BULLETIN MATTERS

In its role as forum for anti-statist, non-market socialists, this issue continues some ongoing debates and begins a couple of new ones. First, Robin Cox defends the proposal of the Guildford Branch of the Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB) for a new revolutionary strategy against the criticism by Adam Buick published in DB28. Also in this issue, Adam Buick responds to Cox's letter. Besides the principles involved, DB readers will be interested in the internal dynamics of the SPGB, especially its handling of internal dissension. One might wish that the SPGB would publish a manual on the subject and send a copy to 914 Industrial Ave., Palo Alto, CA.
An new controversy in the making is an article by Tom Wetzel evaluating some Marxian concepts from an anarcho-syndicalist perspective. The article includes a critique of an article on Marxism by Sam Dolgoff in the latest issue of the Libertarian labor Review (alluded to in DB31). Also, a former subscriber takes issue with some ill-tempered messages to a couple of recent DB contributors. Ben Perry questions Jon Bekken's assertions about the role of De Leon in the IWW. Laurens Otter questions Bob Jones' facts on an aspect of anarchist history during WWII.

Readers will be interested to learn that the Socialist Labor Party's current management has returned in the past year to the task of further purification of the party. This has resulted in the expulsion of most of the New Jersey members and, as one might expect, a new group of DeLeonist dissidents whose statement of principles and purposes is published in this issue. A correspondent tells me that the group has changed its name from Regional Committee to Committee for Socialist Union (CSU).

The final item is a review of the anthology Questioning Technology, which was briefly described a couple of issues ago. At that time the point was made that it was worth reviewing at length.

Once again, the DB exists to serve as a forum for anti-statist, non-market socialists of all stripes. We solicit your letters and articles for publication. All copy should be camera ready. Please single space and use narrow margins to conserve space -- and a dark ribbon if possible.

Frank Girard
for the DB Committee

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Elements of Refusal by John Zerzan; Left Bank Books, 1988; 263 pages, $8.95 from Left Bank Distribution, 5241 University Way, NE, Seattle, WA 98105. In this collection of twenty of his essays John Zerzan seeks to destroy illusions about contemporary society. As he says in the preface, "The modern world offers a severely degraded texture of life without new compensations to make it other than intolerable...I can only hope that these selections contribute in some way to the further erosion of power's lingering sources." Like the anthology on technology which he edited (reviewed elsewhere in this issue) this volume deserves a longer review, in part because of some essays on Marxism and unionism. We hope to have an extended review in an upcoming issue.

Readers interested in a source of anti-authoritarian books and pamphlets should write to Left Bank Distribution for its catalog, easily the most complete on the continent.

International Dockers' Struggles in the Eighties is one of several pamphlets we received recently through the kindness of a Canadian
Dear Comrades,

It seems to me that Adam Buick's letter (DR28) has quite misunderstood, and has consequently misrepresented much of what our circular, *The Road to Socialism* (DR27 & DR28) had to say. There are, moreover, gaping lacunae in his arguments which he attempts to paper over, I fear, with somewhat doctrinaire assertions which show little appreciation of the fundamental issues involved and even less of an historical imagination essential to a critical marxism.

I know that Cde Buick is capable of better than this. To be fair he has raised some important questions which those of us within the Socialist Party sympathetic to the Guildford circular will need to address. Ansofar as this will lead to self clarification this is to be welcomed.

Readers of *Discussion Bulletin* will have noticed that much of what was written in our circular—particularly the second half—was couched in a somewhat tentative form. There was a good reason for this. In mapping out an alternative scenario to the traditional one offered by the Socialist Party (SGB) and its companion parties such as the World Socialist Party of the United States (WSPUS), we have no illusions of having captured the complexity of foreseeable social change accompanying the future growth of the world socialist movement. Indeed, we do not even assert that such growth is historically inevitable. Reality is far more complex than even the most elaborate theory can encapsulate. Consequently, all our attempts to comprehend it, let alone map out the future, can at best arrive at only the most meagre approximation of the truth.

Having said that, I must correct the impression that Laurens Otter (DR28) seems to harbour, that the proposals adumbrated in our circular are being urged upon the SGB for immediate implementation. This is not entirely true. I fully agree with Laurens observations that the relevance of such proposals will depend on the prevailing circumstances—indeed, this assumption is fundamental to our whole scenario and it is a pity that many of our critics within the SGB have not also grasped the significance of this point. They have assumed that that we are suggesting that the proposals outlined in our circular are capable of implementation at the present time and under the prevailing circumstances whereas we had specifically said they must await a significant growth of the socialist movement before they can be realised. We are looking, therefore, to the future, to a time when the socialist movement is a significant social force. It is this, unfortunately, which Adam has quite evidently failed to see.

Nevertheless, there are some proposals which we felt could be implemented by the Socialist Party at the present time. These had to do with the practical organisation of the party itself. We proposed, for example, the formation of a publishing co-operatives and possibly also a research institute engaging in a closely knit symbiotic relation with each other and the party organisation itself. We suggested also that the party could take on the additional function of a sort of clearing house for cooperative ventures undertaken by members themselves. But, most importantly, we suggested that at a theoretical level, the party could and should develop a more multidimensional approach to
the problem of social change, should move away from its exclusive preoccupation with electoralism. All of these proposals I would argue are capable of implementation at the present time were members favourably disposed to accept them.

Nor do I accept Lauren Otters claim that Guildford's strategy would help to "polarise things. Here I very much accept the traditional Socialist Party position that a polarisation of social attitudes is problematic given a substantial growth in socialist consciousness. Democratic and totalitarian ideas cannot comfortably coexist. The one must grow at the other's expense. The political administration of capitalism is bound to adapt to the growth of the socialist movement in the direction of that growth for the reason that socialist ideas would have by then significantly penetrated the social outlook and shaped it in their own image. By and large, governments operate within the constraints, and require the legitimisation, of social opinion. Even in the case of dictatorships it is this the case since a dictatorship exists in large measure because of public acquiescence in it.

As revolutionary socialists we should have nothing to do with the elitist and philosophically idealist conception of social dynamics espoused by Leninists and their Trotskyist sidekicks. Democratic rights cannot simply be withdrawn in the face of public opinion. Democracy is not like some electric current that can be shut off by some Führer taking it into his head to throw the master switch. It is not a question of the ruling class giving up power without a struggle. It is rather a question of who gives them that power and what they can expect to do with it. Governments are ultimately the products of the society over which they govern. On the eve of the socialist society, capitalist government would almost certainly be of an ultra bourgeois-democratic nature. Fascist and totalitarian ideas would have been extinguished by then for all practical purposes.

