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BULLETIN MATTERS

DB31 begins our sixth year of publication. Somehow it's difficult to believe that we have survived this long, independent publications of this sort having a notoriously high mortality rate. In this issue DB continues to function as a forum of our end of the political spectrum with letters and articles expressing the writers' views on the
(British) Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation, the Socialist Labor Party, the Detroit IWW, the [Spanish] Coordinadora, syndicalism, left communism [à la ICC], and a review of a book which finds the common ground among the various currents of non-market socialism, which we have been calling "third force socialism," a term already preempted by a Schachtmanite group here in the U.S. unfortunately. Perhaps "non-market socialism" is the term we all should be using now for our end of the political spectrum.

Frank Girard
for the DB Committee

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Kamunist Kranti, Issue #2, April 1988, $1 from Bhupender Singh, 870 Jawahar Colony, N.I.T. Faridabad, 121001, India. The statement on the masthead of KK, "An attempt to participate in the construction of a world communist party," describes its purpose and explains its content. "On Basics," the lead article, is a theoretical contribution dealing with capitalism's rate of profit. The greater part of this issue is devoted to the group's correspondence with other--mainly European--left communist and councilist groups. KK also sent us copies of its December 1987 publication of the International Proposal to the Partisans of the World Revolution by Emancipation Obrera de Argentina and Militancia Clasista Revolucionaria, Uruguay, which we hope to reproduce in an upcoming issue of DB.

France--Winter 86-87: An Attempt at Autonomous Organization -- the Railway Strike: 23pp. No date and no price from Echanges et Mouvement, BM Box 91, London WC1 N3XX, England. This pamphlet provides important factual data on the causes of the strike and on its autonomous beginnings and development outside the official unions. A summary on the cover includes the following: "Unions are not needed to start and run a strike," "How the need of the system undermined its very operation," "Mass meetings and strike committees want to decide everything," "The autonomous rank and file movement tried to coordinate but..." "Toward other forms of autonomy in struggles." The pamphlet emphasizes the working class spontaneity perspective of Echanges et Mouvement, one of the few councilist publications available in English.

Here and Now, Number 6, 50p [$1] from P/H 2, c/o 340 West Princess St., Glasgow G4 9HF, Scotland. H&N is an independent libertarian socialist magazine. From an editorial: "When we started Here and Now we were concerned to emerge from behind barricades of left tradition and gaze unblinkingly at the wreckage beyond... What we see is a wasteland being sold to us as paradise..." This issue contains articles on anti-poll tax activism in Scotland, the British economy, the opposition in Eastern Europe, "The New Liberals," and other topics of interest to DB readers.


(Cost $5 on p.23)
Dear Comrades,

This is a brief response to Laurens Otter's reply to Mark Shipway concerning the editorship of Solidarity, the paper of the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation (APCF, later the Workers' Revolutionary League). As I am mentioned a couple of times by Laurens Otter and am responsible for at least one error, I thought it appropriate I should write to try and clarify matters.

Laurens Otter refers to my obituary of Willie McDougall and uses this to show that McDougall was not editor of Solidarity throughout the whole period of the paper's existence. I stated in the obituary that McDougall printed, published and edited a number of papers, including Solidarity 1938-40. Now, as Solidarity continued until 1945, Laurens Otter has assumed McDougall was no longer its editor after 1940. This is not the case, and I am responsible for the initial error. At the time I wrote the obituary (1951) I had limited sources to hand and was unaware the paper continued as long as 1945.

Today, with greater knowledge and access to further copies of the paper, I would maintain that McDougall was editor of the paper throughout the 1938-45 period from his various printing addresses in Glasgow and that the paper had nothing to do with the London Freedom group. The only connection between the two groups at this time was in the usual exchange and sale of papers.

Proving editorship of a libertarian socialist paper is a difficult task. From my research into both the paper and McDougall himself, I can find no evidence to suggest that anyone other than McDougall was editor. The comrades in Glasgow who remember McDougall and the paper certainly regarded him as editor, and express surprise and incredulity at the possibility of Plume being editor.

Apart from this there is a reference in a 1945 issue of Solidarity to Willie McDougall as editor. In an article on the work of the Glasgow Freedom Defence Committee McDougall, as chairman of the committee, is referred to as "editor of Solidarity".

If this is accepted as sufficient proof of McDougall's editorship, where does George Plume fit in? I know he was an occasional contributor to Solidarity in the period 1943-45, and he is remembered as an ILPer, pacifist and NLC lecturers, but not as someone who was central to the functioning of the WRL or Solidarity. If he was a "nominal editor ... to fit government wartime regulations", it was something very few, if any, knew about. I would therefore be grateful if Laurens Otter could supply full details of the trial (the treason trial) where his editorship was mentioned.

I should add that I am aware that Plume did face a trial in 1945, but not for treason and subversion. He came before a court martial charged with desertion, the standard charge for a C.O. who had failed
to report for the army. A similar point has been made by Albert Meltzer, who as Laurens Otter mentions knew George Plume well and reported Plume's C.O. trial for War Commentary (30 June 1945). In 1971 Meltzer, too, found himself dealing with a claim by Otter concerning the supposed "treason trial", and responded by pointing out that "Plume had never been charged with anything but the routine offence arising from conscientious objection" (Black Flag, Nov. 1971). Meltzer has recently confirmed this in a letter, noting that "there was no trial of him for anything other than not taking the medical." (August 1988)

Similarly Denis Hayes in Challenge of Conscience, the standard history of C.O.s in World War II, refers to Plume's C.O. trial but makes no mention of a treason trial.

Further, given that Plume was on the run as a C.O. in the 1943-5 period, it seems strange that anyone - especially Plume himself - would want to put his name forward as a nominal editor to satisfy government regulations.

What can we conclude from this for the dispute between Otter and Shipway? Firstly, McDougall was editor of Solidarity throughout the 1938-45 period, and Shipway's claim on this holds good. If Plume was a "nominal editor" for any period it is not a widely known, nor easily checked, fact; and so, secondly, it is certainly not a fact Shipway could be accused of deliberately or purposefully omitting.

Yours fraternally,

Bob Jones.

In DB #26 Monroe Prussack says, "Marin Dekovich was wrong to disagree with Comrade Girard that the organization of revolutionary unions will be part of the revolutionary act itself." I am sorry that Prussack ignored my arguments against Girard's position on strategies DeLeon left to us. DeLeon was not a god. He was a socialist scientist who understood the nature of the ruling class.

