BULLETIN MATTERS

DB40 begins with a new voice in the debate among anarchists, this
time touching on the metaphysical. An anonymous reader asks some questions about the Committee for Socialist Union's article on the Greens. Bob Black teases another "BLEEP" out of me. Included also is a very relevant by the SPFGB on the Greens. Ed Stamm discusses his problems with the working class. Monroe Prussack expresses his concerns about a variety of topics. Ben Perry calls for an insurrection against my nefarious editorial policies. The Ohioan asks some questions which I answer. John Zerzan replies to my DB39 letter, and I reply to him. He is at a disadvantage in this discussion; it would behoove me to give the last word next time. Lee Fu See sent us a letter and the first three issues of Democracy Hall. I hope readers will reply to him and send h8im clippings about China from periodical in our political sector. Laurens Otter rejoins the anarchist discussion. My thanks to all these writers. Remember DB continues to need articles and letters for publication. Since we print directly from your copy, please use narrow margins and a dark ribbon.

Frank Girard for the DB Committee

REVIEWS OF PERIODICALS

As we indicated in the last issue, we are reviewing what we regard as periodicals from our political sector in rotation as space permits. The list below is intended as an exhaustive list of English language periodicals. If you have some ideas for addition--or deletions for that matter--please let us know. Those titles followed by an asterisk are regarded as being in our political sector but suffering from the Leninist virus of "dictatorship of the partyism."


AGAINST SLEEP AND NIGHTMARE, P.O. Box 3305, Oakland, CA 94609. #2 reviewed in DB 30; no new issues received. $2 per copy.

ANARCHIST LABOR BULLETIN, P.O. Box 210005, San Francisco, CA 94121, $1.00 per copy, 6 issues $6, 12 issues $10 Publication of the Anarchist Labor Network. Formerly THE SEDITIONIST. Number 18, January, 1990, headlines "IWA Conference on Eastern Europe," which included a delegate from SHOT (USSR labor organization). Other articles on current labor struggles like Pittston and attempts by radicals to unionize previously unorganized workers.
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I. The Definition of Anarchism

Anarchism means individual sovereignty. Each person is subject to no other government than his or her own self-imposed law. Anarchism is not disorder, it is self-regulated order. Not a government over individuals, but a cooperative community of self-governing persons.

Sounds good, critics say, but will it work? A more meaningful question is, what are the conditions necessary to make it work? Anarchism places a great burden of responsibility on the individual. Without the able willingness of each and every member of society to shoulder this burden, anarchism cannot succeed.


Autonomy is the individual's proper destiny, as the acorn's. Throughout the course of development from infancy onward, the predominant theme is the push toward independence. We become less and less dominated by others, and more and more the makers of our own destiny. When this maturation process is blocked, internally or externally, we have neurosis or subjugation.

Neurosis and subjugation are forms of alienation. In addition to the suffering it entails, alienation wastes human potential. The urge to create is reduced to impotence or destructiveness. We should ask whether alienation "works."

The task of psychological and political liberation is to break through these barriers into expanded realms of freedom and responsibility. No one can make us free. We must emancipate ourselves. As the most advanced political order possible, anarchism corresponds to the highest level of self-realization.

II. The Two Types of Anarchism

The mainstream of anarchism runs within the socialist movement. Individualist anarchism is a relatively small, but nonetheless significant, tributary of socialist anarchism.

Whereas socialist anarchists stress the communal, the individualist anarchists emphasize the autonomous, aspect of human nature. It's an easy mistake to dismiss the individualists as extremists. But without their contribution, anarchism is more socialist than anarchist. An uncompromising commitment to self-regulation is the defining characteristic of anarchism. The individualists are the vanguard of self-determination.

The socialist anarchist perspective rounds out the individualist position by advocating voluntary cooperation as the only legitimate form of "government" in a society of self-directing individuals. The principle of cooperation, of course, must operate within a concrete set of social structures. While these formal relations must obviously be created and controlled by those who live with them, socialist anarchism has already accumulated a sizable body of theoretical
models and practical experiments.