This brings me via a roundabout route to Adam Buick's characterisation of the Guildford scenario as one based on "gradual evolution" rather than a "decisive break". A decisive break he informs us, entails the "capture of political power by a socialist minded working class majority".

Now Comrade Buick knows very well that this dichotomy he presents is in fact a false one. He knows very well that we stated quite in our circular (para 45) that, "in the case of the more firmly entrenched and technically complex capitalist units it will be necessary to bring into play the complementary method of capturing state power in order to legitimise social ownership of these units."

We in Guildford Branch went out of our way to explicitly repudiate the metaphysical dogmatism that can only perceive the problem in black or white terms. The Guildford scenario encompasses and does not at all negate, the traditional strategy of capturing state power. It simply seeks to complement that approach with others. That Adam Buick should have misrepresented us in this way, as the very title of his letter cum article demonstrates, is less than worthy of him. Let us have criticism, by all means, but let it be accurate criticism.
Unfortunately, his misrepresentation is not confined to this. In para. 42 of our circular we referred to the emergence of "socialistic institutions" within capitalist society, mirroring the growth of socialist consciousness: "It is of course quite true that such institutions could not exist in a fully autonomous sense. They would be dependent in varying degrees upon outside contacts and to that extent would be locked into the nexus of capitalist relations even if internally they may strive to conduct their affairs in an unmediated fashion" (my emphasis). Gradually over time, we said, we can expect to see them progressively gutted of their capitalist content (para. 41).

Comrade Buick states that such cooperative enterprises would have no chance of succeeding because they are "inevitably, in Guildford's own words, locked into the nexus of capitalist relations " What he has done here is to lift this sentence out of its context and in the process to distort its meaning. He has left out the qualification "to that extent" which is absolutely crucial. This precisely highlights his ahistorical interpretation of the Guildford scenario. This is what I meant when I referred to the need for a sense of historical imagination on the part of socialists and why Laurens Otter was so right in stressing the importance of circumstance.

Adam Buick's apparent inability or unwillingness to engage with the thrust of our argument is further demonstrated by his sarcastic remark that "Guildford seem to have forgotten that we have already seen the rise and fall of the Cooperative Movement. Robert Owen in the first half of the 19th century also advocated that workers should withdraw from working for an employer and set up cooperatives organised along 'socialistic' lines in the hope that these would eventually be able to replace capitalist enterprises so ushering in the Cooperative Commonwealth. What Comrade Buick has completely overlooked in the process of insulting our intelligence by plying us with information of which he imagines we are ignorant, is the point that we were at pains to stress - namely, that such institutions cannot be separated from the external environment in which they exist. As we put it in para 42 of our circular:"We may expect, however, that with the growth of the socialist movement and the proliferation of such institutions that increasingly these external contacts will be with other such institutions and will take the form of mutual support with a corresponding decline in dependence on capitalist markets and suppliers. Indeed, this growing interaction will be a key to and will go hand in hand with internal changes to the structure of such institutions."

We can now see why Comrade Buick's reference to the 19th century cooperative experiments is quite irrelevant to the Guildford scenario. We made it clear that our scenario was linked to the growth of the socialist movement and moreover, that socialist consciousness would not arise mechanically out such socialistic institutions. The fact of the matter is that in the 19th century, the socialist movement in our sense of the word was miniscule. It still is today. So of course, such cooperatives in the 19th century could not develop along the lines envisaged in our circular for the conditions for this to happen simply did not exist - that is, a strong socialist
movement. Even in a formal sense, these cooperatives, such as they were, did not really conform to the model proposed in our circular—that is, as mutually supportive enterprises with the conscious purpose of expanding the scale and scope of socialist institutions in society.

Of course, if Adam is trying to suggest that our scenario is doomed on the (spurious) grounds of past experience—a non sequitur anyway—she should be aware that he is treading on very shaky grounds himself. The traditional strategy of the Socialist Party is abstract propagandism coupled with electoral activity. By the same token this too has failed miserably. Does that mean we must forsake this as a discredited tactic? Of course not. Again, I want to stress that the answer does not lie in rejecting one tactic in favour of another but in diversifying the range of approaches we can bring to bear in order to foster the growth of socialist consciousness. Socialism will be the synergistic outcome of many different approaches. The time for narrow-minded sectarianism is long dead if it ever had any place in the socialist movement.

At the basis of Adam's critique is an inflexible belief in the inflexible nature of capitalism's so-called iron laws. He is clearly convinced that these allow no room for the development of socialist relations. He simply refuses to question this dogma because he cannot extricate himself from the present when such laws do indeed preempt the possibility of any development at the moment along the lines we suggested. His theoretical approach is thus one of a shallow empiricism.

On what grounds does he suppose that capitalism's so-called iron laws will always remain as inflexible as he suggests? In our circular, we pointed out that the 'big bang scenario' traditionally held by the Socialist Party, implies that there will be no change in the prevailing structure of socio-economic relations right up until the formal enactment of socialism by a socialist majority. With all respect to Adam, his reference to workers' drawing plans does not in anyway alter this scenario, the crucial aspect of which is that the socio-economic relations of wage labour and capital will remain intact in their scope and extent until socialism is formally "enacted".

One of the four major objections to the 'big bang' theory mentioned in our circular concerned the continued feasibility of production with a view to profit in a situation the formal enactment of socialism was seen to be imminent. If it is the expectation of profit that is the motive force behind capitalist production what is to happen in the case of capitalist entrepreneurs who can see the prospect of a socialist society looming ahead of them? What would induce them to invest when there is self-evidently no prospect of profit forthcoming by then the profit system itself will have ceased to exist by virtue of the formal enactment of socialism? Trying to evade this issue by casting capitalists in the mould of "mere functionaries of capital" simply not do. One could as easily re-address the question with regard to capital itself, as an impersonal economic force.
Clearly, this suggests that the iron law of capitalism — no profit, no production—could at really function in the circumstances where there is a massive socialist movement in existence. The point is, however, that this would still be prior to the formal enactment of socialism. None of our critics have satisfactorily answered this point and I invite Adam Buick to try if he can. One branch in the Socialist Party (Camden Branch) did put forward the suggestion that perhaps in this situation the state would take on a more active role in ensuring continuity of production. But of course, it could do so only by over-riding the so-called iron law of capitalism (which to some extent it already does now). This would precisely prove the point that we are trying to make: such laws are not inflexible. There is a further difficulty associated with this in that traditionally the SGB has always held that socialism will only be enacted once there is an overwhelming majority in favour of it. What then is to happen in the interval between obtaining a simple majority and an overwhelming majority? Does this mean that in such an interval the Socialist Party will be obliged to oversee the administration of capitalism?