The Paris Commune was the really first modern-day lesson for we who are involved, consciously, in the class struggle. Though DeLeon did not live in the atomic age, his strategy for the liberation of our class from capitalism's tyranny is more valid now than when he first told us that "Victory at the ballot without industrial organization would be the day of the workers defeat," or words to that effect.

Are we to ignore the Paris Commune lesson? Consider the imperialist attacks against the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917. Even at that time, capitalist organization against any movement to change the system was well organized. As in the time of the Paris Commune, when the monarchies acted in coalition to destroy the Commune, so it was that that capitalist systems in the western world tried to act in
concert to destroy the budding anti-capitalist system then projected by the Russian revolution. Remember the White Army brigades that were financed by "outside" forces to pose a counter-revolutionary front to destroy the Reds? The strength of international capitalism is at its height.

Yes, it is true; the workers in this, the most powerful capitalist nation, are less organized into unions than was the case even 20 years ago, which speaks mountains about the strategy of the ruling capitalist strategists.

So what are we to do? Sit back and wait for "something" to spark our class into spontaneous organization? Based on what set of principles? Based on what idea of industrial organization? From nothing comes nothing. From something comes something. Whatever that "something" that comes from the minds of our class when it becomes conscious of its servile role in this system is, it has to be based upon a conscious understanding of alternatives. If there is no conscious understanding of what is, and what can be, there can be no basis for change.

DeLeon's advice for workers to organize politically and industrially, prior to any revolutionary thrust, is more valid in this Atomic Age than ever before. Today's ruling classes are more brutal, more criminal than ever before. Hiroshima, Nagasaki? Comrade Girard's advice on the point in question would lead to a proletariat defeat, and catastrophe for society.

M. Dekovich

August, 1988

In the DB #30, page 22, Monroe Prussack says, "It is my firm belief that acceptance of Lenin by the SLP has been responsible for the undemocratic behavior of the SLP under the leadership of Petersen. Not to have criticized the seizure of absolute by the Bolshevik Party, at the expense of all other people's organization, made it logically right for the SLP to regiment its rank and file members too."

I was a member of the SLP for 57 years. I read all of the SLP literature, the Weekly People, and the People. I listened to their speakers, but I never read nor heard that the SLP had accepted Lenin's teachings about revolution in America. Oddly enough, this is a well-known fact to the F.B.I., but not to Comrade Prussack, who had also been a member of the SLP.

The Bolshevik Revolution was celebrated throughout the world by oppressed people because it had abolished a then-current tyranny. At that time, to be "against" that revolution was like being against oppressed people everywhere. As a young member of the SLP, I, myself, could not like the SLP position on the Bolshevik Revolution because it did not accept Leninist teaching, in total. When Petersen made the statement, "...Russians are building a house on sand," I took that statement as anti-revolutionary. At the time, I did not understand the Russian, no less the American condition. Petersen was the first who warned the SLP not to accept the Bolshevik, and Lenin tactic, form and goal for the American Labor Movement. This made Petersen unpopular, and caused many SLP members to leave the Party and join pseudo-communist organizations.
I think Comrade Prusseck owes an apology to the SLP, and to Petersen, and to all DB readers. All of us, both in and out of the SLP, have learned our Marxism and DeLeonism in that organization, and no other place. Let us keep our knowledge of history strictly accurate!

Marin Dekovich

---

A PAGE FROM LABOR HISTORY REVISITED

Don Fitz, in his brief report on the "Detroit IWW" (DB #30), is led astray by his enthusiasm for his tendency. Whatever the merits of the 1908 split (and in my view there were solid grounds for believing DeLeon was out to seize control of the union) the Detroit "IWW" was clearly a minority split from the IWW. Even Fitz is forced to admit that it was a mere fraction the size of the larger body. Regardless of whether or not the Detroit "IWW" existed only on paper, it violated basic tenets of working-class solidarity and democratic process when it decided to operate under the name of the majority organization. Surely Fitz would agree that it would be unprincipled for a minority to secede from the SLP or from his Workers' Democracy and to commence operations under the larger body’s name. Why, then, is he prepared to accept it as legitimate when DeLeonists engage in such unprincipled and sectarian behavior against people he views (incorrectly) as anarcho-syndicalists?

But what I found particularly bizarre was his claim that the Detroit "IWW" was stronger than the genuine IWW in Australia. While it is true that the local SLP set up a dummy "IWW" before the IWW took root in that country, it was never anything more than the Australian SLP operating under another name according to everything I have read. The Australian IWW was repeatedly denounced by this paper "IWW," as by the boss press and the politicians (though, to their credit, the SLP did object—all the while blaming the victims for their plight—when the government began wholesale prosecutions of IWW members on the most transparent of frame-ups). The history of the IWW in Australia is reasonably well documented, and nowhere does anyone attribute any importance to the tiny Detroit "IWW" faction—for the simple reason that the members and the action were elsewhere. Fitz’s loyalty to his political tendency may be heartfelt, but he should be more careful not to let it blind him to the evident facts.

He might also want to consider just why DeLeon objected to forming the Detroit "IWW"/WITU. Nothing I’ve read suggests that it was from principled objections to absconding with the IWW’s name. Instead it appears that he (correctly) felt this maneuver would not advance the interests of the party. If this is true, what does it say for DeLeon’s theoretical integrity? Was the doctrine of socialist industrial unionism merely a ploy to help the SLP recruit among rebel workers? And, given the apparent primacy of the party in DeLeon’s thought, what sort of society would his party have brought about? One suspects that DeLeon would have shoved the SIUs to the side just as rapidly as Lenin dumped the soviets overboard when they ceased to be convenient.

--Jon Bekken, August 1988
La Coordinadora Estatal de los Estibadores Portuarios

American union bureaucrats have, as a class, sunk to an utterly contemptible level of depravity. Their forebears accepted a few crumbs in exchange for helping to divide workers by skill, sex, ethnic group, and white vs. blue collar. If workers managed to make some gains despite the labor officialdom, today's bureaucrats give back whatever they can. If they find any glimmer of membership control, the bureaucrats destroy what they can. If members resist or make any move for a decent world, the bureaucrats attack them, steal their money, or even place entire locals in "receivership" and destroy them. Not satisfied with their 30 pieces of silver for these betrayals, they peddle "Buy American" fixes as they oink and grunt their approval of the most barbaric slaughter of workers of the third world.