The only justifiable use of force in an anarchist society is in self-defense. Each individual's involvement in collective activities must be entirely voluntary. This applies to childrearing and education as well, and the results of certain attempts at libertarian parenting and teaching are quite encouraging.

III. The Socialist Spectrum

Anarchism belongs to a larger family of "socialist" ideologies. Political orders are different than economic systems. Socialism is to the left of capitalism because it strives to satisfy the material needs of the many, rather than to enrich the few. But there are a number of possible political variations, some more democratic than others, within the framework of a socialist economics. We can arrange these variations along a scale, or spectrum, according to their distribution of political power. The measure of political power, within a given economic system, is determined by who makes the laws. The further left on the scale, the greater the popular participation in the legislative process.

At the far right of the socialist spectrum is Stalinism, which is autocratic. To the left of Stalinism is Leninism, with its one-party dictatorship. Moving leftward from Leninism is Marxism, which puts the legislative power in the hands of elected representatives. Left of this is Rousseau's concept of direct legislation by the masses according to majority rule. Left of Rousseau, both individualist and socialist anarchism are based on individual sovereignty, wherein each person is subject to none other than his or her own law. Since the individualist anarchist is more concerned with the autonomous, and the socialist anarchist with the communal, side of individual self-rule, the former is the further left.

There is another kind of anarchism, mystical anarchism, which is even more to the "left," though mystics would say that it transcends the spectrum altogether. Strictly speaking, mysticism is apolitical. However, the natural affinity between mysticism and anarchism lends itself to combining them. In mystical anarchism, the two complement and complete each other.

Mysticism distinguishes, within each individual, between the relative self, from which stems conflict and suffering, and the Absolute Self, the inner source of wholeness, aliveness, and creativity. The relative self is what we normally think of as our conscious identity, or ego, which is formed in early life. Before we acquire this ego-identity, we live in a state of unitary, or undifferentiated, consciousness in which there is no division between ourselves as subject, and the inner or outer object of our experience. This nondualistic experiencing is the mode of consciousness of the Absolute Self within.

When we attain a separate sense of selfhood, or "relative" selfhood, we alienate ourselves from the Absolute Self and its nondualistic consciousness. As the mystic reunites with the Absolute Self, the relative self is demoted from a dominant to a subordinate role within the psyche. The Absolute Self is now the sole lawmaker, the Absolute Anarchist, within the person.

While it may be claimed that most, if not all, socialists view
anarchism as the ultimate goal, the issue that parts them is which political order is most suitable at a particular place and time. We develop in stages, and it is unlikely that we can get away with skipping any. Politically, this means that, in the West, representative (Marxist) socialism will probably have to precede majoritarian (Rousseauean) socialism, which in turn will also need to be mastered before full-fledged anarchism can emerge. Insofar as each stage may be seen as a means to the ultimate end, as the immediate end becomes increasingly nonauthoritarian, the means to it must become ever more libertarian.

Psychologically, the need to evolve through stages means that psychotherapy is a precondition of both anarchism and mysticism. In contrast to the "relative self/Absolute Self" dichotomy, therapeutic theory differentiates between the neurotic, and the integrated, ego. Freed from neurotic impairments, the latter can open itself intrapsychically to the Absolute Self and can extend itself interpersonally toward cooperative community. Although anarchism and mysticism may exist separately, neither can manage effectively without the integrated ego. Successful therapy, then, is their common presupposition and the bridge connecting them.

IV. The History of Anarchism

While failing to achieve its overall aim, the classical period (1840-1939) of anarchist history laid an indispensable foundation upon which to build. The neo-classical period (from the 1960s) is, consequently, better prepared to advance the movement.

The New Left continues to preserve and publicize a rich anarchist past, enabling us to learn from our predecessors. Stirner, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, the Paris Commune of 1871, the Russian soviets of 1905 and 1917, the I.W.W. from 1905-14, and the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39 are just some of the high-points of a valuable and inspiring anarchist history.