This is a difficult but no means wholly refractory problem to resolve. It does however underline the need to thrash out such theoretical issues now if we are to seem at all credible. We adopt the view expressed by one delegate at the 1966 SGB conference, that "what would happen in the future was too far away for us to deal with now", at our peril. It is precisely that so called "far away" objective of socialism that we are asking fellow workers to consider.

What all of our critics have overlooked, however, is the impact that a growing socialist movement would have on the operation of capitalism's laws. Such laws are emphatically not like "laws of nature". Society is not some objective reified structure that exists "out there" independently of human agents. Rather as Antony Gidden's put it, social structures are "both constituted by human agency and yet at the same time are the very medium of this constitution" (New Rules of Sociological Method p.121). "Voluntaristic" theories of human action advanced by phenomenologists and the like and structuralist theories of social structure such as that held by traditional marxism, are each weakened by overlooking the strengths of the other. We need to find some way in which to unite human action and social structure in a theory of social action that acknowledges their continual and reciprocal influence upon each other. The trouble with the traditional SGB approach, however, is that it is still trapped within a positivistic paradigm that is the legacy of the 19th century and for this reason is unable yet to transcend the limitations of a theory of social structure. Hence it is unable to perceive the significance of human action in modifying social structure—only the constraints that social structure places upon such action—whereas in reality it is a two way process. Capitalism did not suddenly descend ready made from the heavens upon an unsuspecting feudal society. Neither will socialist social relations. They will be prefigured in the growth of "socialistic" relations which will be nurtured by—and in turn will contribute to—the growth of socialist consciousness.

In another circular which was distributed within the Socialist Party we presented a three phase model to illustrate this process of change.
Socialistic relations may express themselves in many different forms. These may range from education establishments through to communes. At a more (inter)personal level they could express themselves in "skill swap clubs" such as exist in America today, collective sharing of larger consumer durables - from ladders to lawnmowers - among households, voluntary work of all sorts, an expansion of the household economy towards greater self-provisioning. All these different examples evince various ways in which the market place may be increasingly circumvented. It is a pity that Adam Buick saw fit to focus exclusively on co-ops as a medium through which socialistic relations might take hold since this detracted from the emphasis we placed on the diversity of ways in which socialistic relations may take hold.

To begin with there would indeed be "very little room for manoeuvre" and here Comrade Buick's remarks about capitalism's iron laws may well be pertinent. We should not, however, overlook the economic and social benefits that flow from a strong sense of democratic participation within such institutions. As the massive Mondragon cooperative in Northern Spain has shown this can have a significant impact by holding down the costs of supervision as well as inspiring a strong sense of commitment among those concerned vis-a-vis conventional capitalist enterprises.

With the growth of the socialist movement and the infusion of socialist consciousness within such institutions the possibility arises for increasing mutual support and politically conscious coordination between such institutions as well as increasing support from the growing socialist constituency in general in the form of selective purchases, financial and other forms of assistance etc. Anyone who doubts the effectiveness of such methods should ponder, for example, the history of the Afrikaner Broederbond in South Africa which played a leading role in the rise of Afrikaner economic institutions such as the huge Volksbank by appealing to Afrikaner nationalistic sentiments, urging Afrikaners to make use of such institutions rather than those monopolised by the English speaking capitalists. The cause may have been a thoroughly odious one but it would be foolish to throw out the tactical baby with the dirty bathwater of nationalism.

Once such institutions had reached a certain critical threshold in numerical significance and interactional complexity, we envisaged the next stage in the penetration of socialistic relations opening up. This would involve the transformation of economic relationships between socialistic institutions from capitalistic market-oriented relationships - albeit tempered by mutual support - to those based upon the gift economy. In a sense this would be rather appropriate since private property itself emerged out of the institution of the gift prestation as Marcel Mauss showed in his classic work *The Gift*. The Guildford scenario represents as it were a reversal in the direction of this process - that is, towards rather than away from common ownership.

The third and final stage we envisaged in the run up to a fully socialist society, would be characterised by a marked degree of generalised reciprocity, the existence on a significant scale of
unmediated economic relationships. This needs to be seen in the context of what was said earlier about the problem that profit-motivated production would run into where the imminent demise of the profit system is apparent. This in turn touches on a number of issues such as the question of the so called social wage. What will be the relationship between the state and the commercial sector and the relationship between these and the socialistic institutions referred to?

I would be the first to acknowledge the speculative character of this scenario. It certainly does require a lot more thought. It needs to closely picked over and its weaknesses exposed so as to guide our thinking towards an ever more refined and credible model of social change. But this behoves our critics to show us where we went wrong and to be accurate in their criticism. It is frustrating to say the least to have to contend with misrepresentations since apart from anything else this delays the process of self clarification.

What we require of our critics is simply that they engage with the arguments we have presented in a constructive and comradely fashion. We are not obsessive about the scenario we have mapped out and are quite willing to acknowledge that we mistaken in much of what we wrote. But we do need to be told why and in a manner conducive to fruitful dialogue.

Unfortunately, the debate within the Socialist Party provoked by the Guildford circular has fallen far short of this. It has been scarred by dogmatism and heresy-hunting. With the greatest respect to Frank, I don't think he is really familiar with the internal situation within the Socialist Party. Judging by his appraisal that the "SPGB apparently handles what might be considered heretics in a much more rational manner than some parties I can think of" and it saddens me as a member of the SPGB to have to say this.

It is a matter of deep regret that at the 1988 Annual conference a floor resolution was carried to the effect that, "This conference regrets that Guildford branch gave permission to a journal to print in their name views that are in opposition to the Party's position". The journal in question is none other than discussion Bulletin itself.

I regard this resolution as a most serious breach if not in the letter then certainly in the spirit of Party democracy. It is an infringement on the free exchange of ideas and it should matter not a damn whether these are expressed verbally or in print. For a democratic party to exclude outsiders to full and unfettered access to its internal affairs, is to forfeit to that extent, its claim to be such a party.

