT

Coming out into the open after a decade of quiescence, the Spanish labor movement is regrouping its forces and renewing its class con-

sciousness through the ups and downs of the struggles that break out from time to time. The massive strike wave in the Madrid region in January 1976 was one of the most powerful of the post-war movements, remarkable for the form of organization which arose in the course of the struggle and for the problems it raised concern-

ing the relations between the workers and the political underground. Information on the political life of Spain is abundant; when it comes to the social movement, however, there has been very little news. It is no surprise, then, that it is only after a year of silence that one can begin to lift the veil a little. For this purpose, a small book, Trabajadores en huelga, published in Madrid by a group of journalists who are close to the UGO,* is of great interest. It offers an analysis of the causes of the move-

ment, a fairly comprehensive chronology of a month of struggles and, the richest part of the book, a discussion between two rank and file workers, with excerpts from different political tenden-

cies who participated in the strikes. Starting with their backgrounds and many of their documents and information and discussing the main issues raised by the new workers' movement in Spain. The following is not, of course, a definitive analysis, but a contribution to what we hope will be an ongoing discussion.

Starting with the Madrid strikes, we will go on to examine some new organizational aspects of the recent struggles, the strategies of the opposition (focusing on the PCI) and the diffic-
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there is a tradition of struggle, but also the small factories dominated by passivity and paternalism, which had always been untouched by the "wind of action" called by the illegal unions.

On January 12, when "in almost all sectors, the workers showed themselves ready to go on strike," there was no guarantee of a general strike. However, the illegal union organizations persuaded the MNE workers to back a major strike, and this time their demands had been met. The frustration and rebellions which such practices on the part of the government organizations have provoked among a significant number of workers will now become clear. The strike, therefore, was a response to the repression that had continued for months.

The strike wave was the first social upheaval on such a scale of the postwar period. Several months before, the workers at the strike wave at Vitoria, and more recently the struggle of the MNE workers in Barcelona, showed that Madrid was not an isolated case but a sign of a fundamental change in the relations between the Spanish workers and their illegal organizations, the latter being no longer able to contain the former.

2. Organization and Solidarity in the New Spanish Workers' Movement

For the reformists, the PCI, the political content of any struggle is measured above all by the response which its party slogans (amenity, democracy) enjoy. The forms of participation and action are vital in determining its meaning. This is especially evident in the area of organization. A new tendency is coming into view, a tendency to make workers the active parties to the struggle. The extent of the new movement was, as was the fact that it was not only a strike, but the extent of the illegal organizations are entangled and where.

*Micro - mass transit; PTT - communications; NIFH - railroads.

**List of Abbreviations**

- OGT: Organización Revolucionaria de Trabajadores ( Revolutionary Workers Organization)
- PCP: Partido Comunista Español (Spanish Communist Party)
- PCF: Partido Comunista de España (Spanish Communist Party)
- PGSE: Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers Party)
- PSOE: Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers Party)
- PSOE: Partido Socialista Unificado de Cataluña (Catalan Socialist Workers Party)
- PSOE: Partido Socialista Unificado de Cataluña (Catalan Socialist Workers Party)
- CNT: Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (National Workers Confederation)
- CGT: Confederación General de Trabajadores (General Workers Confederation)
- USO: Unión General de Trabajadores (General Union of Workers)
- USO: Union Sindical Obrera (Workers' Syndical Union)

- **Note:** The strike committee was formed by the workers in the text. The strike committee's role is not described in detail in this document.

- **Note:** The strike was successful in some sectors, but not in others. The workers in the text describe their struggle and the difficulties they faced.
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there is a tradition of struggle, but also the small factories dominated by passivity and patriotism, which had always been untouched by the 'stench of action' called by the illegal unions.

On January 12, when 'in almost all sectors, the workers showed themselves ready to go on strike,' the general strike of January 13 was launched. Unlike the illegal union organizations persuaded the workers to hold back, but the workers were not to be interrupted in their demands having been met. The frustration and rebelliousness which such practices on the part of the official organizations have produced among a significant number of workers will no doubt lead to a general strike. In this strike, repression came hard and fast. The army intervened in the Micro, PTR and Mondo: eight PTR workers were brought before a military court, and there were mass arrests and about 1,000 firings. The earlier wage demands were replaced by new slogans: 'Rebel against the fascist police,' 'a just and patriotic strike.'

The Madrid strike wave was the first social upheaval on such a scale in the postwar period. Several months later, the Madrid workers' strike at Vitoria, and more recently the struggle of the Roca workers in Barcelona, showed that Madrid was not an isolated case but a sign of a fundamental change in the relations between the Spanish working class and the illegal organizations, which are no longer able to contain the former.

2. Organization and Solidarity in the New Spanish Workers' Movement

For the reformists, the PCI, the political content of any struggle is measured above all by the response which its party slogans (amnesty, democracy) evoke. But the mass movement of the workers in the Vitoria region has reached other regions: Barcelona, Aragon, the Basque country, and the Asturias.

The industrial suburbs of Madrid—Seúlaco, Valladolid, Alcalá—were specially paralyzed, and in these new workers' towns the strike went from the factories to the streets, in demonstrations and confrontations with the police. Despite a boycott by the 'clandestine' organizations, they were bracing for a political conflict, a class consciousness, which goes well beyond thedaily realities of the illegal organizations. This is especially evident in the area of organization. A new tendency is coming into view, a tendency to link the working class to the workers' organizations and the workers' movement to the political organizations.

The new strike movement of the workers in Barcelona is an example of the de-centralization and de-politicization of the struggles. The workers' movement is not only a matter of the workers' organization, but is a question of the workers' consciousness and decisions of the "workers' representatives."

It has been said of the Madrid strike: "It is general, according to all the information we have received or directly observed, decisions made in open and democratic General Assemblies (AGs), the union representatives or workers' agents acting as unionizers and negotiators without any definite support by the workers. Several leaders of union organizations (heads of the illegal union workers' struggles) were in agreement in affirming that, 'In every case, the aggregates had the prerogative of negotiating strikes or other final decisions. A one-man strike?' A PGD delegate confirms the point: 'For me, what was most striking was the mastery of the rank and file made an important leap forward in understanding: it was all the masses which negotiated the returns, not just the leadership or the union representatives, which were the leaders. It is as the anarchists who are the vanguard; they are the only real vanguard that I have known in this strike," said a Madrid worker in January 1976. But the danger is far from over, and the traditionalist groups are capable of adapting to the new role and function of the delegates."

List of Abbreviations

- CGTS: Confederación Sindical Trabajadores Socialistas, the main anarch-syndicalist union federation.
- CCO.OO: Confederación Sindical General, the major social-Christian union federation.
- IC: Comisiones Obreras, Workers' Commissions, now completely controlled by the PCI.
- LUS: Unión General de Trabajadores, the major union federation.
- UN: Unión Sindical Obrera, Workers' Union; the main socialist and communist federation.
situation, redirecting their manipulative activity towards the assemblies. It is important to note that the string of strikes is the first stage of making a new fetid of the international working class. In the most radical struggles, it is true, they have acquired a consciousness from which prefigures the emancipation of the working class shown on solidarity. On the other hand, in those movements which the parties marked out by traditional unionism, neither the bourgeois nor the left individuals shrive to fear from the CGT—a fact which has been recognized by the current government which in turn has acted to disarm the unions and institutionalize the Assembly as a union organ.

Today, even a Stalinist leader of the CGT, isn't afraid to say, "Everyone accepts the principle that one must negotiate with the workers elected by the CGT... whether they hold union posts or not." Strife, no organizational form, including the CGT, can guarantee workers' autonomy. What is essential is the application of certain criteria, democratic decision-making, revocability of delegates, direct responsibility to the workers and to the people—those who actually have the right to study document the working class. The sessions 2 taken by the most workers' organizations as the Assembly are a necessary but not sufficient condition.

Besides the assemblies, other organizational forms have appeared, always based on the same principle: "the worker, not the representative, the Executive," as they are called, are elected by the workers. They work in the postal service, the 'Committee of Seven' for the hospital workers, the 'Leadership Committee' in general. In various regional committees constituted democratically, the committees of the dock workers and the dock workers' committee. Workgrow via the factory, and the executive workers exist only during the struggle. In January 1976, the Belgian workers were organized on a national scale: a factory council delegates, these in turn elected a regional committee (15–20 members, in Madrid). The delegates of the regional council were members of the committee. The Belgian Workers' Committee (CUT). The Madrid construction workers organized for direct action. They elected 'workshop delegates' and formed mobile teams which, in the assemblies, opposed the police and the employers' maneuver at each building site.

Attacks at the 1976's situation was similar. At Vienna was held a school of working class unity and solidarity, but above all Vienna represented the demand for opening the strike movement which brought new ideas. The political situation, in the streets of the working class, created by the orthodox projects of traditional syndicalism. The Workers' Assembly elects its representatives and can revoke them. The representatives' delegates are constituted exclusively by these delegates. From the beginning many political metamorphoses of the CGT could be seen, that at any moment, no political organization had a sufficient following to impose its will on the CGT. Soon after the conflicts began, the strictly orthodox positions were already abandoned... [The] case was to show the differences in the trade unions, the different solutions for the various factories.

"Factory acts not in the churches and working class neighborhoods; women's and neighborhood's newly-struck factories broke in. In a certain point, a situation was reached where the entire population of the working class was in a type of democracy totally different from formal bourgeois democracy. It was this which Erfeille, then a Minister, underlined when he declared to Mr. Mende: 'What happened then at Vittoria was not simple demonstrations by the workers; it was an insurrection similar to that of May 68." [110]

Solidarity between workers from different factories is frequently seen as a way to develop a new and national level. In the Madrid movement, solidarity was demonstrated by the way the strikes spread in a chain reaction. It appeared in the streets of the working-class suburbs, where demonstrations, mutual aid and confrontations with the police became daily occurrences. Even in factories where the CGT was not present, the work stopped, as a recent back on strike, realizing that more was at stake than the workers' movements. As the urban regions experienced moments of social revolt, the most extreme case occurred at Vittoria, where a radical democratic solidarity with fired workers: "All or none," said the strikers at the moment of decisions. In the other movement, the workers explicitly posed the problem of the powerlessness of an isolated struggle, a large trade union or a national strike. In this case, the workers organized solidarity bulletins to publish an organizational bulletin on the assemblies and coordinated strike action.

Such political consciousness is limited, however, to a minority of the workers; the majority has no sign of aspiration and remains in the final analysis assembly to the 'reasonable' arguments of the reformists. But it is one thing to acknowledge the minority character of the radical tendencies, and quite another to organize it. When the strike's broad, thorough-going, radicalism, are nothing more than economic conflicts, involved with political significance only by the parties' slogans. For these there were not struggles against individual employers or the proposal of social relations, as it made clear in the account of the January movement contained in Trabajadores en huelga. Likewise, in Barcelona at the time of the Roca strikes, an extensive radical movement has been formed. Soon after the conflict began, the strictly orthodox positions were already abandoned... [The] case was to show the differences in the trade unions, the different solutions for the various factories.

The Workers' Assembly was created spontaneously during the 1961 strike in Barcelona, where the workers in Madrid, the Basque country, and the Seville construction trade unions. At first, they were a product of the workers' autonomous activity. However, they immediately became a battleground for inter-party struggles. The PCB in the national movement, the Workers' party was the organization that took control of the Compendio, and through it, of the entire workers' movement throughout the country. The only group that organized on a national level and with a clear political profile, the PCB, that the coordination of this national organization was not able to tone down the conflict. [111]

The case concern the party took over the CGT, has been explained in large part by the limitations of the movement itself. The limited was not only in the national scale, but also in the coordination of collective action. For example, the study of the factory-level workers' organizations was a response to this kind of policy they arose out of unprecedented struggles.

The 1956 Law of Collective Contracts allowed for the participation of workers in the factory's work: this measure was introduced on the initiative of the modernizing bourgeois and moderate trade union groups. to organize in a quasi-religious body known as the 'Catholic trade union.' When the strike's broad, thorough-going radicalism, are nothing more than economic conflicts, involved with political significance only by the parties' slogans. For these there were not struggles against individual employers or the proposal of social relations, as it made clear in the...
situation, redirecting their manipulative activity towards the assemblies. It is important to avoid those trials, because the stage of making a new fetish of the General Assembly has begun. In the most radical struggles, it is true, they have served as a pressure point, from which they prejudice the emancipation of the working class under socialism. On the other hand, in those movements which the parties marked out by traditional unionism, neither the bourgeois nor the left parties could achieve their fears from the CCO—the fact which has been recognized by the current government which in December 1968, in Barcelona, the CCO made a public pronouncement to institutionalize the Assembly as a union organ.

Today, even a Stalinist leader of the CCO, isn't afraid to say, "Everyone accepts the principle that one must negotiate with the workers elected by the Ades...whether they hold union posts or not." No. No organizational forms, including the GA, can guarantee workers' autonomy. What is essential is the application of certain principles: democratic decision-making, revocability of delegates, direct participation, refusal to serve as agents to the bodies to the workers—and for these purposes, appropriate organizational forms such as the Assembly are a necessary but not sufficient condition.

Besides the assemblies, other organizational forms have appeared, always based on the same principles: trade unions as representative organs, as they are called, are elected by the workers, and the workers use them to form the postal service, the Committee for Seven for the hospital workers, the Leading Committee in communities, the Community Committees, the delegates of the dock workers and the dock workers, organized on a national scale. All these forms of action exist only during the struggle. In January 1976, the bank workers were organized on a national scale, and the dock workers' strikes (dialectical) these in turn elected a regional committee (12 members, out of 12, in Madrid). The delegates of the various regional committees constituted a national committee, which included official [minority] delegates as well as rank-and-file workers that is, all those who were elected by the workers themselves. These assemblies in November, at Barcelona, with the United Workers' Committees (CCIT), the Madrid construction workers organized for direct action, they elected 'workshop delegates' and formed mobile committees, and their aim was to win direct and immediate gains.

At Vittoria, the situation was similar. Vittoria, in these months from January to March 1976, was a great school of working class unity and solidarity, but abov all Vittoria represented the fusion of the struggles with the orthodox projects of traditional syndicalism. The Workers' Assembly selects its representatives and can revoke them. The representative committees are constituted exclusively by these delegates. . . . From the beginning many political mistakes arose from the CCO habit of saying that there was a CCO group, in which the possibility that anyone might come to see that, at any moment, no political organization had a sufficient following to impose its solutions or even to influence them. Soon after the conflicts began, the strictly opportunist positions were already abandoned...[The central] council was formed to review individual solutions for the different factories.