What makes the neo-classical anarchist period especially promising, though, is its opportunity to tap into the human potential movement. Whereas classical socialist anarchism focused primarily on changing social conditions, neo-classical anarchism must underscore the importance of self-transformation and self-transcendence. A holistic integration of the political, interpersonal, psychological, and spiritual is required. The fully developed individual is the anarchist revolution. Existential, client-centered, and Gestalt therapies, encounter groups, and meditation are but a few of the literally hundreds of productive approaches to personal, interpersonal, and spiritual growth.

The power to change the world is grounded in the power within. To stifle the latter is to incapacitate the former. Self-actualization, however, is not merely a means to social progress: it is the purpose of society itself. The flower of anarchism is the whole, self-determining person. But since wholeness and autonomy come from within, it is the anarchist who must create anarchism, and not vice versa.

Brad Bohland
Denver, Colorado
An Open Letter to Michael Hinnenkamp
of The Committee for Socialist Union

Dear cmd Hinnenkamp,
I am writing this Open Letter concerning "Building A Green Movement" (DB#39) and the Industrial Union Party. This letter is to request that you answer why you have thus far refused to as you say "dialogue with" those groups in your own political sector.

It is very peculiar that you are approaching the reformist "Green Movement" while refusing to meet with those groups in the De Leonist sector. The Industrial Union Party has a long history of fighting not just the mere ghost of Arnold Petersen (the one you could not exorcise) but fought Petersen in the 1920's. The IUP was also the party to which our late esteemed comrade Eric Hass belonged before his death.

The Industrial Union Party has sought to cooperate with those groups that are SIUist. Certainly, this is more likely to bear fruit than approaching the circus "Greens". I would have nothing against a political "dialogue with" them if you were to "dialogue with" other De Leonists. But you place yourselves in the strange position of refusing to even correspond with IUP members and yet requesting such a dialogue with those who are not likely to agree with socialist industrial unionism.

Cmd Hinnenkamp has not kept prior appointments with the IUP and prior attempts at correspondence with CSU have not elicited any response. Writing as an individual, I hope you will now use this public forum to "dialogue with" the IUP.

I trust you do not believe as the mis-named De Leonist Society it is not worthwhile to "dialogue with" those who left the SLP before or after your own departure because they are somehow tainted either because they "disrupted the bonafide Socialist Labor Party" or were part of "the fraudulent SLP". If the later is true, and I trust it is not, it qualifies the CSU as Petersenites.

Anonymous
"THE PROLETARIAT is the motor of capitalist society and thus its mortal threat: everything is designed to repress it -- parties, bureaucratic unions, police ... the colonisation of its entire life -- because it is the only really menacing force."

ACCORDING TO amateur historian M. Kolhoff, the author of this quotation is an individualist. To quote another Situationist "neo-individualist," Raoul Vaneigem, "You can't make it on your own. You can't live your own life to the full in isolation. But can any individual -- any individual who has got anything at all straight about himself and the world -- fail to see a will identical to his own among everyone he knows: the same journey leaving from the same place."

IF THIS IS "INDIVIDUALISM" -- and so is, among other things, laissez-faire libertarianism -- then individualism is a nonsense category designed to defame, not to explain. Confronted with a detailed demonstration that his history of "individualism" is hogwash, Kolhoff prefers to point out that he is a direct descendant of Paul Bunyan. He tacitly concedes the "individualist" quotation he flaunts in "Neo-Individualists" is, as I've said, forgery. Claiming "no NEED to resort to personal attacks," he resorts to little else ("Bobby Black" -- what a sense of humor this guy has!). If he does it but doesn't have to, he must do it because he likes to. He's telling us he's a madist.

ON THE ONE HAND, "call" is just a proposal inviting discussion; on the other, when he gets discussion, he acts like criticism confirms the weighty importance of this serving of leftovers. At least in speaking of "neo-pseudo-situ-individualists" he conceivably sums up his apoplectic confusion -- every ingredient in this word salad is provided by Kolhoff himself, nobody else talks like this. I wouldn't have noticed Kolhoff at all if Mike Gunderloy hadn't drawn him to my attention and enlisted me to co-author a rejoinder to the "Neo" nonsense. He needn't pride himself on my noticing him, I'm unemployed and I had nothing better to do that day. (Or today.)