Finding the U.S. labor movement in such a degenerated state often results in radicals' abandoning the workplace as a focus of organizing. Or else, it can lead to bizarre ideas about unions, such as the belief that unions "must" become reformist or that unions cannot survive as revolutionary organizations for any length of time within capitalist society. While in Spain over Christmas-New Year season of 1987-88, I had the chance to talk with dozens of longshoremen about their union, "La Coordinadora." Coordinaadora has survived since 1976 as a union which is as revolutionary in its internal structure as in its social goals. Its unique combination of hiring hall job rotation, industrial unionism, and Spanish anarcho-syndicalist assemblyism make it one of the most democratic labor organizations anywhere in the world.

The Spanish hiring halls are a far cry from their American counterparts where teamster and longshore jobs are often plums for the best friends of the local job dispatchers. Both in Barcelona and Valencia, dockers point with great pride to the rows and columns of tags which each bear one longshoreman's number. Those at the top of the list receive the first jobs that come in. Job dispatchers of the Office for Port Labor (OTP), a division of the Spanish Labor Ministry, then move the tags of those who are hired to the bottom of the list.

This system of job rotation lies at the core of strikes which have shaken Spanish harbors ever since its institution shortly after Franco's death. Dockers repeatedly emphasize that there is no favoritism in their work assignments. With work evenly distributed, there is no group of unemployed longshoremen who might step in when others are on strike.

While the even distribution of work has been at least the stated goal of longshore hiring halls on the U.S. West Coast for over 30 years, there is an essential part of the Spanish system for which I know of no American counterpart. Their hiring halls include every docker - rank and file longshoremen, delegados (about the same as a shop steward in the U.S.), local president, and national officers. If you ask dockers how their union different
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from the larger ones you virtually always get the same answer: "In Coordinadora, the officers do the same work as everyone else." Well aware that election to office is the best way to escape from the workplace in most unions, Spanish longshoremen take pride in the everyday practice of their egalitarian ideology. They are uncompromising in their insistence that the only people who can negotiate for dockers are people who work on the docks.

This decade opened with a general port shut-down over the issue of Coordinadora's receiving the same money that the larger unions were getting from the post-Franco compromises. At each workplace, the government set up a system of comites de empresa (literally, "enterprise committees," but, more often translated "works committees"). They consist of delegados who are elected by a complex proportion which has the worker/delegado ratio increase as the number of employees increases. The larger unions worked out a deal whereby the government would reimburse each elected delegate for 40 hours of work per month to free him to do union tasks. Spanish port strikes erupted when the government repeatedly ignored Coordinadora's request that its delegados be reimbursed likewise.

Simmering beneath the ebb and flow of Spain's many port strikes has been a deep distrust between politically-influenced unions. The political tendencies
that mushroomed after Franco's death in 1975 seemed to pick up where things had left off in 1939. Though the Union General de Trabajadores (UGT) has close ties with PSOE, it has increasingly shown a willingness to criticize the social democratic party. How tightly the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) controls the "workers' commissions" (comisiones obreras, or, CC.OO.) depends largely on who you're talking to. The much smaller anarchist union, Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (CNT), has split into two factions, each claiming to be the true descendant of Civil War days.

When the first post-Franco government announced toleration of all parties except the PCE, longshoremen joined the 1976 strike to force its legalization. Shippers fired seven longshoremen as the government was giving in. The dockers then asked the PCE organize a strike to help get their jobs back and were told that the time was not right.

At this time of intense organizing efforts, the anarchists won decisive influence among workers who were already leaning in their direction. Dockers formed their own union, La Coordinadora Estatal de los Estibadores Portuarios, or, "la Coordinadora," as it has come to be known. Coordinadora immediately outdistanced the UGT and CC.OO. and became Spain's only industrial union. While the UGT and CC.OO. frequently win a majority in individual workplaces, they have never been able to match its 80% support throughout a major industrial sector. The longshore union has further consolidated itself by avoiding overt identification with either branch of anarchists. It urges all dockers to join, regardless of their political affiliation.

An ideology of egalitarianism which shows remnants of the anarchism practiced during the Spanish Civil War runs through its meeting structure. In perhaps the only historic instance of peasants' instituting land collectivization rather than resisting it, rural Aragonese tossed out the local gentry and shared the farming of large estates. Unlike Russia of 20 years earlier, Catalonian workers did not look to the state to organize industry, but seized and ran it themselves. Rural anarcho-communists and urban anarcho-syndicalists greatly expanded the practice of assemblyism -- the idea that general assemblies make important decisions and elected delegados have no power other than carrying out those mandates.

At the Barcelona strike meeting of delegados I attended on December 28, I was surprised to learn that only about half the 23 delegates had been present because I counted at least 25 people in the room. They explained that several delegados were on vacation, sick, or picketing and the rest were interested members. Hearing that any docker could attend delegado meetings aroused mixed emotions. On one hand, the openness of meetings was a welcome relief to the "business union" practices of closing the doors to all but the "leadership." Yet, it seemed that there was little point in electing delegados if anyone who
showed up could vote. It took the better part of my two week visit to appreciate the connection between old Spanish anarchism and Coordinadora of the 1980's. Ultimate power rests with General Assemblies which precede each delegado meeting and make the decisions which the delegados must then implement.

Even though there is tremendous pressure to conform to group decisions, occasionally a longshoreman will not give in. This happened early in Coordinadora's history, when it decided to have frequent zone and national meetings which would be funded from the money the government reimburses delegados for union work. Longshoremen voted that delegados would donate government money to the union, thereby requiring them to do their delegate work on top of a full month's longshore work. Their decision was consistent with the old anarchist practice of having much of the coordinating work done by a few highly dedicated activists. Two elected delegados refused to go along with their General Assemblies' majority vote and thereby revived another tradition of Spanish anarchism -- immediate recall of anyone in an elected position.

Spain has about 23 ports, each of which employs from 6 to over 1000 longshoremen. Coordinadora divides itself into five regions or zones: Catalonia, Valencia, Cadiz, Bilbao and the Canary Islands. Each zone has meetings between two or more representatives from each port. Meetings can be as infrequent as monthly, or, can be several times a week during negotiations or strikes. The National Coordinating Committee consists of the National Coordinator and one representative chosen by each zonal meeting. It is responsible for overall communication and nation-wide negotiations with the shippers and government.

These meetings are expensive because of their frequency. The majority of Coordinadora's budget goes to paying for food, lodging and time lost at work for representatives to attend these meetings. Representatives tend to be delegados who will be compensated for time lost at work due to zonal or national meetings but will not be compensated for local union work. When I was at the Valencia delegado meeting, there was considerable discussion of whose term it should be to go to the zonal meeting. The systematic attempts to broaden the number of dockers who attend these wider meetings provides an opportunity for many to become acquainted with the concerns of those in other ports.