Factory assemblies not in the churches and working-class neighborhoods; women's and neighborhood assemblies are also forming. In this context, a certain point, a situation was reached where the entire population of the workers who live in a type of democracy totally different from formal bourgeois democracy. It was this which forced the CCO, the central council, to formulate a new national rail strike—articulated with the Podemos strike, the CCO. The Spanish working class has broken with the so-called worker organizations. It is a means that the CCO has lost its DL 168 [11].

Solidarity between workers from different factories is something felt frequently, to serve as a starting point and even as a national level. In the Madrid movement, solidarity was demonstrated by the way the strikes spread in a chain reaction. Then it appeared in the streets of the working-class suburbs, where demonstrations mutual aid and confrontations with the police became daily occurrences. Even in factories where the strikes had been defeated. As a recent front on striking, realizing that more was at stake than the success of the strike, the urban regions experienced moments of social revolts. The most extreme case occurred at Vittoria, where the factory workers confronted the authorities with fired workers: "All or none," said the strikers at the head of the assemblies. Under these latter instances, the workers explicitly posed the problem of the powerlessness of an isolated struggle, a national coordination of workers and factories in the same community. This is the central council, the CCO. The CCO has the function of bringing the factories into an overall strategy of unionism as on coordinated strike action.

Such political consciousness is limited, however, to a minority of the workers; the majority have not a sign of attention and remain in the final analysis conscious of the "reasonable" arguments of the reformists. But it is one thing to acknowledge the minor, the radical character of the radical tendencies, and quite another to understand them. When the strikes are broad, such thorough-going radicalism, is nothing more than economic conflicts, inflated with political significance only by the parties' slogans. For these were not struggles against individual bosses, but the program of workers of social relations, as it must be made clear in the...

...The new CCO movement played an important role in spreading the news about the Rocia strike, both internally and outside. The first meeting was held in Paris in early January 1977, in which strikers from the orthodox projects of traditional syndicalism. The Workers' Assembly selects its representatives and can revoke them. The representative committees are constituted exclusively by these delegates.

The Spanish workers' movement did not reach a peak after the end of the civil war. Already, in the immediate post-war years (1939 to 1945), the strike waves broke recognizably in Catalonia—most notably, the CCO-led general strike of 1951—and the Asturias. But it was the development of the Spanish capitalism in the 1950's and 1960's, the expansion of modern industry, which was to permit the opening up of a new phase of struggle and factory organization.

The first workers' organizations (CCO) were created spontaneously during the 1962 strike wave in Barcelona. In Madrid, the Basque country, and the Seville construction trades. At first, they were a product of the workers' autonomous activity. (12) However, they immediately became a battleground for inter-party struggles. (13) The CCO in the various regions and the central council was the organization that prepared to take control of the CCO. It was a stage, then, of the entire workers' movement throughout the country.

The only group that organized on a national level was the socialist movement. In the result, the exclusive coordination of this new organization was not able to make the factory strikes impossible. (13)

The same with which the Party took over the CCO is explained in large part by the limitations of the movement itself. The Commissions existed only in the large-scale modern industries. In this sector, the employers had adopted a policy that required less than four agreements by plant. The factory-level workers' organizations were a response to this new policy they arose out of unconnected strikes and lockouts.

The 1956 Law of Collective Contracts allowed the CCO to negotiate with the workers in the factory; this measure was introduced on the initiative of the modernizing bourgeoisie with the aim of modifying the CCO and modernizing it. The workers organized in a quasi-religious body called the CCO. When the strike had broad, thorough-going radicalism, is nothing more than economic conflicts, inflated with political significance only by the parties' slogans. For these were not struggles against the CCO ministers were thrown out of the government, one by one.

From the start, the CCO strive to assimilate the CCO, to its own strategy. In 1948 the Communists adopted the tactic of infiltrating its militants into the Podemos, the CCO and the 'vertical syndicate,' as it is called. In the...

*Juventude Óbrero Catalana; Unión General de Trabajadores; Partido Socialista Obrero Catalana; Organizacion Revolucionaria de Trabajadores; Partido del Trabajo Española.*

**Confederación Nacional Sindical—the 'vertical syndicate' is a corporative body on the behalf of the employers and the state, which also represents both to it. Up to 1956 wages were set, at subsistence level, by state decree. Employers had the right to propose the representatives for while worker representatives were present on the lowest level of the corporative apparatus, the
4. A Modern Dictatorship in an Obsolete Regime

Spanish unionism functions—despite the clandestine organizations' claim that there is no new unionism in a true sense—under the capitalist democracies. (To be sure, it is restricted to the enterprise level—the syndical 'plant council,' they were bribed or coerced into submission. The highest levels of the CNT hierarchy were staffed by Palanca— the syndicate was one of its last strongholds.)

**The first elections were held in 1943. The elections were a plebiscite in the 1946 round of elections, against the initial opposition of the other clandestine parties.**

apparatus remaining though not for long, in the hands of the Francoist old-guard—and even more narrowly to the level of the modern enterprise, as the employers are said to be. Hence, these limitations posed to union negotiations. But these limitations of the CNT's power are no surprise. For years, the 'democratic delegates' have been playing the role of traditional unionists in the overthrow of employers and the syndicate. The 'Bajo Llebreast, Cataluna' in the early 1970's, the 'delegates, who have considerable prestige, who serve in the company, and who can negotiate. They are the ones who can choose. . . . They do so once a year, when the company elections are held. Out of the elections, they win the largest in the region. Then, during the rest of the year, they strike for what they call 'important social rights.' The result is that they win the most important strikes. In exchange, the delegates guarantee to the enterprise that this productivity will continue as planned, that there will be no wildcats. If an unforeseen conflict breaks out, the Personnel Manager calls on the delegates to resolve it. Each month the company enters into the books 100 hours of strikes and the raises to which it will consent in the next contract, as a result of the 'great struggle.'

5. The Political Opposition: Projects and Difficulties

For all of the opposition organizations, the development of democracy provides opportunities whose potential they have yet to realize. If capitalism is to grasp them then the parties must establish control over the workforce; they must show themselves capable of containing workers' struggles within its limits. The real political parties, the institutions, embodying them in all political contest and reducing them to simple and predictable consequences. On the one hand, the personal interests of the capitalists coincide— and both groups, in opposing spontaneous actions by the workers, invite them to demonstrate. On the other hand, the 'modernizers,' the point is to avoid weakening their position relative to the forces supporting the ancien regime. The Party shares this concern, and also wishes to demonstrate to the electorate that the working class has retained its hold on the workers. In January 1976, the Minister of "the gastronomes" and "the bakers" [Franco's entourage] is trying to profit from the strike.

At the same time, the PCE claimed that "the intransigent right is trying to provoke a conflict, and exploited the small employers, whom the strike was doing an injustice." A year later, with the events of '75, the CNT's leadership had changed, the PCE had had these strategies created a new situation: faced with the mass of the armed workers, the PCE joined with the modernizing bourgeoisie in a new "Sacred Union."
Aftermath of deStalinisation, Casillo launched the new slogan of 'national reconciliation,' and the Party threw itself into the task of forming democratic fronts which today's only the latest incarnation. Among the groups to be incorporated into the new fronts were the communist 'leftist' minority of Palamits in the CNS:

"Those who wear the red shirt," said an anonymous, "cannot be the enemy camp, the interests of the working class.

When the fascist regime declared a boycott on the election of CNS delegates,** it was only logical that the PCE seized upon the opportunity and put the CNS candidates in the leadership of the elections. After 1966, the activity of the Commissions was progressively reduced to participating in those elections. Other clandestine organisations eventually followed suit, likewise presenting their candidates as 'democratic delegates.' The participation of these organisations helped to legitimate the syndicate, and in fact it was now their militants who made up the base of the CNS.

For the Party, then, control of the CNS, and "boring from within" were complementary.

"The key positions obtained [in the elections] were the legal arm of the CNS.**[15] The objective behind both tactics was clear: to gain a dominant position in the syndical apparatus, making use of the CNS, in order to bargain later for the survival of the Party (achieved since those words were written).

Once the CNS became a bloc, it was then easy for the PCE to maintain its grip on the unions. In pursuit of the same goal the Party continued to "bore from within" at the head of the Intersyndical. In Portugal, the relative weakness of the workers' movement before the military putsch-there had never been a mass movement comparable to the CNS-allowed the Party to use the CNS as a weapon for control over the working class. This situation is a matter of concern, as the sole force operating within the fascist syndicate.

In Spain, by contrast, the strength of the workers' movement and the years of fascism has produced organisations outside the official syndicate; these were increasing in size. While the last election, the 'fascist delegates' made

new agreements with the syndicate's ability to yield to the workers' demands without endangering its financial position,[17] even more being legitimised, even while still distant from the centre of power, the Party already included the interests of the bosses for the occasion the 'general interest'—as a basic principle of its negotiations. A common solution to be imposed by the 'fascist delegates' made comprehensive agreements on the issue of the bosses. After all, we thought that it was a good contract."[18]

As the example suggests, the participation of the illegal organisations in the "vertical syndicate" could scarcely be described as anything more than a strategy to establish a more democratic front. DeStalinisation was not a move to credit for any improvements. But when a broad scale struggle breaks out, the representatives are left behind by the workers; and when they place themselves on the side of the bosses and try to rein in the movement, as they often do, their employers are only too ready to take such moments, their collision with the employers, and the demands of the workers. For instance, it is significant that the 1965 general strike in Madrid was not a success, in the same sense that the PCE had been in Madrid in recent years. Thechet, the 'democratic delegates' has been playing the role of traditional unionists in the new political context (Bajo Llobregat, Catalonia) in the early 70's, "the delegates, who have considerable prestige, have a considerable authority and don't have to choose. . They do so every year, when the companies negotiate the new contracts. If they start they win the largest raises in the region.

Then, during the rest of the year, they strike for five or six hours a day over the most important strikers. In exchange, the delegates guarantee to the enterprise that the production will proceed as planned, that there will be no wildcats. If an unforeseen conflict breaks out, the Personnel Manager calls one of the delegates to resolve it. Each year the company enters into a contract with the PCE to keep their hands off the delegates, because for the cops an illegal meeting is illegal. Such a broad anti-strike coalition, extending from the Machtai to the social democrats, is so accidents; it is to be explained in terms of the goals and tactics of the syndicalist organisations.

5. The Political Opposition: Projects and Difficulties

For all of the opposition organisations, the development of democracy provides opportunities which are not to be missed. Although they are "one big union," as it were crystallised out of their own efforts, they must establish control over the workforce: they must show themselves capable of containing workers' struggles within the framework of existing institutions, stripping them of all political content and reducing them to simple and pre-determined automatic reactions to the basic demands of the negotiating. On this point, the goals of the opposition parties cannot be turned against capitalism coincide—and both groups, in opposing actions by the workers, invite them only to participate in the apparatus of the new regime, the 'modernisers,' the plan is to avoid weakening their position relative to the forces supporting the old regime. The Party shares this concern, and also wishes to demonstrate to the workers that the struggle has been retained on the workers. The events of 1976, the Minister of the Interior, announced that the negotiations because 'the bunker' [Franco's entourage] is trying to profit from the strike. At the same time, the PCE claimed that 'the intendent right is trying to provoke a conflict and drained the last of the small employers, to whom the strike was doing an injustice.' A year later, with the events of the 'DeStalinisation' had taken place, the limits of these strategies created a new situation: faced with the aftermath of the 1976 strike and the rising expectations, the PCE joined with the modernising bourgeoisie in a new 'Sacred Union.'***

While all of the oppositionists, and even a section of the bourgeois, are in agreement on the need to channel workers' struggles within established institutions, the Working Class is at the same time in competition for control of these institutions. In this regard, the most important recent development is the resurgence with the financial aid, as in Portugal, of the German-social-democrat of the social-democratic party, with which international capitalism hopes to counter the PCE. In a matter of months, the PCE is to be replaced by a new political force capable of competing with the Communists for control of the State apparatus.

On the local level, as well, the PCE's plans to assert control over the workers' movement, in this case, from a quite different source. The Party would like to repeat its success with the CNS, by appropriating the function of coordinating the Neighborhood Committees, which have been developing (often in a spontaneous and politically independent manner) since 1976 in the workplace. These committees are made up of these organisations as stopping stones to governmental posts at the local or municipal level. However, there is a strong tendency to control the underlying the Neighborhood Committees, which identifies itself with the CNS and is resisting the PCE's controlling tactics.

In the field of unions, too, the Party's successes have been partially cancelled by its own machinations. The PCE has pursued the tactic of participation in the vertical syndicate., In 1974, the PCE called for a general strike against the employers. "One big union," as it were crystallised out of the politicians. The Party success at establishing control over the workforce; they must show themselves capable of containing workers' struggles within the framework of existing institutions, stripping them of all political content and reducing them to simple and pre-determined automatic reactions to the basic demands of the negotiating. On this point, the goals of the opposition parties cannot be turned against capitalism coincide—and both groups, in opposing actions by the workers, invite them only to participate in the apparatus of the new regime, the 'modernisers,' the plan is to avoid weakening their position relative to the forces supporting the old regime. The Party shares this concern, and also wishes to demonstrate to the workers that the struggle has been retained on the workers. The events of 1976, the Minister of the Interior, announced that the negotiations because 'the bunker' [Franco's entourage] is trying to profit from the strike. At the same time, the PCE claimed that 'the intendent right is trying to provoke a conflict and drained the last of the small employers, to whom the strike was doing an injustice.' A year later, with the events of the 'DeStalinisation' had taken place, the limits of these strategies created a new situation: faced with the aftermath of the 1976 strike and the rising expectations, the PCE joined with the modernising bourgeoisie in a new 'Sacred Union.'***

"Again, this is reminiscent of the situation in Portugal in 1974, when the PCE took up the struggle at the very moment when the employers' strikes were against the general interest.

"This phrase was originally used by Maurice Thorez to describe the French Popular Front of the 1930s.

"In the same vein, the Machtai also demand a single union. The CNS and PCE, which together broke with the CNS, late in 1974, have also been calling for a single union. This parting of the ways was triggered by the Machtai's demands for full membership in the union, with armed commando groups, head- breaking and reciprocal accusations.}
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cre the single union system, as the Soares government is doing in Portugal.