I can only hope the Party will recover from this self destructive bout of back-pedalling which raises the spectre of the mid 1970s when the SPGB went through possibly the worst phase in its entire history, a phase marked by the most appalling dogmatism. That would be a tragedy of "monumental" proportions. In the meanwhile however,
the debate will go on one way or another both within and without the Socialist Party and your readers are more than welcome to contribute to it whatever those who have tried to suppress free speech may think of this.

Yours fraternally,

Robin Cox

Flat 3, The Mount, Lheer St., Haslemere, Surrey, GU27 2PD, England

Dear Comrades,

DB readers must be intrigued by the fact that a discussion between two members of the Socialist Party of Great Britain on so fundamental an issue as "the road to socialism" can go on in these columns. I must point out that in fact all internal discussions within the SPGB are public in that, as a matter of principle, the SPGB has no secret meetings (even those of its Executive Committee are open to the public) and all Party circulars, etc are in the public domain.

I must say, however, than in carrying such an internal discussion into the columns of an outside journal, however non-partisan that journal might be, Guildford Branch infringed the generally accepted protocol on internal discussions within the SPGB, namely, that the discussion, though public, should commence as a debate between Party members only, in which members are trying to convince each other to adopt, or not to adopt, a particular position as the Party's policy. In directly addressing non-members before the SPGB had considered the matter Guildford laid themselves open to the suspicion that they wished to engage in propaganda amongst outsiders for views which are not the democratically-decided views of the majority. It was for this reason that the 1988 Annual SPGB Conference issued them with what I would have thought was only a mild reprimand -- after all the (non-binding) resolution Robin Cox quoted in his letter only "regrets" their action whereas it could have "condemned" or "censured" them or even charged them "with action detrimental to the interests of the Party" had the delegates felt that strongly about it. In the event they were only told off for having made an error of judgement. I hasten to add that the issue was not the freedom of the DB to publish the document in question (nobody contests that right, you can publish our EC Minutes, accounts, Conference Reports any time you like) but the propriety of Guildford actively soliciting its publication.

Be that as it may, the discussion has been carried to the columns of the DB and so, I suppose, has to continue there too. I must emphasise that, although I am writing in a personal capacity, the views I have been expressing have been those of the majority as decided through the democratic decision-making process that exists within the SPGB. Thus the 1988 SPGB Conference carried overwhelmingly a resolution saying that "this Conference rejects the arguments contained in the Guildford Branch circular 'The Road to Socialism', on the grounds that they are theoretically unsound". Another resolution, also carried overwhelmingly, stated that "it is not the role of the Party to be a printing business and that in no circumstances should its premises be used to house a printing co-operative or any part of any co-operative". This of course will come as no surprise to anyone who knows anything about the SPGB and the consistent policy of opposition to co-operativism and gradualism it has pursued over
the years. Robin Cox may attempt to downplay it, but the key social institution in his "scenario" is the co-operative which he sees as potentially "socialistic" institutions that are capable of out-competing ordinary capitalist firms and introducing elements of socialism into economic relations even before the capture of state power (which I accept he still stands for). The 1988 SPGB Conference rejected this view as "theoretically unsound" because the vast majority of members simply do not accept that elements of socialism can be introduced before the capture of political power.

This does not mean, however, that the SPGB holds that the growth of the socialist movement will have no effect whatsoever on what happens within capitalism. For instance, a statement adopted at the Party's 1974 Conference stated: "when the socialist movement becomes much stronger among the working class generally it will increasingly influence the outlook and sympathies of workers in the administration, armed forces, etc and the government's freedom of action will be correspondingly lessened". Robin Cox is probably right in saying that "on the eve of socialist society, capitalist government would almost certainly be of an ultra bourgeois-democratic nature". Similarly, as more and more workers become socialists, the trade unions will be transformed from the job trusts they now largely are into class-conscious, fighting economic organisations of the working class, which will result in a lessening of the freedom of action of employers too. In fact socialist ideas will become more and more influential in all spheres of social activity -- in education, the arts, and even no doubt in the cooperative movement.

These views have long been taken on board by the SPGB. So the issue is not whether or not the growth of the socialist movement will result in changes within capitalism before the capture of political power (of course it will) but whether or not this will take the form Robin Cox suggests of a three-stage transition from a capitalist economy to socialism via, first, the growth of a co-operative sector producing for the market, then of a gift economy in which the co-operatives would exchange their goods with each other without money, and, finally, of "generalized reciprocity" in which the co-operatives would supply their goods free to their customers, all this before the capture of political power which would be used to abolish any remaining cases of capitalism. It's a point of view, not a very convincing one in my opinion, but one which Robin Cox is fully entitled to express in internal discussions within the SPGB as long as he accepts that he should confine himself to trying to convince his fellow members and not outsiders.

Yours for Socialism,
Adam Buick, Appt A18. 2 rue Jean Engling. L-1466 Luxemburg, Europe.
Social realism is the view that we have to look at real social forces if we want to understand how societies change. A social realist approach to social change is the opposite of an approach based simply on moralizing. I'm a social realist because I believe it is real social forces, not "good ideas", that are the basis of social change.

Back in the 19th century socialist movement, social realism was called "materialism." This "materialism" was not peculiar to marxism; for example, Bakunin also considered himself a "materialist". Kropotkin once observed that the anarchist vision of social change should not be seen as a deduction from ideals arising in certain individual's brains but as the culmination of real forces "already at work in the pre-existing society." This observation is also very much in the spirit of social realism. Today, social realism is part of the intellectual patrimony of the working class; it is not the private property of any particular political label or tendency.

I do not know if Marx originated the distinction between "base" and "superstructure" but this is one point where I would say I am in agreement with Marx. I believe this distinction is a useful contribution to a social realist approach to social change. The idea here is that we're looking at class societies, such as present-day capitalism, and we want to understand the dynamics of such societies, how they evolve and change, how they might be overthrown. And the basic idea is that the various relations and institutions that make up a given society can be divided into two camps: The "base" consists of two things: (1) the real relations between people that structure and organize the process of production, such as the power relations between bosses and workers; and (2) and (in Marx's words) "the forces of production."

The institutions of law and government, such as courts and legislatures, and the ideas and cultural expressions that circulate in that society Marx called the "superstructure," presupposing, and being shaped by, the underlying "base" in material production.

But on Marx's view, the two components of the "base" are not equal. On the contrary, a particular type of economic system -- a particular set of relations governing production -- will be overthrown when it no longer contributes to, but, on the contrary, thwarts, the further "development of the productive forces." That is Marx's most basic idea about how class societies are overthrown.