This sharing of thoughts is vital to Coordinadora's survival because each local is totally autonomous. The concept of a national body putting a local into "receivership" (grabbing its bank account and appointing its officers) is unknown. It is impossible for the national union to force locals to go out on strike. Consequently, the only way a national port strike can occur is for each
autonomous union to recognize that a threat to another port is a threat to itself. Zonal meetings only allow for a few more representatives from a port that may be 100 times the size of a smaller port and the resulting vote distribution may seem quite undemocratic. It took me several days to appreciate that democracy in the sense of gaining 50% + 1 votes cannot apply to port strikes. Every major port must be shut down for the strike to win. Zonal meetings are not so much for dockers to have a formal vote as a time to figure out if the feeling of militancy is simultaneously high in every port.

Aware of the dangers of interport rivalry, Coordinadora's zonal meetings are a communication system which use strong feelings between longshoremen as a basis for solidarity between ports. There is an interesting parallel in the way the union selects its National Coordinator. There is such a dislike of power politics that he is chosen in a two part process: first, a national vote decides the port he will come from; and, second, dockers from that port elect him. The longshoremen thereby prevent the "electioneering" that accompanies nation-wide elections by having the officer determined only by people who have worked with him on the docks.

Sitting around talking sometimes provides rare glimpses into aspects of an organization that may be too intimate for its participants to recognize. I thought I picked up on a subtle difference between the feelings of union officers and other members about Coordinadora. Acutely aware that they are part of a movement that is undeniably unique, both eventually get around to asking, "What do you think about our union?" The average member who has never held office seemed to be waiting to hear, "muy fuerte," in confirmation that his union is "very strong." For a rank and file docker who probably had a relative tortured or murdered by the Franco regime, the chance to describe the ecstasy of throwing a rightist scab into the water is enough to make his day. It's not necessary to understand Catalanian or Valenciano to see the gleam in an eye that unquestionably translates, "We got to kick fascist ass that day."

Delegados and national officers who have been repeatedly exposed to negotiations are quicker to look beyond local physical skirmishes. The powerful array of shippers, government, and Socialist and Communist union federations lined up on the other side make them worry openly about Coordinadora's future.

It's easier to explore this worry than it is to delve into the difference in perception -- the topic of informal social power quickly brings nervous head nods from an organization based on the ideology of egalitarianism. No one in Coordinadora denies that people who are frequently elected to office have more input than those who have never run. But the obstacles they are continually bumping into have not stimulated thoughts about equality on this abstract a level. What is refreshing is an embarrassment about informal hierarchies which stands in such stark contrast to the typical "business union" officer who accepts union power elites as an unalterable fact of life.
As well as giving a distorted view of what unionism can be, America in the 1980's provides a pretty weird portrait of anarchism. Are anarchists a bunch of empty-headed twits whose non-conceptualization of work and self discipline would lead them down Pol Pot Path if they ever reorganized anything? Are anarchists starry-eyed seers who spin fantastic schemas of what a pure society should be, schemas which have no earthly connection to any ongoing class struggle? Or else, are anarchists merely sectarian dogmatists who throw such furious temper tantrums at each other that they exhaust all energy for attacking capitalism?

While talking with Spanish longshoremen, I gained an appreciation for anarchism which I don't think I ever could have in the U.S. Of course, I thoroughly disagree with the anarchist passion for abstaining from elections and wish I could get everyone in Coordinadora to read a few of Daniel DeLeon's ideas about entering the capitalist state in order to destroy the capitalist state. But directly to the task at hand, I wish I could get more Americans to realize that creating socialist relationships between people does not mean attempting to impose a preconceived dogma on others, for all such attempts are forms of vanguardist elitism, even if they come from self-proclaimed "libertarians." Rather, radicals would do much better to study several movements to see which have something positive to offer. The IWW in our own history is an outstanding example; but there are many ongoing struggles -- Solidarnosc, Coordinadora, the Central Obrero Boliviano, the Kilusang Mayo Uno of the Philippines, and the Coalition of South African Trade Unions -- from which Americans have much to learn.

Don Fitz

Dear Readers:

In the Discussion Bulletin Number 30, Monroe Prussack has a letter in which he reports that he attended "a meeting to reorganize De Leonism." Properly, he should write organize the De Leonist movement -- not De Leonism. He then expresses the inaccuracy that "people affiliated with the Socialist Labor Party (SLP) dominated the meeting." The fact is that those present were not members but were formerly associated with the SLP.

Monroe Prussack's presentations are divergencies from historical validity. He states that "it is my firm belief that acceptance of Lenin by the SLP has been responsible of the undemocratic behavior of the SLP under the leadership of Petersen." It is as one were saying that the Spanish grand inquisitor, Torquemada, learned of the barbarous practices from one of his henchmen. Before he had heard of Lenin, Petersen was instrumental in devising the harsh rules, and the vigor with which he had them enforced.

These words of wisdom then follow: "Thanks to the religious author of The Power of Positive Thinking I was able to work
with De Leonists whom I don't regard too highly because that is what we have." It is, indeed, illogical logic.

Insofar as positive thinking, his is positively inept. When principles are involved, a man does not work with those that he does not regard too highly; as he puts it, "because that is what we have" -- whatever that is suppose to mean.

He is utterly confused when he writes: "Marxism taught me to regard religion as a popular way to interpret society, which is made up of people and the world." However, Marxism did teach: "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people."

Prussack has his own interpretation of history, far and away from Marx's materialist conception of history. I know that Marxism also taught: "The religious reflex of the real world can, in any case, only then finally vanish, when the practical relations of everyday life offer to man perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations with regard to his fellowmen and to nature."

Yours sincerely,

Louis Lazarus

Dear Comrade Winslow,

In DB 30 you asked what I'm willing to DO for the Revolution. Very well, I'll tell you--NOTHING. The question isn't what I am, or what anyone else is, willing to do for the Revolution, but what the Revolution is willing to do for ITSELF.

If the Revolution is to be the people's Revolution, then they must initiate, conduct, consolidate, and perpetuate, it. Otherwise, it's not theirs. As soon as the Revolution becomes dependent on leaders, then it's the latter's, not the people's.

In Marx's time, when the French Revolution was still recent history, and 1830 was "just the other day," and 1848 was just around the corner, and 1871 wasn't too far off, it was easy to believe in the "inevitable" abolition of social inequality. But by 1914 the dream was shattered, and it became very doubtful whether the masses would spontaneously liberate themselves from class rule.