On this terrain, the PCE has already been stalemated, despite its initial gains. The strategy of "estrangia" has, as we have seen, had its benefits for both the syndicate and the Party; the latter even succeeded in taking full command of a few syndicate locals, for instance, in the Madrid suburb of Getafe. But the CNS itself is now in crisis, and during the recent struggles the PCE's syndicalism in the syndicate was of no use in steering the strikes into acceptable channels. The movement set itself in motion and organized itself outside the syndicate, and the only role which the Party could play was that of a criticiser. As the UDO and UGT pointed out, workers supported the opposition militants only when the latter acted outside the official organisation; for example, the strike committees set up by the PCE in Getafe and elsewhere in January 1976 remained "totally inoperative" because of the attitude of the UGT's workers to the "victor's syndicate" which was duped by their repeated sacking of its officers. Its deterioration is so far advanced even that a "CCC" leader has called it "practically destroyed" and has stated that "Neither the workers nor the bosses want to hear another word about the CNS; everything happens outside of this monopoly. We are no longer open, and opportunism and corruption have reached the point of selling off the office furniture."

Faced with the collapse of the CNS and the impossibility of preserving a single union system, the Party decided in late 1976 to make of the CCC, its own union, in competition with the UDI and UGT. The Party launched a membership drive for the CCC, federations of CCC locals by branch of industry were set up, and the first Congress of the Syndical Confederation (CC), Women's Commissions was held. "The democratic union organisations have entered, without doubt, a new phase of their history. The time of clandestinity and systematic repression is past. The virtual disappearance of the CNS has permitted an enlargement of their field of action, and an accelerated process of organisation." While thus obliged to accept "union pluralism," the Party has still refused to give up the ground it has gained within the syndicate; it prefers to hold on to its right of inheritance, for whatever it may be worth.

6. 'Eurocommunism' and the Working Class

The abandonment of the concept of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," as well as the promise to respect the rules of the parliamentary game—is the hallmark of the new phenomenon known as "Eurocommunism." This new line is often compared to Social democracy; in both cases, we find a mass party claiming to be engaged in transforming capitalism society by using the bureaucratic state apparatus, proposing a peaceful road to state socialism. Like their social democratic counterparts, the Eurocommunist CPs accept private enterprise as an essential element of the "new society" they wish to build. On this point, of course, the bureaucratisation of the party organisation is evident. Knowledge of the relationship between the private and state sectors is exaggerated. And they are right to do so, for the CPs still ultimately hold to the state-capitalist project. Under pressure from growing leftist tendencies among the working class, the Eurocommunists find it difficult to adopt the corollary of social democratic respect for capitalist private property, i.e., the co-management of the state apparatus. The response to pressure from the labour wave can only be the replacement of private employers by the state as employer.

For the working class, the turn to eurocommunism brings nothing new. The CPs must periodical demonstrate its "responsibility" by restraining the movement. It will encourage mobilization only in support of its own goals; aside from that, it will offer the workers only as much support as is needed to prevent mass defection from its ranks. All of this follows naturally from the political strategy which the CPs have chosen to adopt. In the preceding pages we have frequently touched upon the demobilizing effect which Party policy has had upon the Spanish working class. In the next few pages, we will deal more specifically with this aspect of the situation, by examining two particular instances: La Roca and Sabadell.

The Roca strike, along with the victory movement, marked the high point of last year's struggles. It was over the issue of selection of a delegation to a congress of unions, that the conflict broke out; management refused to recognize the delegates chosen by the workers' assembly. The Assembly also insisted that all delegates resign any positions they held in the official syndicate, a demand that clashed with the tactics of the union leaderships. The unionists opposed the strike from the start, only the UDI and the CNS supported the strike. The influence that the party/union leaders wielded in Bajo Lobropt, their support could have been decisive in winning the strike.

The government, acting through the CNS, openly tried to force the strikers to accept the leadership of the 'democratic unionists.' By refusing to begin negotiations until the workers accepted two conditions: election of delegates by secret ballot and the presence of leaders of the union opposition on the Representative Committee. To this the workers replied, "According to the CNS, members of the union headquarters must be included on the Committee, while these very unions never cease to criticise our delegate movement and our methods of struggle." The Committee would be something superior to the works, a totally bureaucratized organ would thus be created, eliminating the dynamic
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cite the single-system model, as the Soares government is doing in Portugal.

On this terrain, the PCF has already been stalemated, despite its initial gains. The strategy of 'estrangiar' has, as we have seen, had its benefits for both the syndicate and the Party; the latter even succeeded in taking full control of a few syndicate locals, for instance, in the Madrid suburb of Getafe. But the CNS itself is now in crisis, and during the recent struggle the PCF's syndicalism inside the syndicate was of no use in steering the strikes into acceptable channels. The movement set itself in motion and organized itself outside the syndicate, and the only role which the Party could play via the CNS was that of strikebreaker. As the UCO and UGT pointed out, workers supported the opposition militants only when the latter acted outside the official organization; for example, the strike committees set up by the PCF in Getafe and elsewhere in January 1976 remained "totally inoperative" (24) because of their connection with the CNS. The workers' attitude towards the 'vertical syndicate' was amply demonstrated by their repeated marching of its offices. Its deterioration is so far advanced that even a CC.OO leader has called it "practically destroyed" and has stated that "Neither the workers nor the bosses want to hear another word about the CNS; everything happens outside of this monstrosity. The local offices are no longer open, and opportunism and corruption have reached the point of selling off the office furniture."

Faced with the collapse of the CNS and the impossibility of preserving a single-unit system, the Party decided in late 1976 to make of the CC.OO. its own union, in competition with the UCO and UGT. The Party launched a membership drive for the CC.OO., federations of CC.OO. by branch of industry were set up, and the first Congress of the Syndical Confederation was held. "The democratic union organizations have entered, without doubt, upon a new phase of their history. The time of clandestinity and systematic repression is past. The virtual disappearance of the CNS, the relative tolerance which our organizations enjoy permit an enlargement of their field of action and an accelerated process of organization." (25) While thus obliged to accept 'union pluralism,' the PCF has still refused to give up the ground it has gained within the syndicate; it prefers to hold on to its right of inheritance, for whatever it may be worth.

6. 'Eurocommunism' and the Working Class

The abandonment of the concept of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'—i.e., the promise to respect the rules of the parliamentary game—is the hallmark of the new phenomenon known as 'Eurocommunism.' This new line is often compared to Social-democracy; in both cases, we find a mass party claiming to be engaged in transforming capitalist society by using the bourgeois state apparatus, proposing a peaceful road to state socialism. Like their social-democratic counterparts, the Eurocommunist CPs accept private enterprise as an essential element of the "new society" they wish to build. On this point, of course, the bourgeois has its suspicions, knowing well that the relationship between the private and state sectors is antagonistic. And they are right to do so, for the CPs do not ultimately hold to the state-capitalist project. Under pressures from growing leftist tendencies among the working class, the Eurocommunists find it difficult to openly adopt the corollary of social-democratic respect for capitalist private property, i.e., the co-management of private employers by the state as employer.

For the working class, the turn to eurocommunism brings nothing new. The CPs must periodically demonstrate its 'responsibility' by restraining the movement. It will encourage mobilization only in support of its own goals; aside from that, it will offer the workers only as much support as is needed to prevent mass defection from its ranks. All of this follows naturally from the political strategy which the PCF has chosen to adopt. In the preceding pages we have frequently touched upon the demonizing effect which Party policy has had upon the Spanish working class. In the next few pages, we will deal more specifically with this aspect of the situation, by examining two particular instances: the Roca and Sabadell.

The Roca strike, along with the Vitoria movement, marked the high point of last year's struggles. It was over the issue of election representatives that the Roca conflict broke out; management refused to recognize the delegates chosen by the Workers' Assembly. The Workers' Commissions were held. "The democratic union organizations have entered, without doubt, upon a new phase of their history. The time of clandestinity and systematic repression is past. The virtual disappearance of the CNS, the relative tolerance which our organizations enjoy permit an enlargement of their field of action and an accelerated process of organization." (25)

While thus obliged to accept 'union pluralism,' the PCF has still refused to give up the ground it has gained within the syndicate; it prefers to hold on to its right of inheritance, for whatever it may be worth.
of self-organization..."  They saw the proposed secret ballot as a major tool designed to undermine the more radical forms of organization already in place. "As far as we can see, the secret ballot is based on the idea of making bodies. Through the Assemblies, a significant number of non-party radical workers were able to carry through their program. It must be emphasized that, throughout the struggle, many of the leaders attached from union control, or outside its sphere of influence, could be an obstacle to the dialogue between government and workers. The organization of the unions was on the agenda, but it was not on the agenda, and parties had to be set aside. This explains why "during the period between the last months of 1976 and the moment when the government and the opposition concluded the first formal accords, the response of the unions to the economic changes decreed by the government and to the provisions concerning the freedom to lay off workers was no indecisive, and even practically nonexistent. There was nothing new or unsettling in this for the parties; these always believed that the workers' movement ought to adapt itself to the requirements of its strategy in the waiting rooms of the bourgeoisie, in the face of worker militancy, the parties cannot go far inалия the bourgeoisie, lost their mass bases, which they must pursue simultaneously, recruiting workers and building a new class, have come into contradiction with each other than (as said in the Note on the July strike, and at the Ford plant in Valencia), "Recognizing these conflicting goals has never been easy.

After 95 days of strike, the bosses worked, unable to overcome the conflict announced by the parties, had to give in and accept the same social contract which had been repeatedly called. The role played by the unions was expressed clearly in the bourgeois press: "We cannot think that the conflict at La Roche can degenerate into a general strike," the agreement obtained in the negotiations for the metalworkers' contract was the means to stop the situation. The extension of the strike to the Herzog chemical plants, the dismissal of all 250 strikers, on the behavior of the labor leaders made this agreement possible."

The same pattern is evident in the Sabadell strike movement. In November and December 1976, 20,000 metalworkers from the Sabadell region of Barcelona went on strike. The movement united, for the first time in recent years, large shops, small and medium enterprises. The CC.OO. had the largest following among the metalworkers at that time, but only tagged along behind the CNT. Some of the most militant activists come from the Anti-Capitalist Left and from a predominantly Maoist opposition tendency which existed at that time within the CC.OO.

The struggle was characterized by a high level of solidarity between shops, attempts to spread the movement beyond the metal-working sector to other sectors. As far as is evidenced, it decisively-making bodies. Through the Assemblies, a significant number of non-party radical workers were able to carry through their program. It must be emphasized that, throughout the struggle, many of the leaders attached from union control, or outside its sphere of influence, could be an obstacle to the dialogue between government and workers. The organization of the unions was on the agenda, but it was not on the agenda, and parties had to be set aside. This explains why "during the period between the last months of 1976 and the moment when the government and the opposition concluded the first formal accords, the response of the unions to the economic changes decreed by the government and to the provisions concerning the freedom to lay off workers was no indecisive, and even practically nonexistent. There was nothing new or unsettling in this for the parties; these always believed that the workers' movement ought to adapt itself to the requirements of its strategy in the waiting rooms of the bourgeoisie, in the face of worker militancy, the parties cannot go far inалия the bourgeoisie, lost their mass bases, which they must pursue simultaneously, recruiting workers and building a new class, have come into contradiction with each other than (as said in the Note on the July strike, and at the Ford plant in Valencia), "Recognizing these conflicting goals has never been easy.

After 95 days of strike, the bosses worked, unable to overcome the conflict announced by the parties, had to give in and accept the same social contract which had been repeatedly called. The role played by the unions was expressed clearly in the bourgeois press: "We cannot think that the conflict at La Roche can degenerate into a general strike," the agreement obtained in the negotiations for the metalworkers' contract was the means to stop the situation. The extension of the strike to the Herzog chemical plants, the dismissal of all 250 strikers, on the behavior of the labor leaders made this agreement possible."

The same pattern is evident in the Sabadell strike movement. In November and December 1976, 20,000 metalworkers from the Sabadell region of Barcelona went on strike. The movement united, for the first time in recent years, large shops, small and medium enterprises. The CC.OO. had the largest following among the metalworkers at that time, but only tagged along behind the CNT. Some of the most militant activists come from the Anti-Capitalist Left and from a predominantly Maoist opposition tendency which existed at that time within the CC.OO.

The conflict is divided from the other economic conflicts in its characteristics: "Above all, this unifying sympathetic mobilization is different from the others in that it serves to bring the working class (for the moment) to the forefront of the social and political struggle. This mobilization had to be blocked, for it not only "aggravated the crisis of the capitalist system," as La Vanguardia inquired, but also, in the danger of the bankruptcy of the state, led to "the birth of a new social movement which opposes the workers' attempts to spread the strike and condemned the formation of strike pictures." The May 1977 general cultural mobilization tried to safeguard their support among the bourgeoisie, especially the small businesses. In an article in the national press, the PDCU. assured them that the strike was no threat to them, attributed worker dissatisfaction to "the absence of democratic liberties," and asked the employers to be generous to the workers and the administration of the democratic opposition and the workers' ultimate hope of getting rid of the whole of the CNT (as well as the rise of the rise of the CNTs and CC.22), the result of a new content of the workers' struggle, in search of organizational forms permitting the struggle to develop in the way it is not the correctness of some program or platform is relevant, it is relevant only to the militant workers. A few examples will suffice to illustrate the principles of action of the CNTs.

When the labor contracts for the building trades in Aragon were being discussed, the two CNT members elected to the Joint Labor/Manager's committee, stating that all decisions be ratified by mass meetings of the workers. After the 2 November 1976 "day of strike" against the government's economic policies, CNT members were part of the strike committee in Madrid, which to "direct" the strike, side by side with the representatives of the employers (ISO, CNT and CC.22). The CNTs began by publicly declaring that they did not recognize the legitimacy of the strike committee, formed by the local strike committees elected by the rank-and-file. The employers denounced the maneuvers of the Committee and of the political organizations. In the long run, in a situation of acute social crisis, such practices will draw the most militant elements into the CNT. About 90% of the bar members are young people, and according to the national secretary, "many of our best militants come from the CNT."