Tho I agree with the basic distinction between "base" and "superstructure", I have a number of disagreements with the specifically marxist version. Here are three:

[1] Marx understood this phrase "the productive forces" to refer specifically to the technical aspects of production, that is,
scientific and technical know-how, new machinery, new methods of production, etc. People are only relevant in the ways they contribute to productivity. So it is really more accurate to say that Marx was a "technological determinist" rather than an "economic determinist." Notice also that it is not true for Marx that "class struggle" is the most basic cause of social change. For Marx, classes are propelled into motion when inadequacies in the social structure prevent people from benefitting from technical possibilities within their reach. Class struggle is a secondary effect for Marx.

I have a problem with the marxist view because it sees a working class revolution as merely a reaction to the deprivations of a failing capitalism, it doesn’t recognize that the development of the working class towards self-emancipation is equally dependent upon factors in the working class itself, which are not merely determined by the failings of the ruling class.

Rather, I believe that the working class has its own aspirations, which develop somewhat autonomously, and the dynamic that leads towards social change involves an interplay between the aspirations and movements arising within the class, on the one hand, and the failings and deprivations of the bosses’ system, on the other hand.

Nonetheless, we do not have to give up social realism or the distinction between "base" and "superstructure" to accommodate this insight. The working class is itself a "force of production". Indeed, the only essential "force of production" since the working class has the capacity to run production itself. The development of workers’ activity in their own class interests, the increasing unity and solidarity of the class, and increasing clarity and self-confidence would be reflected in the development of a new movement of solidarity and self-run organizations as the class develops towards a revolutionary conflict with the bosses’ system. This would truly be a "contradiction between the forces of production and the social relations of production" (in Marx’s words) that could herald the downfall of capitalism. But the crucial element here, from my point of view, is the change in the activity, solidarity and consciousness of workers as a class. The this is indeed a "development of the productive forces" (since workers are "productive forces"), this sort of "development" is not what Marx meant but represents, on the contrary, a LIBERTARIAN conception of social realism, with its emphasis upon the self-activity of working people themselves.

It is this recognition that the activity and solidarity of working people is itself a real social force that is a hallmark of a libertarian conception of social realism.

[2] The second disagreement I have with Marx’s version of social realism is his inevitable-ism. M. had the view that if a given social order is destroyed due to its inability to further social wellbeing (as permitted by the existing level of “productive forces”), then there is one and only one possible outcome of
that revolutionary change. In other words, M. believed that a given type of society is fated to be followed by exactly one other type of society so that human history is a single path determined by what will best contribute to "the development of the forces of production". This doctrine is sometimes called "historicism" and Marx borrowed it from Hegel. This doctrine reflects the "inevitable march of progress" thinking that was typical of 19th century capitalist society but has no rational basis. Given a revolutionary crisis for a given society, there are no guarantees that it might not collapse to a lower level of production (as happened in the Dark Ages -- or Pol Pot's Cambodia); nor is there any reason to believe that there is only one possible outcome consistent with "the development of the productive forces." In particular, the nature of the social movement or social force that dominates the process of social change is itself a crucial factor in determining the outcome.

This rejection of marxist inevitability is a traditional libertarian criticism of Marx.

[3] My third disagreement with the traditional marxist version of social realism is the rather mechanical way in which the "base" is thought to "determine" the "superstructure." Thus, ideas are sometimes seen as directly "produced" by particular classes or class interests. As critics have often pointed out, the "superstructure" obviously affects the "base" and vice versa, so how can one simply determine the other? Moreover, ideas and cultural expressions are produced by people, not "classes" or "class interests".

To get a better understanding of what the relationship between the base and superstructure is, perhaps an analogy with evolution would be helpful. The presence or absence of predators and other factors constitute a particular environment that animals must contend with. Whether traits or variations in animals survive or not is determined by that environment. Certain traits or mutations may die out if they don't help in the survival of certain individuals or they may remain if they don't hinder its survival. For example, the trait of not being able to fly survived in birds on South Pacific islands (e.g. Kiwis on New Zealand) because the absence of mammals (til European settlers brought them) meant they didn't need flight to escape predators. There may have been flightless birds in other parts of the world at an earlier period but they would have been killed off. But this process of so-called "natural selection" does not determine how traits or variations in animals arise. From the point of view of "natural selection," variations arise in an autonomous manner (apparently during periods characterized by "bursts" of mutations).

Analogously, I would suggest that the economic base of a society -- that is, the power relations between people in production, the class struggles taking place, etc. -- constitute the "environment" that the political system, political ideas, etc. will tend to adapt to. Artistic expressions, political ideas, etc. may arise autonomously, from individuals. But the opportunities for artists, politicians,
writers, etc. are determined by what has the best "fit" with the prevailing system of class power. Thus, the economic "base" is the "environment" that political leaders, lawyers, writers, artists, etc. adapt to in order to prosper.

If we look at the various institutions that affect popular consciousness, such as the press and television, schools and colleges, these tend to reflect the needs and interests of the business class. Newspapers and book publishers, TV stations, and so on are also businesses and this shapes the "environment" for ideas in those institutions. Journalists know what sorts of ideas are going to gain the approval or disapproval of their superiors -- and a lot of self-censorship takes place. Even if the bosses exercise no overt censorship, the people who work in, and manage, newspapers, schools, training programs and so on want to prosper. And in the normal working of the system their opportunities depend upon accommodation to the interests of the employing class. Thus, the ideas that become dominant at a given time are normally those that have the best "fit" with the concerns and interests of the business class.

I believe that this distinction between "base" and "superstructure" particularly makes sense from a syndicalist point of view. A worker who regularly observes the actions of police and judges in strikes will most likely perceive a clear pattern of bias in the interests of the employing class. This perception backs up the syndicalist view of the state as an institution that exists to defend the power of bosses. Thus, anarcho-syndicalists do not propose to change society through activities inside the government. The state is not essential to production but it is essential to continued class rule. Syndicalists pose the politics of direct economic re-organization by working people themselves as the alternative to the politics of elections and governments. In recognizing that what is crucial is control over production, syndicalism sees that class emancipation must mean a direct change in the economic base. What we see here is how the syndicalist approach presupposes the "base/superstructure" distinction (or something like it).