The Leninist vanguard party was created as the only hope. But if workers require a militant vanguard, then their situation is hopeless--as all Revolutions led by such groups to date unequivocally demonstrate. It isn't movers and shakers the masses need, nor even "educators" and "organizers." THEY NEED INITIATIVE.

But didn't Marx tell us to "change the world"? Yes, and what he meant was that it must, and would, change itself. Do you think Marx really believed that servile wage-slaves could be made into free men and women by political activists? If he did, he was a fool. What Marx actually claimed was that the proletariat contained within ITSELF its own impulse toward self-determination, and that that impulse would ripen of its own accord--with or without a "leadership."

Today, we have good reason to question this faith. Yet, even if Marx was wrong about the inevitability of proletarian self-eman-
ciaption, he remains right about one aspect of it—unless workers liberate THEMSELVES, they'll never be free.

Am I advocating apathy? Not at all. I'm advocating AUTONOMY. No genuine revolutionary needs a following, let alone a vanguard—all he or she needs is the WILL TO SELF-DETERMINATION. I serve the Revolution by taking responsibility, not for it, but for myself. That's what I'm willing to DO!

For a free society of self-governing individuals,
Walt Seasons

WHO ARE THE ANARCHO-SYNDICALISTS?

I want to thank Frank Girard again for his willingness to print articles in Discussion Bulletin on the differences between the WSA and the anarcho-syndicalists at LLR, since these letters are of marginal interest to his many Deleonist readers. It is unfortunate that anarchists do not have a similar bulletin where these things can be hashed out. I will try to be brief both to spare your readers and because I feel that drawn out debates are useless with a group that constantly changes its official positions like WSA.

Contrary to Tom Wetzel's suggestion, the issue has never been whether or not anarchists should read Marx, nor whether anarchists should refuse to work with marxists under any circumstances. Rather our disagreement with WSA is over its notion that Marxist "economics" are indispensable to the social revolution, and that anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists must build a partnership with the so-called "libertarian" wing of the marxist movement. It is one thing to read marxist literature, and quite another to actively propagate in favor of marxism as does WSA.

It is our position and also that of most in the anarcho-syndicalist movement that anarchism and marxism have irreconcilable differences that prevent the kind of "synthesis" sought by WSA. Wetzel cites examples of anarchist and marxists working together but always neglects to mention the other side of the story: Marx railroading Bakunin out of the First International, the split of the First International into marxist and anarchist wings, the purging of anarchists from the Second International, the 1908 split of the IWW into its revolutionary and "political" wings, the suppression of the Mahknovists, the conflicts with the POUM trying to takeover the CNT, the diatribes by the council communists against anarchism, etc. The problem with alliances between anarchists and marxists is that eventually they come into conflict and one or the other must prevail. Short-term cooperation is possible, but anarchists cannot allow themselves to be lulled into a false sense of security and must take necessary precautions to defend ourselves and self-management. The most fundamental precaution is to keep our organizations free from marxist domination.
It is also important to point out that there is not much basis for Wetzel's separation between the "economic" Marx and the "political" Marx. The fundamental basis of marxism is that politics are subordinate to economics. One cannot be a marxist without agreement on that point. If one is a marxist, one believes that things like authoritarianism and bureaucracy are solely the result of capitalism, whether in its "private" or "state capitalist" forms. Suppress capitalism, the marxists say, and bureaucracy, classes, the State, etc, must "wither away". This is nonsense say the anarchists. While not denying that economic power leads to political power, we recognize the psychological and sociological roots of authoritarianism as well. Therefore we place more emphasis on decentralization and putting limits on power, even on those who claim to govern or manage as workers or on the behalf of the working class. Anyone who claims to be both an anarchist and believe in marxist economics does not know what they are talking about. Both anarchists and marxists share a SOCIALIST economics, but only the marxists believe that the present and future of human society are DETERMINED by economics.

Wetzel's version of labor history is just as selective of the facts as and one-sided as his radical history. His claim that the IWW evolved from the AFL is absurd. After the IWW was formed, the trade unionists pulled out within months, including the bulk of the Western Federation of Miners. It was not a mass transformation of the AFL, but a minority of revolutionaries who built the IWW from about 10,000 members in 1908 to over 100,000 in the early 20's. These new members were organized directly into the IWW without first going through the AFL. Thus history shows that it is not necessary for AFL-CIO locals to secede en masse, in order to build a revolutionary union. Indeed, it is far more likely that AFL-CIO locals would secede if there were an already functioning revolutionary labor federation for them to affiliate with. The recent odyssey of Local P-9 through the various "rank-and-file" networks is a case in point. A revolutionary union with its act together could have attracted the Hormel workers into affiliating.

After cutting through the gobbledygook and obscurationist, Wetzel's position really boils down to this: small groups of radical workers should make no effort to initiate or even encourage the formation of revolutionary unions or councils, until large numbers of less radical workers do so on their own. To do otherwise, as Wetzel puts it, is to do something "preconceived" (ie. not conceived by WSA). Yet if the purpose of WSA is not to encourage all efforts at building revolutionary labor organizations, but instead wait for others to take action, of what use is WSA to workers, particularly anarcho-syndicalist workers? The answer to that is, of course, "none whatsoever", assuming one wants to build a revolutionary labor movement. However, Wetzel makes it clear in Discussion Bulletin #29 that building
revolutionary unions or councils is not WSA's purpose anyway. Rather it is to build a libertarian left political organization to seek influence (and power) within the trade unions, a sort of anarcho-marxist version of Teamsters for a Democratic Union or its spinoff "Solidarity".

WSA's goal of building a political organization runs counter to their mandate as a propaganda section of the IWA, but this doesn't bother the WSA. The IWA franchise is just something they use for recruiting purposes. Thus it is not surprising that while they sent 6-7 pages of diatribes against us at LLR, they said nothing to rebut Mick Larkin, the British voice of the CNT-U "renevados". How can any anarcho-syndicalist "critically support" the renevados, who are collaborating with the Spanish government's efforts to integrate the unions into the State, and have stolen both the name and the funds of the CNT? The renevados, regardless of the repression dealt out to some of its members, are SCAFS, who disregarded the decision of the majority in the CNT to boycott the elections to the phoney enterprise committees. The CNT-U is an opportunist outfit which, like the UDM (the class collaborationist split from the British miners), should be denounced by all revolutionary workers.