Is this a reassessment of the CNT's confidence in the 1973's, the memory of which has been religiously handed down by the clandestine cells within Spain and the nostalgics in exile? For the moment, it seems more accurate to see the CNT as "not a mass organization, but rather a large movement unifying (libertarians)."(36) As one of the CNT militants put it at that time, "the CNT acts as an autonomous movement rather than a structured union."(37)

The CNT movement is distinguished from the other social movements due to its characteristics: "Above all, this unifying sympathetic mobilization is different from the others in that it serves to bring the working class (for the moment) to the forefront of the social and political struggle. This mobilization had to be blocked, for it not only "aggravated the crisis of the capitalist system," as La Vanguardia inquired, but also, in the danger of the bankruptcy of the state, led to "the birth of a new social movement which opposes the workers' attempts to spread the strike and condemned the formation of strike pictures." The May 1977 general cultural mobilization tried to safeguard their support among the bourgeoisie, especially the small businesses. In an article in the national press, the PDCU. assured them that the strike was no threat to them, attributed worker dissatisfaction to "the absence of democratic liberties," and asked the employers to be generous to the workers and the administration of the democratic opposition and the workers' ultimate hope of getting rid of the whole of the CNT (as well as the rise of the rise of the CNTs and CC.22), the result of a new content of the workers' struggle, in search of organizational forms permitting the struggle to develop in the way it is not the correctness of some program or platform is relevant, it is relevant only to the militant workers. A few examples will suffice to illustrate the principles of action of the CNTs.
of self-organization..." They saw the proposed secret ballot as a ruse designed to undermine the more radical forms of organization already in existence. As for the non-party workers who were also in attendance, it decided-making bodies. Through the Assemblies, a significant number of non-party radical workers were able to participate in the struggle. "It must be emphasized that, throughout the strike, many workers associated with the CNT, new or old, were too much for the PCI to handle. Faced with these new realities, however, the Spanish Communists (like the Italian PCI, the French SFIO, and the French SDI) remained mired in old strategies.

7. Revolutionlary Tendencies Among the Workers:

The CNT's movement in Madrid on 27 March 1937, which drew a crowd of more than 20,000, forced people's attention to this new element specific to the Spanish political scene. How can one deny it, the CNT is once more a real presence in Spain. One of the most obvious changes is that the other opposition organizations are obliged to accept its participation in strike committees and unitary meetings. From Vigo to Términos, from Alicante to Santander, in the factories and in the offices, cells of militants spring up, proclaiming their fidelity to the CNT. The local activities of these groups, the new phenomena of direct action and excited crowds, made up mostly of young people. This fact is all the richer for the fact that its cells and organizations are not the creation of an apparatus but arise from the rank-and-file; and that it is precisely this mass phenomenon, in the very heart of the neighborhoods and the employer's backyards, that gives rise to the "new CNT." This new CNT has its roots in the rank and file, but its dynamics are being shaped by the process of subordinating the social movements to the political leadership, the building trade, the banks, the entertainment industry, education and testing of mental and cultural norms in order to fulfill its own ideological and institutional goals. The CNT movement is distinguished from the other movements not only for its essential characteristics: "Above all, this unifying process is based on the clear and firm assumption that the only supporters of the CNT are those who share its goals and principles..." and its political identity: "the CNT's movement has its roots in the mass phenomenon, but its dynamics are being shaped by the process of subordinating the social movements to the political leadership..."
A concrete example of the confrontation between the two currents within the CNV is provided by the recent dispute in Andalusia and Catalonia on the question of alliances between the CNV and CNT. On 5 December 1976 a proposal by the traditionalists on this issue was discussed in a regional meeting in Catalonia, in which more than 150 organizations were represented. The majority declared against the proposal. Without rejecting the principle of alliances, they stressed that it was up to the rank-and-file and not the leaders to decide, taking each particular situation into account, to create unitary ties between workers of different organizations. [42]

8. A New Kind of Unionism

In the 1940's, Anton Fanseckaz described the ambiguities of the workers' movement in the following terms: "Whereas in their conscious thinking and action they have a role in determining their arguments and opinions, at the same time they are so weak and so dependent, a strong intuition of real conditions breaks forth, determining their actions..." [43] Even in the case of organizations and struggle stand opposed, the old one of trade unions eud fest a strong intuition of real conditions breaks forth, determining their actions..." [43] Even in the case of organizations and struggle stand opposed, the old one of trade unions and regulated strikes, and the new one of spontaneous strikes and workers' councils. This does not mean that the former at some time will simply be replaced by the latter. Intermediate forms of direct action, class struggle, and refusal of permanent delegation of power can survive the requirements of the daily tasks of the union and its role within the capitalist system. "We are practicing anti-syndicalism," says one militant, justly noting that, "all unions are established according to capitalist structures." For the survivors of the old working-class movement it is easy to become bureaucratic; however, it is the syndicalist perspective which maintains its own importance, already on the offensive against a reluctant rank-and-file. "It is time to construct, seriously and in a responsible fashion, majority unions of workers, whose strength and ability can obtain the best results. Let us no longer fall into the error of reducing the unions to minorities of theoreticians. We must not be identified with separatist attitudes," [44]

Juan Casas, National Secretary of the CNT, puts the argument more strongly: "These younger militants, through lack of experience and through ignorance of the nature of anarcho-syndicalism, because they have not lived through it, are creating problems. The CNV cannot function in the same manner as an anarchist group. [45] There has been even a certain reaction against all representative organs such as the national or regional committees," [46] so that now political questions of representation and organizational identification are present in bureaucratic style: through a paternalistic appeal to 'experience'-as if it wasn't: precisely the experience of those who force the new militants to pose these issues.

For the present, the reformists, whose strategy is to integrate the majority of the workers into capitalism, are in a strong position. The workers' frustration and lack of confidence in their own power may open the way for the "social peace" desired by the reform bourgeoisie and for the parliamentary democracy desired by the political opposition. It should not write off the prospects for renewed revolutionary struggles. All observers agree that in the conditions of the last few years the workers have demonstrated a strong capacity for autonomous action, going beyond the bounds of the opposition apparatus. And there is a radical tendency, small but determined, with a rich tradition and clear anti-capitalist goals, which has firm roots in Spanish society and a significant impact on the workers' struggles. The result of the conflict between this tendency and the reformists will have an importance which is not limited to Spain alone.
formation of a central labor union and a group which opposes this project and points to the errors of the past. And in fact, it's hard to see how the revolutionary policies of direct action, class struggle, and refusal of permanent delegation of power can survive the requirements of the daily task of the union. It is in the great American union, "Industrial Workers of the World,"... Similar forms of struggle and organization may arise elsewhere, when in big strikes the workers stand up, with little notice of these events and with a confidence to take matters entirely into their hands. But only as temporary transitional forms. [43]

Franco's plight just as well be describing the current situation in Spain. The spontaneous action of the rank-and-file and their consistent refusal to submit to outside leadership permit us to see in today's movement the germ of a more radical future. In the Madrid region, in shops where there was no tradition of struggle and where the workforce was often young and female, the workers use the term "union" to describe any organization which functions on the basis of rank-and-file democracy and recognizability of delegates, in a sort of modern renaissance of revolutionary syndicalism.

But for those who believe in the potentially revolutionary character of those forms of organization which stand halfway between the union and the autonomous rank-and-file group, for those who believe in the possibility of a "building a new union," failure is certain—just as certain as it was in Portugal, where the majority of the most political movement tried to set up non-reformist "class unions" starting from the Workers' Commissions. The new forms of organization could flourish only in the context of wide-scale social conflict; when this period came to a close, it was once again the problems of day-to-day survival which preoccupied the workers. Such daily issues can be handled most easily by a traditional union, whose functioning is based on class consciousness, permanent delegation, and high grade of centralization, hold the winning hand. Those who would organize the CNT as a mass union should be aware that they can only create an imperfect miniature replica of the great reformist unions.

Perhaps for some the FC's success is appealing. But such "success" has nothing to offer the revolutionary, for it is predicated on the workers' defeat. Today in Spain, as yesterday in Portugal, the Communist reformism develops only when the labor struggles have been smashed. The Party recruits on the basis of defeatism: "We'll have to work together, you see, some day or other..." Test the reader think this an exaggeration, I want to point out an incident that occurred during the December 1976 strike in Madrid: the Communists brought workers fired during other strikes to the mass meetings of the Madrid railroad men... to illustrate the consequences of "irresponsible" and "thoughtless" action. Perhaps one can expect more of the same from the reformist organizations: they will try to keep "politics" and "unionism" strictly separated, place revolutionary desires with reforms, and isolate the movements shown above. In Spain, the new form of struggle and lack of confidence in their own power may open the way for the "social peace" desired by the reform bourgeoisie and for the parliamentary democracy desired by the political organizations. We should not write off the prospects for renewed revolutionary struggles. All observers agree that in the condition of the last few years the workers have demonstrated a strong capacity for autonomous action, going beyond the bounds of the oppositional apparatus. And there is a radical tendency, small but determined, with rich traditions and clear anti-capitalist goals, which has firm roots in Spanish society and a significant impact on the workers' struggles. The result of the conflict between this tendency and the reformists will have an importance which is not limited to Spain alone.

Notes

(10) CNT, "La huelga," p. 121.
(11) CNT, "La huelga," p. 32.
(13) CNT, "La huelga," p. 113.
(14) CNT, "La huelga," p. 113.
Three
Interviews

J. GOMEZ CASAS
(CNT National Committee)

QUESTION:

How do things stand today with the CNT, in
Madrid in particular and in Spain generally?

ANSWER:

It can't be said that things are the same
in Madrid and the Central region as in
Valencia, Andalusia, and Catalonia; each area has its own
situation which derives from its particular his-
tory, the different aspects of the current
scene, and the political organizations present.

This was true when the CNT was started up, pri-
marily thanks to the impetus of young liber-
tarian militants, especially anarchists. Until
two months ago, the CNT existed only in the form
of a national committee which was such in name
only. With the rebirth of anarchism and the
immediate objective of reconstituting the CNT,
anarch-syndicalist groups began to develop all
over Spain, giving the first real life to local,
then regional, and finally national organiza-
tions. A meeting of 300 comrades in Madrid in
December 1975 was the beginning of the develop-
ment of the CNT in Madrid; then the unions began
to develop. The first was the construction
workers', formed by young, very dynamic people,
very combative. The process of reconstitution
was the same in all the regions, in Andalysia,
the eanque country, in Cantabria, Asturias,
Extremadura. It is going on now in Galicia and
Aragon, where regional committees have not been
formed but where there are many groups. In
effect, the collective memory dating from the
civil war still exists: the young people under-
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Three Interviews

J. GOMEZ CASAS
(CNT National Committee)

QUESTION:
How do things stand today with the CNT in Madrid in particular and in Spain generally?

REVIEW:
It can’t be said that things are the same in Madrid and the Central region as in Valencia, Andalucia, and Catalonia; each area has its own situation which derives from its particular history, the different aspects of the current scene, and the political organizations present. This was true when the CNT was started, primarily thanks to the impetus of young libertarian militants, especially anarchists. Until two months ago, the CNT existed only in the form of a national committee which was such in name only. With the rebirth of anarchism and the immediate objective of reconstituting the CNT, anarcho-syndicalist groups began to develop all over Spain, giving the first real link to local, then regional, and finally national organizations. A meeting of 300 comrades in Madrid in December 1975 was the beginning of the development of the CNT in Madrid; then the unions began to develop. The first was the construction workers’, formed by young, very dynamic people, very combative. The process of reconstitution was the same in all the regions, in Andalucia, the Balearic country, in Cantabria, Asturias, Extremadura. It is going on now in Galicia and Aragon, where regional committees have not been formed but where there are many groups. In effect, the collective memory dating from the civil war still exists: the young people under-
stand our history and the old remand it. The reorganization presented in the resolution of the national committees last September [1967] - the national committees, the election of a national committee composed of one delegate from each region and a permanent secre-
tary, a post composed of five members. The

**QUESTION:** What problems have you encountered?

**ANSWER:** I would say, the problems of an extremely young organization. From the fact that we can say that 99% of the members of the CNT are young, and that this is very lucky; but these young people lack experience and the belief in anarchism, syndicalism really is because they haven't lived it. This creates problems, which, however, are easily resolved. One of the major problems with which we have had to deal was with young people coming from anarchistic groups, who entered the CNT with an anarchist mentality, thinking that a union can be organized in the same way as their little groups. But to the ex-
tent that the CNT is an organization which in-
volves many workers, it cannot function like an anarchist group. The young people must learn this from their own experience—they have row, and this difficulty has been overcome. There is also a kind of rivalry at any sort of repre-
sentative structure over the regional or the national committee was seen as a sort of bureau-
cracy. But these problems we have had are not the sole problems that the committee made no decisions but only followed the decisions made by the various unions. There were differences between the old and the young; but today a process of clarifi-
cation, of discussion, of confrontation, of voting is going on. In this way difficulties are resolved little by little. The CNT today is thus much more ready in its content than it ever was, thanks to the enormous quantity of anarchists inside the CNT. We can constitute the 'guarantee that the CNT of today will become what the classical CNT was, but adapted to the pre-
current day. We have today a more different from the organization of '56—and yet with its content, its anti-state and anti-par-

**QUESTION:** Is the spectrum of political organis-
ations? How does the CNT fit into this spectrum? What problems are there between the CNT and the other organizations?

**ANSWER:** We have been disorganized and dispersed as a result of the expression of the last 40 years, and we started in a weak position, significantly behind the other left groups. In addition, we have recovered the entire sector of the socialists and others. At present, the CNT has no paid officials, and those among the Spanish regional organiza-
tions; and not only of Catalonia and the Basque country but also of regions of advanced capitalism, are favorable to us for be-
cause this means movement towards decentraliza-
tion. Of course our job is to push these demands further, giving them a libertarian socialist content. It is obvious that we can't get interested in placing one government with six or seven; but we must defend the working people and of regional organ-
ization from the point of view of libertarian feudalism. All of which I think we have here means that despite the thousand difficulties, we find ourselves in a favorable situation, in which our coherence puts us in a position to mark, be-
fore the workers' eyes, the contradictions and the mystifications of the other parties.

**QUESTION:** What specifically anarchist groups exist, and what are the relations between them and the CNT?

**ANSWER:** It can begin by saying that we don't recog-
nize the official existence of the FAI at this moment; we know that a multitude of specific groups are active in the socialist movement. For instance, the Workers' Commissions, the FAI is not organized and does not exist in the whole of the country, with many forms: collectives, cultural groups, study groups, etc. All these groups must be linked under one label, not even that of the FAI. I have just finished a study on the history of the FAI, and I would add to the text that individuals in the anarchists is not the FAI, but anarchists.