On the other hand, if this distinction is rejected, this is likely to lead to the idea that workers interests can be represented within the state and that there is no reason to prefer a direct struggle of workers in the economy over efforts to gain representation in, or influence over, the government. Thus, the various "revisionist" marxists who have rejected a materialist outlook and the base/superstructure distinction generally do so as part of a justification for pursuing "a struggle inside the state", as they might put it. The idea of direct workers revolution is abandoned in favor of a preoccupation with parliamentarism and influencing government policy. Sam Dolgoff, in his article on marxism in the last issue of "Libertarian Labor Review," seems blissfully unaware of these implications of his attacks on social realism and the base/superstructure concept. He quotes approvingly from revisionist historian (and former Progressive Labor Party member) James Cronin without considering how Cronin's anti-syndicalist prejudices and social-democratic orientation go hand in hand with
his rejection of a viewpoint that puts the primary emphasis upon the world of production, the indispensable location for building workers' control.

The purpose of this text is not to argue for a "synthesis of anarchism and marxism," but to show (1) how it is possible for anarchists to evaluate marxist ideas on their own merits, (2) to try to explain how a specifically libertarian social realism is possible, (3) how it would differ from marxism, and (4) to give some reasons why I think a social realist outlook is important to syndicalism.

-- Tom Wetzel

P.S.: Jeff Stein's grandstanding (in DB #31) on the issue of Mick Larkin's support for the CNT-U (minority breakaway from the CNT-AIT) is hypocritical. If Libertarian Labor Review is so concerned about Larkin's support for the CNT-U, why have they been maintaining an alliance with Larkin's pal Guy Cheverton, another CNT-U supporter? Back when Cheverton was editor of "Direct Action," the paper of the IWA organization in Britain (the Direct Action Movement), LLR inspired Cheverton to introduce a motion at a DAM conference putting the DAM on record in favor of WSA's expulsion from the IWA. This was a sudden ambush in that neither Cheverton nor LLR ever notified us of these charges. We were thus given no opportunity to defend ourselves -- clearly a violation of libertarian democracy (not to mention simple decency). After Cheverton lost that vote (and some others), he decided to quit DAM. But before doing so, he put out an issue of "Direct Action" which directly endorsed the CNT-U -- in violation of a democratic decision of the DAM. He knew that issue of the paper would be useless to DAM yet it exhausted the organization's paper fund.

Discussion Bulletin readers:

My subscription to the Discussion Bulletin ran out with DB #31, and I won't be renewing at least for the time being, as I am putting time and $$ into other things......But I did want to end my current readership with a few words....

AS TO THE W.S.A.: the W.S.A. has discussed a "common program" with "libertarian" Marxist groups (and members of the I.W.W.), but this "program" was to be economic & class based not political. The W.S.A. has not sought alliances with statist groups.// the W.S.A. does not and has never been in favor of any brand of Marxism, so we could not have propagated in favor of it as P.W. Stein claims // the W.S.A. has never been in support of the C.N.T.-U; we have always supported our fellow I.W.A. section the C.N.T.-A.I.T. // the W.S.A. is an Anarcho-Syndicalist organization. Our Anarcho-Syndicalism and loyalty to Libertarian Communism is found in our statement of principles, our constitution and our practices and conduct // the W.S.A. is a recognized and respected member/section of the International Workers' Association.

COMMENT: the statement made by J. Bekken in DB #31: "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" --I would suspect the same. DeLeon's fake I.W.W. sounds like the modern-day fake "C.N.T." 

TO MR. SEASONS: Instead of thinking about what I had to say you "reacted" w/o thinking... I'm not going to use my anti-vanguardism as an excuse to sit on my ass. Also: why address me as "comrade"? I am not a Marxist and you seem to be. It's FELLOW WORKER to you bub!

"War to the palace, peace to the cottage, death to luxurious idleness"

RIK WINSLow, WSA SACRAMENTO LOCAL
P.O. BOX 41363, SACRAMENTO,
CA., 95841

In my work on a history of the SLP, I am currently focusing on the period from 1900 to WWI. Hence, I am particularly interested in Jon Bekken's remarks relating to Don Fitz's history of the Detroit IWW.

First off, I would appreciate hearing about Jon's "solid grounds for believing DeLeon was out to seize control of the IWW in 1908." I have seen the minutes of the fight over credentials in the 1908 IWW convention and am not much wiser regarding the real issues. What is clear is that there was a distinct change in attitude on the part of people like St. John and Haywood toward De Leon after the 1906 convention. (In 1905 Haywood wrote to De Leon that "I should be glad to allow my name to stand as one of the leaders of the I.W.W."

Connolly was a special General Executive Board meeting on December, 1907, may have convinced many that the organization would be better off without the DeLeonists. The fact is, though, that the anti-political clause wing, though greatly strengthened by the failure of the Socialist Party leaders to accept industrial unionism, were not willing to face De Leon at the 1908 convention and risk losing the debate again over the political clause. Large numbers of western anti-De Leon delegates were brand new members whose knowledge of the issues was limited to the dogma that De Leon was a "pope" and should be punched out. (The SLP delegation felt it necessary to provide a bodyguard for De Leon.) De Leon was denied a seat at the convention over the technical question of whether he was a member of the correct union. The dishonesty of most IWW histories is clear when one realizes that these historians fail to mention that De Leon's occupation and IWW local membership had been unchaged since 1905.

I find it hard to sympathize with Jon's complaint about the DeLeonist seceders from the convention calling themselves the IWW. Obviously they felt justified since it was clear that the IWW leadership was willing to change the IWW's line even if it meant packing delegations, unseating opponents and threatening violence. That the IWW line did change is hardly subject to question, many Wobblies stating that the "real history" of the organization began in 1908.
I would also challenge Jon’s view regarding “the apparent primacy of the party in DeLeon’s thought” and his suspicion that socialist industrial unions were only a ploy. I am aware of the problems that IWW historians have in categorizing the Socialist Labor Party and recall the great frustration that I and another person with extensive SLP background had at a joint DeLeonist/IWW meeting nearly twenty years ago. Although much more sympathetic to the IWW than the SLP, we could not convince the IWW’ers that the SLP does in fact advocate the elimination of the state immediately upon the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and that the political party is not only subsidiary to the socialist industrial union but is to be abolished immediately upon the revolution. The IWW members “knew” otherwise apparently because of the complicated picture that would arise if they had to abandon their myths.