Jeff Stein, C/o PO Box 2824, Station A, Champaign, IL 61820

PS. To Richard Laubach: The fact that you quote denunciations from CNT militants of market-syndicalist deviations during the Spanish Revolution, actually refutes your position, not mine. It proves that market-syndicalism runs counter to CNT principles. So you can hardly use that as evidence that your own market-syndicalism is compatible with anarcho-syndicalism.

To Groups & Militants in the Proletarian Milieu:

Enclosed is a copy of a leaflet ("NO TO ELECTIONS, YES! TO CLASS STRUGGLE"), which we are currently distributing as widely as possible. As the headline suggests, this leaflet has as its axis a denunciation of the bourgeois electoral circus, in general, and the attempt by the bourgeoisie to radicalize its left flank in order to mislead militant workers, in particular. It poses the working class alternative of class struggle and revolution.

The current campaign of bourgeois mystification by the ruling class necessitates an intervention by revolutionaries to clearly pose the issues for the working class.

We call upon all groups and militants in the milieu to:
1) reproduce and distribute the enclosed leaflet, if in agreement with its contents;
2) take a clear position denouncing the electoral campaign of the bourgeoisie;
3) to make the denunciation of the electoral mystification the focal point of articles and editorials in the press;
4) to draft and distribute leaflets to the workers on this topic;  
5) to communicate comments on the contents of the enclosed leaflet to the ICC.

Revolutionary regards,  
INTERNATIONALISM

INTERNATIONALISM  
POST OFFICE BOX 288  
NEW YORK, NY 10018-0288

---

No! To Elections  
Yes! To Class Struggle

Every four years the biggest circus of them all comes to town—the electoral circus. The ringmasters of the electoral circus are guided by the cynical principle that there's a sucker born every minute. Through demagoguery and democratic sleight of hand, they try to play us all for suckers. They tell us that by casting a ballot in their fake elections that we are free, that we are participating in determining the fate of society. But this is a lie, a swindle.

For working people capitalist elections mean nothing. We have nothing to gain no matter what the outcome. Whether it's a liberal or a conservative, whether it's Jackson or Bush, Dukakis or Cuomo who wins, the austerity attacks will escalate, war preparations will go on and capitalism's decline into misery and suffering will continue. Just look at what's happened in France where the workers elected a 'socialist' government in 1981 and got the same attacks on their standard of living experienced by workers in countries run by rightwingers like Reagan or Thatcher.

Today the left is mobilizing around the campaign of Jesse Jackson, who pretends to be the champion of the working class, but whose real function for capitalism is to bring disenchanted blacks and militant white workers back into the electoral process, where their anger and militancy is harmless. Jackson's campaign does not challenge capitalism nor offer a promise of 'economic justice.' Rather it serves capitalism by diverting and derailing the struggles of those who have begun to understand the need to struggle against capitalism, by spreading illusions about the possibility of improvements within the capitalist system.

The ruling class has a strategy to keep us in line and under control. This strategy uses a division of labor between the right and left. While the right administers governmental attacks against the workers and the poor, the left helps to impose austerity by pretending to oppose the government's policies in order to keep control of working class discontent and to derail it into harmless directions. Over the last ten years, while unions have talked tough about fighting the Reagan administration's attacks, they have helped ram wage cuts and givebacks down the throat of workers. While Democratic politicians have made eloquent speeches about 'economic justice' and even controlled both houses of Congress, the Democrats have helped push through budget cuts which have slashed the standard of living.

Workers have no choice but to reject this ideological campaign of the ruling class and take up the struggle to defend their interests against the capitalist attacks. The economic crisis is unrelenting. Things will only get worse and worse, as they have done for more than a decade now. Against the economic crisis, against the austerity attacks, against the electoral mystification, there is only one answer: the class struggle.

While the unions and the left try to divert us to mobilize for the campaign, we have to redouble our efforts to resist wage cuts, layoffs and speedups. We have to turn our backs on the electoral circus and step up the struggle. We have to spread our struggles, linking up with workers in other sectors and companies. We have to take struggles into our own hands, organizing mass assemblies of strikers and electing strike committees controlled directly by the strikers. In so doing workers will develop a revolutionary movement which will be able to openly confront and destroy capitalism and replace it with one controlled by working people themselves, in which exploitation of man by man will be banned forever.

The electoral circus may be in town, but workers must show them we aren't buying any tickets.

—Internationalism
Dear Comrades,

This is intended as a reply to Internationalism's letter in DB30 and as a review of Communist Organizations & Class Consciousness (128pp., No Date, $3 from P.O. Box 288, New York, NY 10018), which it invited DB to review. The program and analyses in Communist Organizations and Class Consciousness (CO&CC), published by the International Communist Current (ICC) of which Internationalism is the U.S. section, have much to recommend them to third force, non-market, libertarian socialists. These include its view of the USSR as state capitalist, its rejection of reformism, and its views on unionism and third-world nationalist struggles.

Especially apt, in my view, is CO&CC's description of the changes in organizational theory made necessary by capitalism's cooptation of the mass social democratic parties and the trades union movement. By 1900, as CO&CC points out, the social democratic parties had become the left wing of capitalism's political machine. At the same time the trades unions had become anti-revolutionary and integrated into the economic system as a labor control mechanism.

While agreeing with much of the pamphlet, I do have serious differences with some of the ideas it presents. These begin with its acceptance of the "Bolshevik" or "Leninist" concept of the revolutionary party. For regardless of its disavowal of what it terms the "substitutionism" of the Bolsheviks for the working class in Russia after the revolution, CO&CC's insistence on the need for a leadership party that will "point out the general line of march" for the working class prior to the revolution and its failure to call for its own dissolution immediately after the revolution ensures its proceeding on a substitutionist course after the revolution.

One evidence to support this prediction is its attitude toward the role played by the Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution. While recognizing that the Bolsheviks substituted themselves for the working class by gathering power into their hands after the November revolution, it fails to see that Bolshevik action during the entire post-February period was substitutionist, its Central Committee and Lenin privately debating when and how to stampede the Petrograd working class and Bolshevik supporters in the military garrison into seizing power.