Many anarchists are active in neighborhood organizations, for example: some work with us, others not, for there is an anti-union tendency in anarchism in Spain has many groups connected to the FAI, and the only or-

**QUESTION:** What is the strategy of the CNT?

**ANSWER:** I would say, with that we ought to afford our problems, our influence of our move-
ment, and our historical characteristics: anti-capitalism, anti-statist, and anti-parlia-

democracy; direct action, self-management, im-
possible struggle against those in power. And then the question is, of what are the functions of the CNT in the situation in which we now have been regarded as a political opposition, in our action, in our defense against the repression, to join the fray, on the national or on the municipi-
stand our history and the old reminder. It the reorganization process in the organi- ation of the national committees last September [1970]. The national committee, in the election of a national committee composed of one delegate from each region and a permanent secre- tary post composed of five members.

**Question:** What problems have you encountered?

**Answer:** I would say, the problems of an extremely young organization, if the fact that we can say that 90% of the members of the CNT are young, and that this is very lucky; but these young people lack experience. It seems to me that anarchistic syndicalism really is because they haven't lived it. This creates problems, which, however, are easily resolved. One of the major problems with which we have had to deal was with young people coming from anarchist groups, who entered the CNT with an anarchist mentality, thinking that a union can mirror the passions and the unity in the same way as their little groups. But to the ex- tent that the CNT is an organization which in- volves many workers, it cannot function like an anarchist group. The young people must learn this from their own experience—they have row, and this difficulty has been overcome. There is also a kind of division at any sort of repre- sentation. Indeed, some of the national or the regional committees have seen as a sort of bureau- cracy, but then we have seen that the committees made no decisions that only followed the decisions made by the various unions. There was a certain division between the old and the young; but today a process of clarifi- cation, of discussion, of confrontation of ideas is going on. This makes the difficulties that we are resolved little by little. The CNT today is thus much more readily in its content than it was ever, thanks to the enormous quantity of anarchists inside it, who constitute the guarantees that the CNT of today will become what the classical CNT was, but adapted to the pre- sent. To say that this process is very different from the organization of M—yet with its content, its anti-state and anti-parlia- mentarian philosophy.

To sum up, it can be said that the CNT is a new CNT, young, vintage 1977, but connected directly or indirectly with the old anarchist tradition. At present, in this process of clarification which implies both confusions and tensions, we have a different and coherent organization in which not everything runs smoothly but which is very lively and very dynamic.

**Question:** What is the spectrum of political organisations? How does the CNT fit into this spectrum? What problems are there between the CNT and the other organisations?

**Answer:** We have been disorganized and dispersed as a result of the expression of the last 40 years, and we started in a weak position, significantly behind the other left groups. In addition, we have created different autonomous organizations that we have called the CNT, the CC, and the others. At present, the CNT has no paid officials, or those whose positions live from their labor. Thus we don't have the efficiency of the professional apparat- us of the workers' committees, or of the CNT with its 50 or 100 full-time workers. But this gives us a position of marginalism. Of course our job is to push these demands further, giving them a libertarian socialist content.

It is obvious that we can't be interested in replacing one government with six or seven; but we must defend our own people and of regional- ization from the point of view of libertarian anarchism. All of which leaves us a position of marginalism, but despite the thousand difficulties, we find ourselves in a favorable situation, in which our coherence puts us in a position to demand, be- fore the workers' eyes, the contradictions and the mystifications of the other parties.

**Question:** What specifically anarchist groups exist, and what are the relations between them and the CNT?

**Answer:** We can begin by saying that we don't recog- nize the official existence of the PAF at this moment; we know that a multitude of specific groups exist, the Catholic, the CNT, the Socialist Party, the CC, and one socialists. The workers' commissions have had to abandon their plan and deal with the fact that there are other forces, and therefore, that the CNT and the CNT. For the moment, the CC has still the majority position even if the CNT in Catalonia, for example, the CNT is beginning to have some influence. The fact is that we believe that, while the strength of strength will change.

On the other hand, we have one great advan- tage over the other forces: they claim to be autonomous, independent of political parties, and this link is very far from being true in the Socialist Party, the CC, on the Communist Party, the PAF, and in all the socialists. The only organiza- tion tied to no one is the CNT. This gives us a great theoretical advantage because all the call attention to the fact that no one imposes a line on us, whereas we work to understand this. When we say that we have no leaders, that the mass meeting is sovereign, that every position is accepted, then we understand what we are talking about.

Today in Spain, after 40 years of dictator- ship, there is a rediscovery of Proudhonian con- cepts, the most recent being the concept of anarchism. And it is obvious that there exists a real revolutionary force, and all the groups talk about self-management. But the CNT. Evidently this gives us an advantage, since we are the only coherent spokes- people for the recognition of self-management and the existence of a strong and numerically large CNT is necessary to the development of the spec- ifically anarchist movement. If we lose our battle as the CNT in the world of labor, we will only be able to get together with other anarchists in the future, to drink a beer and talk about anar- chism. What then would be our influence on reality?

**Question:** I would like to know whether, during the reconstruction of the CNT, there have been at- tempts at infiltration by the communists or, whether members of the (farcist) verticalists?

**Answer:** The CNT was created by anarchists and anarchists, or rather, by the people excluded from out of the Marxist groups, disrupted by the political leaders of the Workers' Commissions. Many of our best militants, now convinced anar- chists, come from the CNT. Up to now, there has been no communist infiltration, also because our current form of organization doesn't permit this. As far as infiltration by verti- calist elements goes, there is even less. In Catalonia there were people who had been in the verticalist movements who were selected by the workers as their representatives, but with- out ever sharing the political line of the verti- calists. There are many Communists who were and still are in the syndicates because they have the practical possibility of infiltrating it. There is no verticalist influence inside the syndicates, or the CNT.
our ideas. We have a real alternative to offer. For example, when the process of democratisation is completed, the political organisations will fight against starvation and for workers' management of this sector, and to begin to create really functioning factories already now, in this society, for we cannot wait for the arrival of libertarian communism. We must already now give very precise ideas of it. For example, the Madrid subway runs a heavy deficit and there is talk of rationalising it. We ought to propose, in contrast, that the subway should be run by the workers and the users, and the same thing for the other type of mass-managed administration. We know very well that real self-management can exist only in a libertarian society, but this society can certainly not be created magically from one day to the next. It is with such proposals that we can, starting now, advance in this direction.

Finally, I believe that our strategy ought to be continuous to weaken the state, by taking all citizens into the work from different class. This differentiates us from all the other political forces which, on the contrary, tend to reinforce the state by giving it new powers, such as the nationalisation of private enterprises.

Luis Andrés Edo and Luis Burro, Barcelona CNT

**Question:** What is the situation in Barcelona today?

**EDO:** To begin with, it must be said that at this time all the organisational levels of the CNT both exist formally and at the same time don't exist. The National Committee does not function, nor do the regional committees or the local federations, nor even the unions, and nevertheless, all these organs certainly exist. This holds for all levels of the organisation in all the provinces, and it is not a problem due to particular peculiarities but to the local federations or even the unions, nor the sectors affected. This is a phenomenon in itself. Each level of the organization, from the assembly up to the central committee, does what it can, but we are powerless to overcome something which is not just a question of assemblies or plenums, necessary though they are, but only through the process, now beginning, or actually constructing the organisation. This is the background to the situation of the Catalan regional plenum—the only one in Spain, as the organization not run by anyone. It is out of this that the mechanisms and forms of organisation will develop, by a natural and spontaneous process.

**Question:** What are the activities you say you are going so well here?

**EDO:** In Catalonia, in the last three months, the union leader has been attacked by the state syndicate to infiltrate the CNT by having various prestigious individuals enter it, but this also didn't succeed. We used all the means we could. I would say that we are engaged in gathering the fruits of the plenum. After two months, we are now having discussions, the militants have come to terms with the stagnation due to our collective inactivity, and the unions do not even have any real meaning; they produce all kinds of newsletters and bulletins, but they only represent a handful of comrades who can't convince others. This is a contradiction within the CNT. But we must not forget that we can count on a 45-year experience and 80% of the militants have an average age of 22 years, and that they are therefore neither weather nor prepared. The function of the plenum was exactly that of educating the young militants.

**Question:** What do you say is different from other regions like Gomar Cases told me in Madrid, he said that the organisation functions very well, even if there are some practical problems. You, on the contrary, say that the organisation does not function. Do you think there are practical problems or do you think this is just a matter of time? This seems to me to indicate that the process of recovering the organs, it is very different from one city to another, and therefore, there exists a spectrum of militants and organisations.

**EDO:** I respect every comrade's opinions and also that of Gomar Cases, who has been my friend for many years. As a comrade, I recognize the richness of the CNT, and that also is the richness of the CNT. I have just returned from Madrid where there was a meeting of the National Committee at which we debated (Gomar Cases participating at great length) that these days I've put forward to you. My thanks were accepted by the majority. In fact, the National Committee is not the new functioning of the CNT—mechanism exists throughout Spain to a lesser or greater degree, depending on the size and regional context. In Catalonia, where things are going the best; on the other hand it's absolutely normal that after 40 years, in a new organisation, and a non-authoritarian one, we have such problems.
pal level, and their behavior will do nothing but prove that we are the only revolutionary and autonomous organization in the country, and that we are the opposition even to the opposition.

**QUESTION**

When I asked about the strategy of the CNT, you answered with very clear principles, but I wanted to know to what extent it is changing. It seems to me, in the Unión de 1977, that not of 1976, it has become an industrialized, advanced country, with a new social structure linked to the development of industrial capitals; this evolution is reflected in the way the CNT is organized.

Given all this, what is the strategy of the CNT?

**ANWER**

I would say that the economic and social situation of Spain has changed, and it is true that the situation of the working classes is not the same as it was in 1966, but in the months to come the conditions of the working class will become even worse as a result of the crisis. The workers' living conditions are very bad, and their worsening points towards social conflict. I do not believe that there is a real possibility that the working class will be able to sleep by living too well, since such a prosperity does not exist and will not exist in the future. The workers will have to fight hard to improve their conditions, and this is the reason why we see the possibility of a new style of collective action. We know very well that real self-management can exist only in a libertarian society, but society can certainly not be created magically from one day to the next. It is with such proposals that we can start, now, to advance in this direction.

Finally, I believe that our strategy ought to be continually to weaken the state, by taking all means and power from the class from the state, and so is the way to get into contact with them and to offer them our ideas. We have a real alternative to offer. For example, when the process of bureaucratization is completed, the political organizations will finish the deficit-producing sectors of the Spanish economy, which could be put to use by the workers, as we see in the Nuevas Ideas. It will be to fight against self-interest and for workers' management of this sector, and to begin to create new ones, that are already now, in this society, for we cannot wait for the arrival of libertarian communism. We must already now give very precise ideas of it. For example, the Madrid subway runs a heavy deficit and there is talk of nationalizing it. We ought to propose, in contrast, that the subway be run by the workers and the users, as things are going, this type of new self-managed administration. We know very well that real self-management can exist only in a libertarian society, but society can certainly not be created magically from one day to the next. It is with such proposals that we can start, now, to advance in this direction.

**QUESTION**

What is the situation in Barcelona today?

**EOO**

To begin with, it must be said that at this very moment the social movements in Barcelona itself are intense, but we cannot say that this is a crisis. The current situation is not a crisis because it is not a situation of total anarchy, nor is it a social revolution. It is a situation where the workers are organizing themselves, but they are not yet ready to take control of the economy. They are still dependent on the state for many of their needs, and they do not have the resources to be truly independent.

**LUIS ANDRÉS EDO and LUIS BURRO, Barcelona CNT**

**QUESTION**

What is the situation of the CNT, and what are its relations with the other unions?

**EOO**

I respect every comrade's opinions and also that of Gomes Casas, who has been my friend for many years with his opinions, and that also is the richness of the CNT. I have just returned from Madrid where there was a meeting of the National Committee at which we debated (Gomes Casas participating) at great length. These theses I've put forward to you. My responses were accepted by the majority. In fact, the question of the non-functioning of the CNT mechanisms exists throughout Spain to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the size and political importance of the area, and therefore where things are going the best; on the other hand it's absolutely normal that after 40 years, in a new organization, and a non-authoritarian one, we have such problems.

**QUESTION**

What are the activities you say are going well here?

**EOO**

In Catalonia, in the last three months, the unions have been very active. Many different firms and neighborhood groups asked the various union organizations to give presentations of their positions and activities. We have already made over a hundred such presentations and we'll be doing more. There are also presentations together with the Workers' Commissions, the UGT, with great popular discus-

**QUESTION**

Since you're talking about these forces, can you say what are the strongest unions in Catalonia, and what are the relations between the CNT and the other unions?

**EOO**

First of all, today no one has any real influence over the labor movement. Many labor organizations, with their apparatuses, are trying to make themselves appear as the most powerful, but they have not succeeded. They are trying to create a power base, but they are unable to do so. The CNT, however, is a power base without any real meaning; they produce only newsletters, but they represent only a handful of workers. They are a sort of contradiction within the CNT, but we must not forget that they have come from 40 years of dictatorship; 80% of the militants have an average age of 72 years, and that they are therefore rather nature prepared. The function of the CNT was exactly that of educating the young militants.

**QUESTION**

What do you say is different from what Gomes Casas told me in Madrid, he said that the organization functions very well, even if there are some practical problems. You, on the contrary, say that the organization does not function well, and that militants function individually. This seems to me to indicate that the process of organization in Catalonia differs from one city to another, and that, therefore, there exists a spectrum of militants and of organizations.
MANIFESTO

Mujeres Libres, a Libertarian organization which has successfully published and distributed its activities up to 1939, has returned to activity with the appearance of a group of women who, in agreement with other women, wish to continue their actual, and widen the work of women's advancement and emancipation (expression of a restructuring of society which would permit men and women to live as persons, with total equality of rights and obligations).

For Mujeres Libres the fundamental question is not the liberation of women per se, but the placing of this liberation in the broader framework of the emancipation of the toiling classes in a libertarian perspective.

This group proposes:
- to create a conscious and responsible feminine force, that is, to sensitize all those women presently alienated in their complete acceptance of the role of dependence on men and all the social habits determined by an unjust class society;
- to establish, in the absence of class organization, a network of committees, with the aim of the liberation of women and of her emancipation from the three-fold slavery to which she has been and continues to be subjected: slavery of ignorance, slavery as a woman, and slavery as a sexual being; slavery of society;
- to fight against the economic and social inequality of women, which is the primary cause of all other social problems whose victims we are;
- to fight against men but against the structures, both political and mental, responsible for the clashes between men and women;
- to modify the socio-legal norms of work, education, and human relations; this has been a means to our real end: that of changing the norms, behaviors, images, customs, social forms, fashions and beliefs of people with respect to men and women;
- to eliminate every sort of rules (political, cultural, economic, etc.), if they are against women, for we think that the hierarchy has never been a mere expression of the superiority of the individual, whether man or woman;
- to refuse every sort of particular culture, whether feminist, macho, bourgeois, etc.