I am confident that neither Jon nor anyone else can find any post-1905 statement by De Leon to the contrary. De Leon, while always highly critical of the SP, did not even feel that the SLP itself was essential. As early as 1902, De Leon stated that the SLP might not eventually be THE party of the working class. In February, 1908 he gave a speech advocating unity with the Socialist Party. (This was done as an individual, not a party member. In those days that could be done.) He also believed (before 1908) that the IWW might establish its own revolutionary political party.

The figure of De Leon is a complex one and research does not support the SLP picture of a demigod or everyone else’s picture of a power-hungry tyrant. He clearly was a cantankerous person usually intolerant of views different from his own. His positions changed a number of times but this didn’t prevent him from employing a great deal of invective against opponents. The problem for the opponents was that few individuals could match him in open debate. Further, while greatly respected (even venerated), as National Editor (an extremely influential post, to be sure), he lacked any administrative post where he could directly control the party as the various National Secretaries have, beginning with Arnold Petersen. At the National Executive Committee meeting in 1907, he won out over opposition forces that could have removed he as National Editor by only a single vote. During his last years, when no important opposition existed, NEC support was not unanimous.

On August 1907, De Leon wrote to Haywood congratulating him for his release from prison on a trumped-up murder charge. Haywood was advised that, unlike De Leon himself, he, Haywood, was “unencumbered by the animosities inseparable from the early days of the struggle” and had become a natural working class leader. “The capitalist class has thrown the ball into your hands. You can kick it over the goal.” As for the SLP, “when the I.W.W. will have reflected its own political party...it will be with a shout of joy that the S.L.P. will break its ranks.” The letter does not fit very well into the conventional picture of a monomaniac eager to split the IWW to benefit a party that he controls.

Ben Perry, October 1988
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES
REGIONAL COMMITTEE FOR MARXIST - DELEONISM

PREAMBLE

The following Statements of Principles and Purposes developed from a series of preliminary discussions among former and present members and sympathizers of the Socialist Labor Party. We have concluded that the Party is no longer a viable political organization and that the struggle to advance the Marxist-DeLeonist program must be carried on by other organizations in the United States. Consequently, we have formed the Regional Committee for Marxist-DeLeonism.

Those of us who have initiated the founding of this Committee are all firmly convinced that the principles of Marxism and the DeLeonist program are more applicable to conditions in the U.S. today than ever before despite the terribly backward and apathetic condition of our working class. We see the U.S. capitalist system and its imperialist underpinnings as the linchpin of the world's capitalist economy and as such a menace to humanity. We recognize that while this system's demise may not be near at hand, it cannot go on as it is indefinitely. Consequently, we also see the paramount need for an independent political and economic organization of the working class that will lead that class in a revolutionary struggle to victory over capitalism and to the establishment of a truly socialist order in society.

Consistent with our past learning and political experience we reject the party vanguardism of the Leninist Left and the bureaucratic despotism of the so called "Soviet model." At the same time we also reject the reformism of the Social Democratic Left that ties the working class to the capitalist system and its political agents.

We see the DeLeonist program as a relevant and viable political alternative to the other programs of the Left while recognizing that it is not an all-inclusive, perfect blueprint for reaching the goal of socialist revolution. We firmly believe that this program should and must be studied and supported by those who sincerely desire socialist revolution because it focuses the might of the working class at the very heart of all power in modern industrial society - the point of production. And it does so allowing the workers to maintain complete democratic control over the revolutionary process.

We also want it to be clearly understood that we do not define ourselves in terms of being merely a faction or tendency of the DeLeonist Movement which is only set up in opposition to the Socialist Labor Party or any other socialist party or organization. We are a politically involved educational organization that seeks to apply the DeLeonist program to conditions in the United States and to challenge the various distortions of Socialism that prevail in our time.

We ask only that those who join us subscribe to the Statement of Principles and Statement of Purposes.
1. We subscribe to the fundamental tenets of Marxism (i.e., the Law of Value/Surplus Value, the Materialist Conception of History, the Class Struggle, etc.)

2. We subscribe to the application of Marxist principles to conditions in the U.S. that evolved into the program of Socialist Industrial Unionism developed by Daniel DeLeon.

3. We do not view the Socialist Industrial Union Program as a complete blue print for socialist revolution in this or any other country but rather as a fundamental means by which the working class can achieve democratic control of the means of production and all services and thereby establish a Socialist Society.

4. We are opposed to dogmatism and sectarianism and recognize them for the pernicious errors that they are.

5. We reserve the right to engage in good faith and fraternal debate with any other political organization in order to defend our program and analysis and to criticize what we view to be errors in any other program.

6. We firmly believe in maintaining the most open and broad adherence to democratic procedures within this Committee and we encourage the free and unrestricted exchange of ideas, opinions and commentary at all levels of organization.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

1. We seek to apply the principles of Marxism-DeLeonism to the analysis of conditions here in the U.S. and around the world.

2. We seek to broaden our own knowledge and understanding through reading and discussion.

3. We seek to apply what we have learned and our program through direct engagement in the class struggle in the form of
interventions into social, political and economic struggles.

4. We view political activism as indispensable for the individual development of the socialist and for the advancement of socialism.

5. We seek to teach what we have learned to our fellow workers and in turn to learn whatever we can from our fellow workers.

Committee for Socialist Union, P.O. Box 303, Camden, NJ 08101

Dear D.B.,

I must admit to being a bit stunned by Bob Jones’s changed account; I must nevertheless persist, even though I did not know George Plume anything like as well as Meltzer; but that said of those who confirmed George’s story, Sammy Cash shared a flat with George, (he’d been in the SGB through the war,) & Wilfred Wigham, Alex Alexander & Joe Thomas were all on the same sort of terms with him as was Meltzer.

I cannot recall, as early as 19/1, mentioning George Plume’s trial, so I find it surprising that at that time Meltzer replied to me on the issue. I wish I had known. Wilfred was still alive & I was in touch with him, also with Joe, (through Wilfred with Alex,) so it would have been possible then to assemble sufficient people who knew George during the war as an after.

As I said in my last letter, those I have mentioned, plus Harry, Mister, & some others, all said concerning George, that though one could not always trust the detail, the substance of his accounts was accurate.

As Bob knows, I do not live in an university town, indeed there is no educational establishment in Shropshire above the Technical College or Sixth Form College level; I therefore do not have access to the sort of library that would allow me to find the transcripts of a 1945 trial.