Later the party maneuvered to control the Military Revolutionary Committee (MRC) set up by the Soviet during the Kornilov threat in late August. Then at the time of the insurrection in October (November) it becomes clear from all four of the eye-witness accounts that I read that the decision for the insurrection was made at a closed meeting of the Bolshevik Central Committee on November 6. What could be more substitutionist than to have the tactics and moment of the revolutionary act dictated by the party rather than the working class? State power was seized in the name, not of the Soviets but the Military Revolutionary Committee headed by the Trotsky and the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks then received state power from the hands of the MRC. Incidentally, a serious criticism of the pamphlet is its
entirely off-base conclusion about this action: "The workers as a whole made decisions and held in their hands the reins of history, even if
day to day military actions were implemented by a small number of
people." (p. 81) and "No party substituted itself for the practical
decisive activity of the workers." (p. 62)

A major issue here is the concept of "pointing the line of march,"
which Internationalism advanced in DB30, quoting from the Communist
Manifesto. If Internationalism means no more by the phrase than
pointing out to our class that capitalism is the source of our problems
and socialism the solution and describing the general outline of a
socialist society, then one can agree with the concept. But in the
case of the Russian Revolution it meant that the political party seized
the moment, decided on the action, and with the support of war-weary
peasant boys in the Petrograd garrison and Kronstadt, seized power.
This action placed it in a position to continue its substitutionism and
laid the groundwork for post-revolutionary actions of Lenin and Stalin,
on to Gorbachov.

In some respects Internationalism's concept of unitary organizations,
explained in some detail in COACC, seems to accord with the reality of
revolutionary behavior as we have seen it historically. In Russia
these unitary organizations took the form of councils of the
revolutionary elements—industrial workers, peasants, and soldiers (the
sons of peasants).

Internationalism suggested that my earlier letter indicated the lack
of a position on this matter and that of the revolutionary party.
While agreeing with Internationalism that what it calls unitary
organizations will appear and must be encouraged by revolutionaries, I
am much less certain about the form they will take. Whether they will
be workers councils in industrially advanced countries remains to be
seen.

In this connection, around the turn of the century the American De
Leon and like-minded critics of the coopted, trade union movement
reacted by organizing a revolutionary socialist industrial union, the
IWW. It is at least possible that our class will produce a new union
movement on syndicalist (IWW/SIUist) lines as the unitary organizations
in a new period of revolutionary activity by workers in the advanced
industrial nations of Western Europe, the Far East, and the Americas.
Militating toward that end, it seems to me, is the the lack of a
peasantry and a military derived from it in these parts of the globe,
the tendency of industrial workers to form unions when under attack,
and the current disillusionment of workers with the capitalist union
movement.

The matter of the revolutionary party remains a question for me and,
I believe, for others in our political sector. Some of us are, at the
very least, ambivalent about national and international political
parties of socialism. On the one hand they do serve as the mechanism
through which revolutionaries can debate, discuss, and gather the
resources to disseminate revolutionary ideas among our class. On the
other hand they have a tendency toward oligarchic authoritarianism,
organizational patriotism which is very divisive, and substitutionism. All these seem to be inherent and to resist the best efforts of their members to mitigate them.

All of our experience in the nearly three quarters of a century since the Russian Revolution tells us 1) that such parties are weak reeds at best, at least in the period of working class quiescence, 2) that our class is infinitely suspicious of them and their motives, and 3) that they begin to decay almost as soon as they are born because they provide a warm, wet place for the growth of hair-splitting factionalism and personal feuds.

Any party, national or international, that sees itself as destined to provide leadership for the working class and the unitary organizations is bound to fail. It will be lost in the myriad of leagues, parties, currents, and other groups even in our own political sector, not to mention the social democratic radicals and the Leninist denominations.

And what if such a party does succeed in dominating the revolutionary movement—-the unitary organizations—to the point that the Bolsheviks did in 1917? Can anyone really believe that such a party wouldn’t be “forced” to take the same path as the Bolsheviks to “save” the revolution, regardless of its good intentions.

Under these circumstances, aren’t we, the revolutionary militants Internationalism speaks of, better off avoiding any sort national or international unified party and instead working individually and in autonomous local groups to raise the consciousness of our class and to let the organizations throw up spontaneously by our class—-the SIUs or Workers’ councils—-set up as much or as little of a political party reflex as they need?

I wish to end this by recommending to the reader ICC’s very serious and well thought out pamphlet and to thank Internationalism for the opportunity to answer its letter. In the latter connection I should point out to DB readers that I haven’t appointed myself their spokesperson, that the ideas expressed here are my own, and that the DB is open to further responses to Internationalism’s letter. Frank Girard

__________________________

Dear DBers:

I’m writing in regards to Bob Rossi’s remark in a recent DB about WSA’s problem with our “New York ethnicity”. Just what is this “New York ethnicity”? And what is the problem it caused?

Yours in Brother- and Sisterhood,
Martin Comack
NON-MARKET SOCIALISM IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES;
Edited by Maximilien Rubel and John Crump; other contributors: Adam
Buick, Stephen Coleman, Alain Pengan, Mark Shipway; 187 pp., 1987;
L8.95 from MacMillan Press, Ltd.

It would be accurate, I think, to call this the most important book
yet published on the politics of our end of the political spectrum. It
serves the same purpose in defining the complexity of our political
perspectives that STATE CAPITALISM: THE WAGES SYSTEM UNDER NEW
MANAGEMENT [reviewed in DB22] does in expressing our views on state-run
economies.

First, the book makes it clear that 'non-market socialism' is almost
exactly what the DB has been referring to as third-force socialism.
The authors make the same clear distinction most DB readers do between
the social democrats and Leninists on the one hand and the genuine
socialists on the other. In fact, John Crump carries the point even
further, showing how Leninism and and social democracy function as
political expressions of state capitalism at different levels of
industrial development. Leninism, true to its preindustrial Russian
origins, is best suited to administer state capitalism in the third
world, while social democracy serves the state capitalist needs of the
industrialized West.

But the principal thrust of the book is the history and present
circumstances of non-market socialism. To this end the first chapter by
Maximilien Rubel finds the roots of non-market socialism in Marx and
Engels' critique of the social reform movements of the early nineteenth
century. The utopian schemes of Weitling, Cabet, Proudhon, St. Simon,
et al. were variations of early social reform programs that retained
that most basic of capitalist characteristic, the market and presaged
modern state capitalism. Today, in one of those ironies of history,
the major parties that claim to represent the heirs of Marx and Engels,
the various social democratic and Leninist parties, many of them in
power and thus in a position to impose their views on the media, have
succeeded in identifying socialism with state capitalism in the minds
of most people.

In his chapter, "Non-Market Socialism in the Twentieth Century," John
Crump sees a major blow to genuine socialism in the growth of
'socialist states' after the turn of the century. This phenomenon
began with the transformation of the social democratic parties from
revolutionary opponents of capitalism into de facto supporters.
Through efforts to increase numbers, the parties began to emphasize
immediate demands at the expense of their revolutionary programs. By
the turn of the century many of these parties had become, in effect,
capitalism's leftwing supporters. World War I cemented the
partnerships as party after party supported its national bourgeoisie.