With respect to political parties, we think that every "femenine" section of a party, or every feminist movement whose leaders are party figures, is condemned to serve the interests of the party, before that of the group. Thus, it pretends to fight. We therefore accept no sort of leadership or manipulation from parties, nor any sort of complicity with them, except for tactical reasons in a particular struggle, and if our participation is in conditions of total freedom.

This movement (M.L.) exists at Madrid, Valencia, Andalusia and other regions of the Peninsula; it is little by little structuring itself as a federation of local groups in order to arrive at a common direction for the peninsula as a whole.

Mujeres Libres
C/o Nandres Núñez 14, 7, 24
Barcelona 1 -- Spain

MUJERES LIBRES

QUESTION:
And neighborhood work?

ANSWER:
At this time there is an attempt to create a federation of neighborhood committees. There exist groups which work not on the anarchist-syndicalist level, but on the anarchist level; many anarchists are not in the CNT and prefer to center their activity in the neighborhoods where they live and which offer enormous potential for the diffusion of anarchist ideas. Where I live, for example, at Santa Coloma de Gramenet, a vast working class dormitory-city, the anarchists are the main political force, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and they have no form of community life in other neighborhoods. This is why we are trying to create a federation of neighborhood committees.

I would like to make clear that when I said that the CNT has broken all the traditional union schemes I also meant to say that there exists no organization which, in an activity beyond the workplace and the place where people live after work, i.e., the neighborhoods, we think the neighborhoods are enormously important and we believe that if the CNT really wants to become a union different from the others it must unify the two areas of life, for this reason, among others, we have organized on an unprecedented scale.

I personally believe that the CNT shouldn't have been started up on 29 February for a particular reason: its statutes date from 1939.

Barcelona, 10 January 1977

movement had its first great public moment with the "Catlan Women's Days" organized in a series of meetings in which nearly 4,000 women participated, and which concluded with the unanimous adoption of a resolution in the name of the Federacion de Mujeres Libres. As a starting point, the different groups expressed need to create Coordinators, a weekly coordination meeting, in which we anarchistas participate only as observers.

With respect to our relations with this movement, I would say that, at least for the moment, they are non-existent because we find ourselves in total dissonance on basic issues: the movement is exclusively working in a class, the inter-classism which characterizes many groups is replaced by an internal problem of women from social reality as a whole. Other groups have relatively modest positions, others yet are formed by libertarian women. The majority of these feminist groups, however, use the Marxist method of analysis. The feminist and since then many things have happened. Multinational companies have come into existence, a capitalism with completely new characteristics has developed; it is thus necessary to verify if the structures adopted by the CNT are still valid. Everybody have doubts about this, because I have noticed that many unions only make demands based on certain social type, while I think that the goal of the CNT is to insist on the different aspects of life. We ought to begin building another society right now, and thus the CNT ought to be the organization which contains the premises of this new society in embryo. But given that the CNT is structured by unions, it seems to me very difficult to succeed in this. I am a member of the health workers' union and I can say that at the moment I work I know that the part of the militants think they are in the CNT to defend their professional and wages interests while others think they are in the CNT to construct a new society. These two tendencies have given rise to a division of the union into two parallel sections with different aims. The section to which I belong thinks that a health worker, is restrictive and implies demands on our employers, while we think that it would be more appropriate the Popular Health and Hygiene union, which would fight for prevention in the evolutive process of disease, in hospitals, while we work only in hospitals. Our work ought to go on in the neighborhoods, libertarian work, because of living conditions and overwork.
**MANIFESTO**

**Mujeres Libres**, a Libertarian organisation which has been formed very rapidly and which has already developed its activities up to 1939, has returned to activity with the appearance of a group of women who, among other things, wish to continue their activities, and widen the work of women's advancement and emancipation, by the organization of a restructuring of society which would allow women to live as men, with total equality of rights and obligations.

For **Mujeres Libres** the fundamental question is not the liberation of women per se, but the placing of this liberation in the wider framework of the emancipation of the laboring class in a libertarian perspective.

This group proposes:

- to create a conscious and responsible feminine force, that is to say, to sensitize all those women present, and to educate them, so that they understand the role of cooperation on men, and the principles of emancipation determined by an upper- class society;

- to establish to end schools, lecture series, courses, groups, etc., with the aim of the liberation of women and of her emancipation from the three-fold slavery to which she has been subjected, and to cease being subordinated, enslaved, oppressed, and as a woman, suppressed;

- to fight against the economic and social inequality of women, which is the primary cause of sexual slavery,

- to fight against men not against the structures, both political and mental, responsible for the clashes between men and women;

- to modify the socio-legal norms of work, education, and human relations; this has to be a means to our real end: that of changing the norms, behaviors, images, customs, social forms, fashions, and beliefs of people with respect to men and women;

- to eliminate every sort of rules (political, cultural, economic, etc.) that they have imposed on women, for we think that the hierarchy has never been a specific oppression of the individual, whether man or woman;

- to refuse every sort of particular culture, whether feminist, macho, bourgeois, etc.

With respect to political parties, we think that every "feminist sect" of a party, or every feminist movement whose leaders are party figures, is condemned to serve the interests of the party, before that of the women, as it pretends to fight. We therefore accept no sort of leadership or manipulation from parties, nor any sort of compromise with them, except for tactical reasons in a particular struggle, and if our participation is in conditions of total freedom.

This movement (ML) exists at Madrid, Valencia, Andalusia and other regions of the peninsula; it is little by little restructuring itself as a federation of local groups in order to arrive at a more advanced coordination for the peninsular as a whole.

---

**MUJERES LIBRES**

**QUESTION:** Who should like to know first of all if a feminist movement exists in Spain? If so, what are its positions, and what are your relations, if any, with the feminist groups?

**ANSWER:** The Spanish feminist movement is very young. Its obvious existence. The movement began a year ago and it is in no unified position. This is because it contains many tendencies: there are more radical groups of feminists who see men as the principal enemy and for whom women constitute a well-defined class which ought to demand special treatment. Other groups, looking at women as a class, the inter-classism which characterizes many of them, have relatively modest positions, others yet are formed by libertarian women. The majority of these feminist groups, however, use the Marxist method of analysis. The feminist movement had its first great public moment with the "Catalan Women's Days" organized in a series of meetings in which nearly 4,000 women participated, and which concluded with the unanimous decision to form a national organization. The act as a starting point, the different groups expressed their need to create the Coordinadora, a weekly coordination meeting, in which we anarchists participate only as observers.

With respect to our relations with this movement, I would say that, at least for the moment, they are nonexistent because we find ourselves in total disagreement on basic issues: the classic opposition, looking at women as a class, the inter-classism which characterizes many of them, and of course, the feminist strategy. This doesn't mean that if in the future we should see that it is possible to carry out some specific and time-bound work with these groups, we wouldn't consider this.
Interview with Paul Mattick

QUESTION: What are your relations with the specifically anarchist groups and with the CNT?

TESSERA: As a group, Mujeres Libres is completely autonomous. We are not anarchists or libertarians, some of us are also in the CNT. They do anarchist-syndicalist work there, because the ideological framework is the same as ours.

QUESTION: Do you have a program and any activities around abortion?

CHESTINA: The problem of abortion is certainly very important at this point, and the opposition to it is becoming even more so. That is, we think it is very urgent to give people the knowledge necessary to use contraceptives so they won't need abortions. At a time like today, the problem is strongly felt. We think that our task is not to campaign against the existing structures, because we're not interested in making deals with the system. We've got to create illegal structures to which proletarian women can go for abortions without risking their lives. And that is what we are working on, setting up in collaboration with some doctors. The problem of abortion is a little like that of divorce. We don't believe in the state, we fight the state, so it would be simply absurd to demand the legalization of anything. All our initiatives ought to be undertaken outside of the logic of the state and with our own forces, under our control and by those women who identify with our struggle. As far as abortion goes, we believe concretely that with the Karen method, anybody can practice it. Thus the problem is to take from the doctors the knowledge which they have engrossed in order to have power over our bodies.

QUESTION: What type of activity have you been engaged in up to now?

PAUL: Presently, we are doing some support work for the La Roca workers, who have been on strike for two months now. We are doing this in collaboration with different neighbourhoods, collecting money and other stuff to help the families to live, toys for the children, and we try to give our solidarity as many forms as possible. The first thing we did was publish an appeal to the workers of La Roca, in which we collected first-person accounts by those women about their situation there, and the problems they have lived through during this time. We are distributing this pamphlet. In the coming days, we plan to tell a revealing story: some women from La Roca went to a feminist meeting where more than 400 women were present and tried to speak on La Roca. Well, they were refused the floor and none of the women present spoke up for them. We have a program and a series of writings on various subjects-marriage, divorce, abortion—and we try to explain what Mujeres Libres is doing in the various neighborhoods. Besides this, we are setting up a clinic.

ANSWERS: We seem to be entering into a new period of serious economic and social crisis. What are the new features of this period, in comparison with the 1930s?

ECONOMY: The basic reason for the current crisis is not the same as those which caused all previous capitalist crises. But all crises have also specific features with respect to their initiation, the reactions released by them, and their outcome. The changing capital structure accounts for these peculiarities. Generally, a crisis follows in the wake of a period of successive capital accumulation, wherein the profits produced and realised are sufficient to maintain a given rate of expansion. This state of capitalistic prosperity requires a steady increase in the demand of labor, large enough to offset the relative decline of profitability resulting from the changing capital structure. The competitive and therefore blind pursuit of profit on the part of individual capitalists cannot help but increase the changing capital/labor composition of the social capital. The crisis erupts, when an arbitrary disproportionality between a required rate of profit for the social capital and its necessary rate of accumulation forbids its further expansion. This underlying but empirically unobservable discrepancy comes to the fore in terms of market relations as a lack of effective demand, which is only another expression of a lack of accumulation on which the effective demand depends.

Prior to 1930 periods of depression were answered by deflationary procedures, that is, by a reduction of "the market" rather than in the course of the expectation that sooner or later the declining economic activity would restore the equilibrium of supply and demand and thereby revive the profitability of capital. The crisis of 1929, however, was too deep and too extensive to allow for this traditional remedy of coping with it. It was answered by inflationary procedures—that is, by governmental interventions in the market mechanism, up to the point of international warfare, for the restructuring of the world economy through a forced centralisation of capital at the expense of weaker national capitals, and by the outright destruction of capital in both its monetary and physical forms. Financed by way of government deficits, that is, through inflationary methods, the results were still deflationary on a far larger and far more systematic scale than had been accomplished previously by passive reliance on the "laws of the market." The long depression period and the second world war, and the attendant monstrous destruction of capital, created conditions for an extraordinarily long period of capital expansion in the leading Western nations.

Both deflation and inflation led then to the same result, to a new upswing of capital, and were subsequently and alternatingly utilized in the attempts to secure the newsworn economy and social stability. Undoubtedly, it is possible by way of deficit-financing, that is, by way of credit, to enliven a stagnant economy. But it is not possible to maintain the rate of profit on capital in this manner and thereby perpetuate the conditions of prosperity. It was then only a question of time until the crisis mechanisms of capital production would reassert itself. By now it is obvious that the mere availability of credit to expand production is no solution to crisis, but a fleeting make-shift policy with only temporary effect. If, not followed up by a genuine upswing of capital, based on larger profits, the economy collapses in itself.

The Keynesian remedy has led merely to a new crisis situation with growing and growing inflation—both equally detrimental to the capitalist system.

The present crisis has not as yet reached that degree of devastation which, in the 1930's, led from depression to war. Although unable to overcome the present depression, the inflation measures alleviate to some extent the social misery caused by the decline of economic activity. But this inflationary capitalism, these measures become themselves the cause of a new and similar situation. They make it more difficult to regain a starting-point for a new upswing. Also the
Question: Before turning to Mujeres Libres, I'd like to know your general position on dealing with the woman question from the anarchist point of view. To whom do you address yourselves?

Christina: Above all we don't define ourselves as feminists, because of the deep and important differences that separate us from the feminist movement. Obviously, that's also the case with women, and so we want to fight for women's emancipation, but we are also anarchists and we are quite aware that if we really want to change the reality of life we can't stop at a single aspect of inequality but have to remember that life is a whole series of social categories excluded and discriminated against. You only have to think of children, old people, homosexuals, lesbians, homosexuals: these people have problems that don't exist to seek for the feminists. Besides, we think that men are exploited, conditioned, and alienated like us, and that's the reason why we wonder what, when there is in fighting against them instead of with them. Always, of course, if we wish to change all this, we need a coherent structure and the mentality it produces. It is necessary to destroy this hierarchical society which is based on antagonism, on divisions, and on competition. We ask if it makes sense to fight for simple equality in the job hierarchy. It seems to us in fact that to succeed in having as many women as male executives or government officials means not to change the structures and the division of labor instead of destroying them and therefore not modifying the credibility of this exploitative society.

With respect to the people we address ourselves to, I would say that we would choose as comrades in struggle, exploited women, those at the bottom of the social pyramid since they are exploited economically as well as oppressed sexually. Bourgeois women, who are only sexually oppressed, are not approached, because we don't consider that they have a choice of class and renounce their privileges. We understand that that is very difficult to do.

Question: What kind of activity have you been engaged in up to now?

Pankin: Presently, we are doing some support work for the La Roca workers, who have been on strike for two months now. We are doing this in collaboration with other groups from different neighborhoods, collecting money and other stuff to help the families to live, toys for the children, and we try to give our solidarity as many forms as possible. The first thing we did was a pamphlet printed in The Women of La Roca Speak, in which we collected first-person accounts by women about the situation they confront, and the problems they have lived through during this time. We are distributing this pamphlet. In the coming months we hope to tell a revealing story: some women from La Roca went to a feminist meeting where more than 400 women were present and tried to speak on La Roca. Well, they were refused the floor and none of the women present spoke up for them. We have a program and a series of writings on various subjects—marriage, divorce, abortion—and we try to explain what Mujeres Libres is to the various neighborhoods. Besides this, we are setting up a clinic.

Interview with Paul Mattick

Question: What are your relations with the specifically anarchist groups and with the CNT?

Teresa: As a group, Mujeres Libres is completely autonomous. We are not anarchists or libertarians, some of us are also in the CNT. They do anarchist-syndicalist work there, whereas the ideological framework is the same as ours.

Question: Do you have a program and any activities around abortion?