When I went to T.C.D. in October 1951, either in my first or my second term, for reasons I cannot now recall; (it may have been because I was at the trial of Von Manstein, it may have been because the History Society in college used to indulge in Balloon/raft games - that is when four people are given the roles of unpleasant historical personages, & have to produce a spurious defence, reasons why they should be allowed to stay on the raft, or in the balloon gondola, even though someone else must be thrown out to avoid sinking;) I read rapidly through the end of the war treason trials, one of which was for G.P. Harper.

Seven years later, soon after meeting George, he claimed to have been tried for treason; when I enquired further, and said I had once read the transcript, he said yes well really my name is George Plume-Harper, & it was as Harper I was tried. My memory of the transcript, seven years after reading it, was not extensive, but was sufficient, then, - with the confirmation of others, - to give his account verisimilitude. Thirty years later I don’t remember
that sort of detail.

There were not an awful lot of such trials, & I remember that in college (T.O.D.) they came in a single folder. I do not suppose for one moment that the TCU library is in this unique.

Laurens Otter

REVIEW


As our brief mention of this book in DB29 under "Publications Received" indicated, it consists of thirty-one essays arranged to answer a set of nine questions on the origins and development of technology and its effects on the present and future development of life on this planet. The essays by authors as diverse as Lewis Mumford and Russell Means are organized and unified with an introduction by the editors and short introductory essays for each question. The questions themselves are organized under three headings: "Technology: Its History and Our Future," "Computers and the Informed Individual," "Technology: The Web of Life?" The sum total of the essays and introductions constitutes a many-sided critique of technology.

The comment in DB29 criticized the book's failure to relate technology to capitalism. This drew the following note from Comrade Zerzan:

"In your mention of Questioning Technology, which I co-edited, the book is characterized as a criticism of technology rather than capitalism. It is true that the nature and effects of technology are stressed, but not to take wage-labor and the commodity off the hook; rather to argue that a "socialism" that subjects people to the deadening and life destroying instruments of production in the same way capitalism does is an utter failure. In the book this is, I grant, more implicit than explicit, but we did not intend one more bourgeois theory that fails to indict capitalism. Selections by Bradford, Pulano, and the Zerzans make this anti-capitalist element rather clear, I believe. Down with the division of labor and production, two of the foundations of class society! -- For a deeper critique."

David Brown of Left Bank Distribution, who wrote the forward to Zerzan's new book, Elements of Refusal, expressed some of the same ideas:

"Regarding your review of Questioning Technology, I suggest your reading of Zerzan seeing technology as a separate ("more important source of social problems") issue from capitalism could not be more wrong. Even a simple reading of his essays indicates that technology is intertwined with the rise of capitalism, and especially so with industrial capitalism. Zerzan attacks exactly what attribute to him: he attacks the phenomenon prevalent within the left generally, and the anarchist movement specifically, to treat technology as a new and separate god to cure all; indeed, it is this very notion that technology can be separated from capitalism (and its various hierarchal and alienating structures) to create an anti-authoritarian society(s) which is being debunked.

Hopefully many of your readers, like your reviewer, will understand that
this cannot be done. Unfortunately, my own observation is that most anarchists (markedly prevalent with the anarcho-syndicalists) have a full-blown love affair with technology. That this leads to a rather curious (and not uncomfortable apparently) bed—full of ideologues from the extreme left to the extreme right seems to provide no slackening of the juices. Too reiterate, Zerzan’s point, I believe, is that as capitalism must go, so too its miscellaneous props.

In part I suppose we can account for this difference in understanding to differences in expectation. To me technology is one more facet of a society in the service the profit system. When technology is freed from the influence of that system, it will become a blessing rather than a curse. Zerzan belongs to an element in the anarchist wing of non-market socialism that rejects this view. To him and others—the most extreme of whom are grouped around the quarterly The Fifth Estate [Box 07548 in proct, M. [raw]], the real villain is technology. Their concerns about the environment and the quality of life in the twentieth century compared to that of more primitive men lead them to reject "progress" and the "civilization" that Marxists would argue constitute the positive benefits of technology. Because of our reading of history, we regard technological advance as the reward to humankind for several thousand years of class oppression. It is the factor that has made possible the production of goods and services in excess of need, making socialism possible.

In a sense Zerzan is right about the essays in the book being an implicit criticism of capitalism, since he and I and most DB readers realize that in a class-divided society technology is at the command of the ruling class. Unfortunately general readers don’t have this perspective. They can’t be expected to see the relationship between capitalism and technology.

The point where one might expect an anti-capitalist (revolutionary) analysis of the role of capitalism in technology and its growth is Question 4: “What is the future of human culture with respect to technology? Is there a solution to the reality of being diminished by high tech?” (p. 67 of.) The answer proposed in the introduction to the question seems to call on humans to deliver themselves from the tyranny of technology through an effort of will, presumably within the framework of capitalism and in the face of an overwhelming pressure to increase rather than decrease dependence on technology.

Fulano’s essay, which Zerzan mentions in his note, is a metaphorical indictment of "civilization" ending with the assertion that it dooms us all. Russell Means’ essay, despite his disclaimer, is a racially oriented indictment of “Europeans,” “Caucasians,” and “white society” as the carriers of the technology that has brought about “the despiritualization of the universe.” Sally Gearhart’s “An End to Technology,” after asserting that the human race cannot be separated from its involvement with technology, recommends species suicide as the only decent and effective thing we can do to preserve the earth. The last essay in this section, “The Reenchantment of the World—II” by Nowak, presents an interesting new technology—free world in cadences suitable for a description of the Second Coming of Christ or
the advent of the Age of Aquarius—all the changes in human attitudes necessary for the New Jerusalems happening, apparently, without cause.

Despite the negative comments above, I strongly recommend the book to DB readers: 1) It supplies a wealth of detail on the effects of technology on the human psyche and the environment and 2) it raises a question that most of us never think about: the role of technology and industrialism in a socialist world. Unfortunately the audience for whom this book is presumably intended, the well meaning Green/environmentalists will come away from it with their understanding of the underlying cause of the cause of the war between technology and the planet no further advanced

Cont'd from p. 2

the subscriber. They all bear the unlikely imprint of BM BLDB, London WCIN 3XX. Readers of Don Fitz's article on the Spanish Coordinadora will find a wealth of additional information on that movement and on dockers' struggles in Britain and Denmark. This is a large pamphlet, 66 pages, 8 1/4 by 12 inches. It contains twenty articles, documents, circulars, etc dealing with recent struggles mostly in Spain. Unfortunately we have no information at present on the price nor do we have a source from which these publications can be obtained in the U.S. We hope to have more information in DB33 along with brief descriptions of other titles.