The Russian Revolution brought with it the socialist states modeled
after the Bolshevik example. Then, in addition, post-WWI "socialist
governments' were formed in many western countries as the social democrats took over the administration of capitalist states when the ruling class deemed it necessary. Such socialism, designed to preserve capitalism, whatever the form, meant opposing working class interests. Thus socialism was hardly likely to arouse working class enthusiasm as an alternative to capitalism.

And the working class instincts in this matter are correct. The programs and objectives of what are popularly understood to be the socialist/communist parties, whether social democratic, communist, Castroite, Trotskyist, Stalinist, or Maoist, are directed toward gaining or retaining political control of capitalist states, not destroying them.

This leaves a tiny political element—what Crump calls "the thin red line" of genuine socialists/communists in five major currents. In chronological order of their appearance on the political stage they are Anarcho-Communists, Impossibilists, Council Communists, Bordigists, and Situationists.

Individual chapters of from 20 to 25 pages provide historical detail and contemporary data on the various strands of these currents. None of them, I suspect, will please all DB readers. For example, this reviewer was disappointed by Alain Pengan's inexplicable omission of anarchosyndicalism from his chapter on anarchism. Also, probably because of the origin and experience of the authors, the book is heavily skewed toward European events and organizations. Steve Coleman's chapter on Impossibilism, for example, devotes only two pages to the Socialist Labor Party, which with the IWW—also barely mentioned—constituted the bulwark of non-market socialism in North America.

Crump identifies four principles these currents hold as requisite for a socialist society: 1) Production will be for use and not for sale on the market, 2) Distribution will be according to need, and not by means of buying and selling, 3) Labour will be voluntary, and will not be imposed by a coercive wages system, 4) A human community will exist, and social divisions on class, nationality, sex or race will have disappeared. To these he adds two more: To differentiate non-market socialists from "all varieties of Leninists including Trotskyists," "5) Opposition to capitalism as it manifests itself in all existing countries. And to emphasize rejection of the transitional state/dictatorship of the proletarian perversion of socialism advocated by social democracy and Leninism: "6) Capitalism can be transcended only by immediately being replaced by socialism."

He attributes the hostility that divides various elements of the "thin red line"—anarchist versus marxist, for example—to differences in tactics. Other deviations he sees from the six "principles" include the vanguardism of the Bordigists and the seeming parliamentarism of the SPGB. To these we can add the question of autonomy versus centralization and free access versus labor time vouchers. In fact, it seems to me that the six principles provide the beginning of debate rather than the last word on inclusion in the milieu of non-market
socialism.

Besides exhaustive documentation for each chapter, an especially attractive feature for DB readers is a "Postscript" in which the authors have provided information on contemporary groups and publications, including addresses, in each of the "currents." The Discussion Bulletin is listed as are the SLP, SPGB, ICC, the works of Paul Mattick, and many others.

That the book is a must for DB readers who want more information on the history and present condition of non-market/third-force socialism goes without saying. Obtaining it poses no problem for British and presumably other European readers who have only to write to the publishers for the paperback edition for \$8.95. American readers are faced with the fact that St. Martin's Press, the American distributor sells only the clothbound edition at \$39.95 !!!!. However, we have found a source willing to sell the paperback. \$8.95 at the current exchange, amounts to about \$18 (not cheap even for the paperback). In addition there will be postage and handling charges. This source will unfortunately accept only bulk orders. We at DB are willing to make such an order. Anyone interested should send us \$10 earnest money by October 1. We will order the books enclosing full payment. Purchasers will then have to mail us the balance—probably around \$8—to get their copies.

(Cont'd from p.2)

Pamphlet Laurens Otter, a frequent contributor to DB, examines various analyses of the Russian Revolution—Stalinist, Trotskyist, orthodox Marxist (SPGB), and others. He opts for the state capitalist theory of Rosmer and Weil from which he sees the work of Castoriadis, C.L.R. James, and Dunayevskaya emerging.

Socialism and Democracy number 6 Spring/Summer 1988, 227 pp., \$4 from Research Group on Socialism and Democracy, P.O. Box 375, Graduate Center, 33 W. 42nd St., New York, NY 10036. It is published twice yearly. S&D can be termed "radical"—for lack of a better word to describe left academic, anti-western capitalist journals. Much of this issue is devoted to theory, examining the "socialist" states: Cuba, USSR, Yugoslavia, and East Germany. Two articles which might interest DB readers are "Democracy, Rights, and Conflict in the Soviet Union" by Sander Lee, which seeks to explain Glasnost by reference to Lenin's theory of the state as found in The State and Revolution, and "The Communist League of Yugoslavia: Elite of Power or Consciousness" by Laslo Skelj, who compares the functioning of the Yugoslavian CP (Communist League of Yugoslavia) with what he describes as the three models of revolutionary organizations: those in which Marxist revolutionaries are a part of the working class, not directors of it; Leninist, modeled after Blanqui's revolutionary elite, vanguard party of the proletariat; and the Luxemburgian/Council Communist reaction to the Leninist vanguard party: a return to the original marxist concept. He locates the Yugoslavian CP in the second camp, using as evidence statistics and the historical record.
Adam Buick        R36
40 Granville Gardens
London W5 3PA
England

_Libertarian Labor Review_. Published twice yearly, subtitled "A Journal of Anarcho-Syndicalist Ideas and Discussion," number 5, 48pp. $2.50 from P.O. Box 2624 Station A, Champaign, IL 61820. This issue contains a very valuable article on the Sandinista Counter-Revolution, a couple of hardline articles on Marxism and Marxists, and an editorial very critical of the IWW and WSA calling for another nationwide syndicalist organization.

"Conference on Workers Self-Organization Agenda as of August 21, 1988" This is the agenda for the conference advertised on page 8 where readers will find an address to write to for additional information. Among the meetings listed in the agenda are these: "Shop-Floor Action of American Auto Workers," "Organizing St. Louis Gas Workers in the 1930s," "Fire Our Land Too - The Legacy of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union," "American Labor in the 1980s," "Third World Organizing - South Africa, Phillipine Islands -- Kilusang Mayo Uno, Bolivia - C.O.B." and more including labor revolts in Eastern Europe, Wobbly organizing in the eighties, alternatives to the vanguard party, and Italy in the 1920s when 600,000 workers occupied their workplaces.