Christina: The problem of abortion is certainly very important in Spain, and so is the problem of prevention, even more so. That is, we think it is very urgent to give people the knowledge necessary to use contraceptives so that they won't need abortions. At a time like today, the problem is strongly felt. We think that our task is not to campaign in the streets, but to create illegal structures to which proletarian women can go for abortions without risking their lives. And this is what we are doing as well, that is, setting up in collaboration with other doctors. The problem of abortion is a little like that of divorce. We don't believe in the state, we fight the state, so it would be simply absurd to demand the legalization of anything. All our initiatives ought to be undertaken outside of the logic of the state and with our own forces, under our control and by those women who identify with our struggle. As far as abortion goes, we believe concretely that with the Tarazon method, anybody can practice it. Thus the problem is taken from the doctors the knowledge which they have engrossed in order to have power over our bodies.

Question: Do you intend to put out a journal, Mujeres Libres, later?

Antonia: Yes, it's a project we have, but evidently this magazine will be very different from that of 1936.

Barcelona, 10 January 1977

Edited translations of interviews published in A. Rivista anarchica (Edizione A., Case Postale 3240, 20100 Milano, Italy), and in Le Pétrole, n° 14, 92360 Meudon-La-Forêt, France. If you write, don't mention L.W. (on the envelope).

Economic theory through a forced monetization of capital is itself the cause of new cycles of crises, and by the outright destruction of capital in both its monetary and physical forms. Financed by way of government deficits, these forced inflationary methods, the results were still deflationary, that is, the scale of depressions had been accelerated previously by passive reliance on the "laws of the market." The long depression period and the second world war, and the attendant enormous destruction of capital, created conditions for an extraordinarily long period of capital expansion in the leading Western nations.

Both deflation and inflation led then to the same result, to a new upswing of capital, and were subsequently and alternately utilized in the attempts to secure the newsworn economic and social stability. Undoubtedly, it is possible by way of deficit-financing, that is, by way of credit, to enrich a stagnant economy. But it is not possible to maintain the rate of profit on capital in this manner and thereby perpetuate the conditions of prosperity. It was only a question of time until the crisis mechanism of capital production would reassert itself. By now it is obvious that the mere availability of credit to expand production is no solution to crisis, but a fleeting 'wash-and-play' policy with only temporary effects. If, not followed up by a genuine upswing of capitalism, based on larger profits, the upswing can collapse in itself. The Keynesian remedy has led merely to a new crisis situation with growing inflation—both equally detrimental to the capitalist system.

The present crisis has not as yet reached that degree of devastation which, in the 1930's, led from depression to war. Although unable to overcome it, the classical anti-inflation measures alleviated to some extent the social misery caused by the decline of economic activity. In the current crisis, both the Keynesian capitalist economy, these measures become themselves an integral part of the market equation. They make it more difficult to regain a starting-point for a new upswing. Also the...
Degree of international "integration" of the capitalist economy, caused by liberal trade policies and monetary arrangements, is steadily undermined by devaluation and de-industrialization. Problem of this nature disturbs the world market still further. As the depression becomes more general, it may be considered that the work of the population, the bourgeoisie must try to stabilize their position, and increase the profits of the workers. The increase of unemployment, though of some importance, will be lessened by the higher wages sufficiently to increase the profitability of capital. The income of all non-capitalist classes are reduced, and the so-called welfare measures diminished. An attempt is made to reach an agreement in the movement of the workers, which allows for its further expansion. Although a rapid rate of inflation has this effect, it also finds its limitations in the increasing anarchy of capitalist production and society in general. As a permanent policy it threatens the existence of the system itself.

**QUESTION:** In this connection, how do you see the role of the Left, especially the Communist Party? What is the meaning of Eurocommunism?

**ANSWER:** One must distinguish between the "objectives" of the Left, as organ of the proletariat, and the organisations, which, on any issue, is not so far from a proletarian nature. In Italy, for example, the Communist Party holds the dominant position in the Left. In other times, it may almost determine "left" policies, despite opposition from other organisations. In Italy, the Left to the right, but the Communist Party is not a correct definition. Long since it turned into a social-democratic phenomenon, a reformist party, a home within the state, and therefore offering itself as a supporting instrument. Practically, the Left is to satisfy the bourgeois aspirations of its leadership and the needs of its bureaucracy, by mediating between labor and capital in order to stabilize a bourgeois state. Thus, it is not just a question of existence, but of its continuous existence, bound as it is to its continuous existence. Objectively, industrial workers and rural workers are not interested in revolutionary implications and thus, political forms, because one can only live in the capitalist society. The working class does not need to conceive of revolutionary implications, because it is not interested in the possibility of creating a socialist society. In the capitalistic society, any state of permanent capitalism decline its struggle takes on revolutionary connotations. However, it is not enough of all awareness, of course, the workers might be prepared to accept, within limits, a decreasing share of the social product, if only to avoid the alternative of a collapse in confrontations with the bourgeoisie and its state. But this might not be sufficient if the capitalistic society is to be a new economic upsurge, and there is not enough to halt the growing unemployment. The division between the working and the non-working classes, becomes more, the more difficult it is to find the bourgeois state and its government, and there may be an increase in the number of conflicts between the different groups. This means that the bourgeoisie must adopt a series of measures to control the situation, which may be seen as a basic factor of the bourgeois regime, in the defence of the state apparatus, and the bourgeoisie. To this end, the bourgeoisie, its state apparatus, must be matched by a greater power, which can be obtained through a continuous disruption of the production process, which is the basis of all capitalist social reality. The power of the workers, the unemployed workers and workers to force the bourgeoisie to the means of existence, is thus more and more important. For the bourgeoisie, the students and revolutionary groups are concerned, in order to be effective at all they must somehow reach the state. The workers and unemployed are not to realize any objective that can be reached by the bourgeoisie to the means of the impending class struggle and the directions it has to take due to the imminent laws of capitalist production.

**QUESTION:** What role do you see for violence, and in particular for armed struggle, in radical activity?

**ANSWER:** This is not a question which can be answered by allocating to violence either a positive or negative role. Violence is impossible to evade, but it cannot be used as a means. Violence is the outcome of the absence of a legitimate authority. As far as the radical bourgeoisie can exist, violence is meaningful, for it is only the laboring process which yields the capitalist profit. A "radical" role of violence is not sustainable, and capital is therefore out of the question, the bourgeoisie will alleviate its struggle with violence where ever it threatens to become serious threatening the peace of the state. It does not allow the workers to choose between non-violent and violent methods of class struggle. It is the bourgeoisie, in possession of the state apparatus, which determines which one it will be on any given occasion. Violence cannot only be answered by violence, even if the weapons employed are only the same, the question of principles enters here, but merely the reality of the social class difference.

However, the question posed is whether or not the radical elements in anti-capitalist struggles should take the initiative in the development of the struggle. The decision to the bourgeoisie and its mercenaries. Non-violence cannot win against the bourgeoisie. To find the bourgeoisie unbowed and where a violent clash with its armed forces favors the revolutionaries. But the whole history of radical movements shows clearly that the revolutionaries must find the means to fight. In military terms, the bourgeoisie will always have the upper hand, unless revolution is able to organize itself on a large scale. It is only in conjunction with great
of international "integration" of the capitalist economy, by liberal trade policies and monetary arrangements, is steadily undermining the "depression. Program of capitalist parties disturb the world market still further. As the depression became more general, so the spread of the working population, the bourgeoisie may try all available means, economic or political, to an increasing rate of inflation, which | wages sufficiently to increase the profitability of capital. The incomes of all non-capitalist layers of the population, the so-called welfare measures diminished, an in an attempt to recoup for the losses of capital which allows for its further expansion. Although a radical rate of inflation has this effect, it also finds its limitations in the increasing anarchy of capitalist production and in society in general. As a permanent policy it threatens the existence of the system itself.

QUESTION: In this connection, how do you see the role of the Left, especially the Communist Party? What is the meaning of "Eurocommunism"?

ANSWER: One must distinguish between the "objectives" of the proletariat as such, and the organized left, which is not strictly a proletarian nature since left, at any rate in Italy, the Communist Party holds the dominant position among the working class. In those times, it must probably determine "left politics," despite opposition from other organizations which are too often to the right. But the Communist Party is not a consciousness of the proletariat in the traditional sense. Long since it turned into a social-democratic formation, a reformist party, a home within the bourgeoisie, and therefore offering itself as a supporting instrument. Practically, the idea is to satisfy the bourgeois aspirations of its leadership and the needs of its bureaucracy, by mediating between labor and capital, and therefore offering itself as a supporting instrument. The fact of its large working-class base, its adherence to the worker's unyielding, or unwilling, to overthrow the capitalist system and their desire to find, instead, accommodation within it. The illusion that this is possible supports the opportunity with the worker who is ready to accept the capitalist conditions. They must therefore try to prevent working-class actions which would undermine capital and its recovery. Their reformist and opportunistic policies take on an open counter-revolutionary role, as the system finds itself endangered by working-class activities that cannot be satisfied within the crisis-ridden capitalist system.

The "Eurocommunism" espoused by the Communist Party has no meaning other than a geographic or a social category. This empty term seeks an attack on the part of European communists to differentiate their present attitudes from past policies; it is a declaration that, so long as they have not forgotten, socialist-capitalist goal has been given up in favor of the mixed economy, so as to present a "so-called welfare" as a request for official recognition and for a full integration into the national system, which implies, of course, an integration into the various nation-states that comprise the European territory and the limitation of "responsibilities" within the capitalist society and its governments, and a promise not to disrupt the limited degree of cooperation reached by capitalist nations in the European context, and to abstain from all activities that may disturb the apparent consensus between the East and the West. It does not imply a radical break with the state-capitalist part of the world, but merely the recognition that this part, too, is not interested in the extension of state-capitalist systems by revolutionary means, but rather in a fuller integration into the capitalist world-market, despite the remaining socio-economic differences between the state-capitalist and the state-capitalist systems.

QUESTION: What possibilities are there for revolutionary action, or action which wants to prepare conditions for revolutionary action? What possibilities do you see for workers, unemployed workers, students, the left-wing groups?

ANSWER: Revolutionary actions are directed against the system as a whole - for its overthrow and its general disruption of society which escapes political control. Thus far, such revolutionary actions have taken place in conjunction with social cataclysms, such as were released by the First and the Second World Wars and the economic dislocations. This does not mean that such situations are an absolute precondition for revolution, but it indicates the extent of social disintegration that precedes revolutionary upheavals. Revolutionaries are involved in the action of the proletariat. But ideology but necessarily brings the masses into revolutionary movements. The transition to a revolutionary ideology, namely an understanding of what has to be done, is a continuous effort of the struggle against the system's defenders. At the present time the possibilities for revolutionary actions are extremely dim, because the chances of success are practically nil. So far as practical experience, the ruling classes expect revolutionary activities and have armed themselves accordingly. Any attempt to mobilize the working class by internal means - politically they still have the support of the large labor organizations and of the majority of the population - they have not as yet exhausted the mechanisms for social oppression, and, despite an increasing international competition for the shrinking profits of the working class, they are likely to intensify their activities of proletarian upheavals wherever they may occur. In this context, one finds the so-called socialist regimes in the defense of their own exploitative class relations.

While a socialist revolution at this stage of development is likely to take place in working-class activities in defense of their own interests possess a potential revolutionary character. In any case, the bourgeoisie finds itself in a state of decay that might last for a long time. No one is able to predict the dimensions of the depression for lack of relevant data, but everyone faces the actual crisis and has to react to it: the bourgeoisie in its way, the working class in opposite ways. In periods of relative economic stability the worker's struggle itself hastens the accumulation of capital, by forcing the bourgeoisie to adopt measures that increase the necessity for both labor and capital. As just the bourgeoisie can only exist by virtue of its control over the means of production, so it must defend this control by extra-economic means, and thus over the means of suppression. Already a refusal to work takes the form of a meaningful protest, and therefore meaningless, for it is only the laboring process which yields the capitalist profit. A "purgatory" is established between labor and capital, and capital is therefore out of the question, the bourgeoisie will always supplement this struggle with violence whatever it threatens its existence by seriously threatening the preservation of the "capital. It does not allow the workers to choose between non-violent and violent methods of class struggle. It is the bourgeoisie, in possession of the state apparatus, which determines which one will be on any given occasion. It is only possible to be answered by violence, even if the weapons employed are not only non-violent but based on principles of integrity toward all aware persons, and therefore the real meaning of the social class struggle.

Of course, the worker might be prepared to accept certain limits, a decreasing share of the social product, if only to avoid the alternative. The bourgeoisie does not have the power to continue with the bourgeois state and its process. But this might not be sufficient in the long term, and it is clear that some economic upsurge will not be enough to halt the growing unemployment. The division between labor and capital, as the result of capitalist necessity, turns into a catastrophic situation which is under conditions of economic stagnation and decline. If one wishes to support the workers to react to the deepening crisis, all that could be said is that the bourgeoisie is divided, that the workers are divided under their own direct control, and to fight for immediate needs, regardless of the state of the secondarily collaborative form of the official labor movement. In other words, the working class finds itself in an armed struggle as it is fought by the bourgeoisie. The advantage on the part of the bourgeoisie, its state apparatus, must be matched by a greater power, which is possible with the continuous disruption of the production process, which is the basis of all capitalist power, for the active participation of the unemployed to force from the bourgeoisie the means of existence. As just the radical students and revolutionary groups are concerned, in order to be effective at all they must somehow reach the masses of the workers and unemployed not to realize any objective, but only to be able to pose the meaning of the impending class struggle and the directions it has to take due to the imminent laws of capital production.

QUESTION: What role do you see for violence, and in particular for armed struggle, in radical activity?

ANSWER: This is not a question which can be answered by allowing to violence either a positive or negative role. Violence is immediately necessary for both labor and capital. As just the bourgeoisie can only exist by virtue of its control over the means of production, so it must defend this control by extra-economic means, and thus over the means of suppression. Already a refusal to work takes the form of a meaningful protest, and therefore meaningless, for it is only the laboring process which yields the capitalist profit. A "purgatory" is established between labor and capital, and capital is therefore out of the question, the bourgeoisie will always supplement this struggle with violence whatever it threatens its existence by seriously threatening the preservation of the "capital. It does not allow the workers to choose between non-violent and violent methods of class struggle. It is the bourgeoisie, in possession of the state apparatus, which determines which one will be on any given occasion. It is only possible to be answered by violence, even if the weapons employed are not only non-violent but based on principles of integrity toward all aware persons, and therefore the real meaning of the social class struggle.

However, the question posed is whether or not the radical elements in anti-capitalist struggles should take the initiative in the struggle for power. The decision to the bourgeoisie and its mercenaries. It will have always the upper hand, the revolutionary. But the whole history of radical movements shows clearly that they can succeed only when they are able to be more that merely a defence. In military terms, the bourgeoisie will always have the upper hand, the revolutionaries must find the bourgeoisie unprepared and where a violent clash with its armed forces. The advantage on the part of the bourgeoisie, its state apparatus, must be matched by a greater power, which is possible with the continuous disruption of the production process, which is the basis of all capitalist power, for the active participation of the unemployed to force from the bourgeoisie the means of existence. As just the radical students and revolutionary groups are concerned, in order to be effective at all they must somehow reach the masses of the workers and unemployed not to realize any objective, but only to be able to pose the meaning of the impending class struggle and the directions it has to take due to the imminent laws of capital production.
mass movements, which totally disrupt the social fabric, that it becomes possible to wrench the means of production and thereby the means of production from the ruling classes.

The futility of badly-matched military confrontations has not been able to assuage this. There do arise situations, moreover, where such confrontations release the trigger for greater things and may lead to mass movements, such as the general strike of 5--6 October 1968. For example, we consider the case of the General Strike in France, as发生的两次革命, and how the bourgeoisie, having recognized the threat, decided to make this strike the occasion to crush the working class, to show their utter contempt for the working class, to demonstrate their total control. It is for this reason that it is so dangerous to insist upon non-violence and to make violence the exclusive privilege of the ruling class. But here we speak of highly critical situations, not such as are present in the capitalist countries, and also about large and sufficiently armed forces able to wage their struggle for a considerable length of time. In the absence of such highly critical situations, such actions amount to no more than collective suicide, not unexpected to the bourgeoisie. They may be appreciated in moral or even aesthetic terms, but in the course of the proletarian revolution, except by entering into revolutionary folklore.

For revolutionaries it is psychologically quite difficult, if not impossible, to raise their voices against the futile application of "revolutionary justice" by terrorist groups and individuals. Even Marx, who despised all forms of satirical actions, could not help being imposed by the terrorist tactics of the Russian "Duma of the Will." As a matter of fact, the counter-revolution of revolutionary groups cannot be prevented by mere recognition of its futility. Their perpetrators are not moved by the conviction that their actions will lead directly to social change by destroying the bourgeoisie's ability to accept the unchallenged, the perpetual terror that we are all challenged.

And once engaged in illegal terror, the legal terror forces them to continually intensify their activities until the bitter end. This type of people is itself a product of the classridden society and a response to its increasingly brutalization. There is no sense in forming a consensus with the bourgeoisie and condemning their activities also from a proletarian point of view. It is enough to recognize their futility and to look for more effective ways to overthrow the present capitalist terror by the actions of the proletarian class.

Paul Mattick
October, 1977

---

A New Class Theory

before the turn of the century, no one predicted the appearance of a distinct and large stratum of professionals and managers. Bourgeois social scientists were quick to see in this new "middle class" a confirmation that social classes would eventually evolve out of existence. The tremendous technological and material progress which accompanied capital accumulation meant an improved living standard for most despite the fits-and-starts of economic cycles and continued inequalities in the distribution of wealth.

Marxists, though, because they saw the per- sistence of a working class in the industrialized countries and its constant creation in all newly-capitalized areas of the world, were slower to pay attention to the new trends. The growth through the century in size and power of this new group created a debate and crisis for Marxists, for it seemed that Marx's theory could only account for a society with a growing division into capitalists and wage-laborers. In the last several decades, one major debate between bourgeois social science and Marxism has been over whether the new stratum represents a "new middle class" or a "new working class."

Barbara and John Ehrenreich follow this debate, and attempt to synthesize the results in a new Marxist theory which accords the professional-managerial stratum a class status along- side the two capitalist groups. The North American New Left, from whose perspective they wish to view the new conditions, had some influence on, but little support from the working class. This, they think, is because the Left shares with the professional-managerial class a common social position and a common view of socialism in which technical efficiency and technological rationality play the role of the future ideal. In turn, this explains the confusion of many leftists about their own class position, since many of them come from professional and upper-class backgrounds. While the Ehrenreichs applaud the Left for its attempt to overcome this position, they remain disturbed because their analysis implies that the Left's isolation is not merely historical. It is not that the Left has a conscious position in the working class has yet to develop; rather, the divergence in consciousness comes from fundamental social and technological differences.

In order to orient the Left towards an alliance with the working class, which they see as essential for a successful revolution, they show that professional-managerial conceptions of socialism are different from and opposed to working class conceptions. Unfortunately, the Ehrenreichs do not describe working class perceptions of socialism except in passing that they are concerned with 'cultural' as well as 'bread and butter' issues. To prove their thesis, they have drawn on the appropriate theory and history, all of which is accomplished in two short magazine articles. (1)

According to the Ehrenreichs, "a class is characterized by a common relation to the econo-
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In order to orient the left towards an alliance with the working class, which they see as essential for a successful revolution, they show that professional-managerial conceptions of socialism are different from and opposed to working class conceptions. Unfortunately, the Ehrenreichs do not describe working class perceptions of socialism except to mention in passing that they are conversed with 'cultural' as well as 'bread and butter' issues. To prove their theses, they have drawn on the appropriate theory and history, all of which is accomplished in two short magazine articles. (1)
Scientists travelling through a hitherto unpaved region on New Guinea have discovered that they believe to be a new social class, number 347 on the Ethnography of Labor. The scientists believe these are the first people to be found wearing wristwatches on their big toes, a cultural trait that has never been observed before. Confirmation awaits a positive sighting.

It is also misleading for the Ethnerecht's view managerial and professional work as 'productive' and 'unproductive,' (1, 13). Human activity is involved, and this requires work, regardless of whether it contributes to the process of profit. Bourgeois standards on the definition of work are no reason to push-push someone's place in society.

Feminist theory popularized none of the conflicts between the working class and management. Their purpose was to show that one need not work directly for capital to perform an economic function in the social system. By doing so, they corrected a bias which has long existed in Marxist and Engelsian literature. The Ethnerechts have used these popular notions, but have adapted them for different purposes. While feminists criticized the Left's fixation on the bourgeois conception of work in order to show the importance of women in the social system, the Ethnerechts accept the bourgeois definition straightforwardly to defend their ideas on work.

When Marx used the concepts of productive and unproductive labor, they had nothing to do with a person's class position or their political allegiances. Only workers perform labor, and they do so regardless of the ultimate consequences of their actions. Those concepts referred to the production of value and surplus-value, which were the keys to understanding the social system as well as its fallerings. An exact definition was needed for these different social roles, and this was why the process of labor and capitalism in which this distinction was not crucial, but was merely a further and specific elaboration of a trend within the system.

Even though the Ethnerechts acknowledge that the professional-managerial class is a derivative class, in that it is an outgrowth of the capital-wage-labor relation; nonetheless, they claim that it is a class because it is 'independent' of the direct production of capitalist class relationships. (1, 13) Marx too, Marx used the concept of production and reproduction for purposes which make their definitions arbitrary and one-sided. The working class does perform 'production', but because the product is owned by the capitalists the workers must continue to sell their working abilities if they are to survive. The act of production is simultaneously one reproduction of work, for when workers perform tasks, they reproduce themselves as wage-laborers.
mich foundations of society" which "arise from the place occupied by groups in the broad social division of labor, and from the general situation of control over access to the means of production and of appropriation of the social surplus." (Part 1, page 12) Unlike the petty bourgeoisie, which existed at the beginnings of capitalism and then declined into feudalism due to its uncompetitive position, the petty capitalist or "bourgeoisie" class has "taken form in monopoly capitalist society" (11,12) and is a permanent class of the 20th century. The new class differs from the working class in that its role is "the reproduction of capitalist class relations" (11,13) while the working class has been "in the forefront in the dynamic role of the new division of labor." The new class is the "parasitic class" which has grown because of the "ever deeper separatization of mental from manual labor," and the means of production to which the capitalists have turned over the day to day management of their firms and social system, and which has grown because of the ever more severe separation of mental from manual work. In summary, Marx analyzed the overall features which characterized and motivated the "bourgeoisie" system. Its exact evolution over time, however, could only be estimated. The bourgeoisie are often characterized by the immediate and tangible benefits which they bring to society, particularly as they apply to the appearance and growth of the professional/managerial stratum. To overcome what they see as "the invidious consequences," they have redefined the concept of class.

Marx, of course, was well aware of the problems of monopoly and social divisions within the working class. He believed that a full of resistance to the "separation of the workers into skilled and unskilled." (12) He also contains sections on "class consciousness," in which he identifies women and children as subjects of capital. When Marx wrote the "Das Capital," he simultaneously worked as a political journalist where he wrote on topics such as the American Civil War, describing how the Civil War was "the war of the Northern people, and the resources for the European bourgeoisie and their impact on the Northern population, and the resources for the conflicting results in the 1862 elections." At the beginning of his career, Marx was encouraged by Engels to study economic theory and the working classes. These were studies which Engels had already begun and from which he gained the respect and admiration of his mentor. In 1848 Marx published "The Communist Manifesto." Capital twenty-five years later, he still praised Engels for his detailed discussions of working class life.

The bourgeoisie are not without their critics. They believe that Marx spent too little time analyzing the differences between the industries involved and the types of labor. Marx interested in the conditions which would lead to the creation, the development, and the abolition of the working class. To explain these phenomena, he used the concept of abstract labor. He described the general relationship through which laboring activity is used and directed in capitalist society. The capital-wage-labor relation explained the production of wealth, the necessary means and the evolution of the capital system through prosperity and collapse. The "stratification of classes does not appear in its pure form, but is only superimposed on the intermediate stage of capitalistic exploitation of wage-labor everywhere." (4) In his later works, Marx provided a theory of capitalism in which this distortion was not crucial, but was merely a further and specific development of a trend within the system.

Even though the bourgeoisie acknowledge that the professional-managerial class is a "derivative class," they claim it is an outcome of the relationship of capital-wage-labor, which was the "foundation of the development of capitalist class relationships." (11,13) Marx, too, saw the bourgeoisie as a "syncratic" development. He believed that the bourgeoisie as a whole is not only the owners of the capital it is owned by the capitalists. It is a "process" that works to enrich the working class as it is component in the working class. He is in the process of "bourgeoisie."
white, skilled trade unionists who live in the suburbs of Boston. At the very least, they are unified by an economic interdependence and by a common relation to the means of production; and while this is a form of culture, the similarity need not extend further. If an all-encompassing culture defined a class, there would be some thirty or forty social classes in the United States today.

The Ehrenreichs go on to explain the lack of a common working class culture by recognizing that "culture has a memory," (1,12) one that may be a holdover from previous social conditions. It is true that what time working class culture becomes more and more alien, an alien concept that replaces an older, more organic one. The system of a system, if, however, a homogenous culture is not the trademark of a class, it can be said that the United States is still without a working class. At best, this cultural definition holds true only for the ruling and the professional-managerial segments of the population.

The Ehrenreichs claim that they can explain phenomena which Marx's "two-class model" never took into account, but with which many leftist writers are concerned—like the rise in power and size of professionals and managers, the gulf separating the left from the working class, and the appeal of technocratic conceptions of socialism. In itself, this is not a critique of Marx's theory, which the Ehrenreichs seem to have little familiarity with except in broad, generalized terms. Marxism was never meant as a replacement for sociological insight and detailed description of social relations. It is a reaction against modern socialism, (1,13) a means to discuss social problems without the harsh conclusions of a class theory.

Marx's concept of class is a concept that is not involved in the everyday reality of working class life, the economic and cultural differences, and many other aspects of social existence. The Ehrenreichs address these aspects, but in a way that de-emphasizes the overall trends and features of the system. For Marx, the capitalist-wage-labor relation produces the system, a system which evolves along many avenues, destroying some features while creating others, including the differences between mental and manual work.

The Ehrenreichs have taken this particular division of labor to a class distinction, and have revised Marx's theory in order to draw attention to it. In other words, they have taken the sociological concepts of mental and working class, altered their definitions slightly, and applied them with a Marxist terminology—an ironic undertaking for Marxists. At the present time, it is difficult to understand what anyone in the United States has to gain, either personally or scientifically, by following suit.

Gary Roth
7 January 1978
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white, skilled trade unionists who live in the suburbs of Boston. At the very least, they are unified by an economic interdependence and by a common relation to the means of production; and while this is a form of culture, the similarity need not extend further. If an all-inclusive culture defined a class, there would be some thirty or forty social classes in the United States today.

The Ethnographs go on to explain the lack of a common working class culture by recognizing that "culture has a memory," (1, 12) one that may be a holdover from previous social conditions. It is true that with time working class culture becomes more and more alike, an capitalist production generates work disciplines and consumption patterns which are established throughout the system. If, however, a homogeneous culture is the hallmark of a class, it can be said that the United States is still without a working class. At best, this cultural definition holds true only for the ruling and the professional-managerial segments of the population.

The Ethnographs claim that they can explain phenomena which Marx's "two-class model" never took into account, but which many leftists are concerned-with like the rise in power and size of professionals and managers, the gulf separating the left from the working class, and the appeal of technocratic conceptions of socialism. In itself, this is not a critique of Marx's theory, which the Ethnographs seem to have little familiarity with except in broad, generalized terms. Marxism was never meant as a replacement for sociological insight and detailed descriptions of people and social movements, a point which the Ethnographers confuse. In fact, the European population of the 1880's already accepted the analysis of capitalism versus workers before the field of sociology was developed as an academic discipline. "It would be more correct to say that 'sociology' is a reaction against modern socialism," (17) a means to discuss social problems without the harsh conclusions of a class theory.

Marxian provides the context, the context-wide analysis, within which sociology can help explain the day-to-day realities of working class life, the economic and cultural differences, and many other tangents of social existence. This theory addresses the overall trends and features of the system. For Marx, the capital-wage-labor relation produces the system, a system which evokes along many avenues, destroying some features while creating others, including the difference between mental and manual work.

The Ethnographs have taken this particular division of labor to be a class distinction, and have revised Marx's theory in order to draw attention to it. In other words, they have taken the sociological concepts of middle and working class, altered their definitions slightly, and supplied them with a Marxist terminology—an ironic undertaking for Marxists. At the present time, it is difficult to understand what anyone in the United States has to gain, either personally or scientifically, by following suit.
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