WHAT FEEBLE EFFORTS Mikeykins (isn't babtalk a laugh riot? perhaps we'll see no more of it) undertakes by way of counter-attack are easily disposed of. The Situationists did not merely "have a strong council-communist element within their ranks," councilism was official SI dogma at least from 1961 (when the arty types were kicked out) till the group disbanded in 1972. But they drew no "fuel" from Stirner. Rather than quote any evidence whatever Kolhoff airily announces, "read their stuff and see for yourself." He's bluffing. I can simplify the search. Ken Knabb's Situationist International Anthology contains, in addition to about one-third of the SI's journal and many other texts, three indexes -- one to the anthology itself, the others to the two major Situationist treatises -- Debord's Society of the Spectacle and Vaneigem's Revolution of Everyday Life. The sole reference to Stirner in the anthology is hostile: "The one-sidedness of Stirner's notions on the relation of the egoist with the organization that he enters or leaves at whim (though it does contain a grain of truth regarding that aspect of freedom) does not allow any independent role for his passive and defenseless ghost of an 'organization.' Such an incoherent and undisciplined organization is at the mercy of the individual 'egoist,' who cynically exploits it for his own ends (and in fact the
Stirnerian individual can just as well enter the most reactionary association for his own personal profit)." This "individualism" is actually a more coherent equivalent of Kolhoffism. Debord's only comment on Stirner (thesis 78) is to mention him along with Bakunin and Marx as constituents of the (Young) Hegelian current the workers' movement interacted with. Vaneigem (ch. 6) merely mentions Stirner as one name on a long list. There is nothing "Stirnerist" in situationism. Which is too bad; I think Stirner has much to contribute to the communist revolutionary adventure. After all, Stirner never espoused market economics; he addressed other matters. Loospanics carries a "communist egoist" essay by the pro-sit group For Ourselves — I wrote the introduction — which I recommend. The Right to Be Greedy. I was only half joking when in times past I purported to be a group called "Marxist-Stirnerists." Marx and Stirner complete each other, although they never knew it.

TO WRAP UP this Stirner stuff, Kolhoff quotes, with righteous indignation. Stirner's "most famous quote" (10 better ones spring to mind, but I'll let Kolhoff have the floor before I use him to sweep it up with) : "The people is dead — long live me!" I see why this comment is a scandal to Christians, nationalists, fascists, Stalinists and totalitarians... why should it trouble an anarchist? I know this quote, as it figures in the excerpt from Stirner I included in the Eanks anthology I co-edited with Adam Parfrey. I will now quote it in the context Kolhoff has suppressed to show what it actually means:

Listen, even as I am writing this [in 1844], the bells begin to sound, that they may jingle in for tomorrow the festival of the thousand years' existence of our dear Germany. Sound, sound its knell! You do sound solemn enough, as if your tongue was moved by the presentiment that it is giving convey to a corpse. The German people have behind them a history of a thousand years: what a long life! O, go to rest, never to rise again — that all may become free whom you so long have held in fetters.—The people is dead.—Up with me!

STIRNER'S COMMENT is anti-nationalist, and splendidly so. If he was mistaken in his optimism it was a mistake he shared with the authors of The Communist Manifesto and many anarchists. "That all may become free" — that's got by a damn sight "our national slogan for the last ten or twenty years" as Kolhoff says. Even Stirner acknowledged the interdependence of egoists in order to be free (the "Union of Egoists"), and we are free to improve upon him. Kolhoff means "neo-individualists" as "akin to fascists," but even an anti-Stirnerist historian like John Carroll admits, "It is unlikely that Hitler ever heard of Stirner," although there is no doubt he heard of Bakunin et al.

UNABLE TO REFUTE what I say, Kolhoff contradicts what I didn't say. I never denied that Josiah Warren was an individualist. What I deny is that there is any meaningful and important-sense in which Warren, Tucker, Stirner, the Situationists, the Fifth Estate, John Zerzan, Mike Gunderloy, the anarcho-capitalists and myself are individualists. With at least as much justice, every anarchist could be called an individualist, illustrating the uselessness of the term to draw distinctions within the milieu. The few ideologues around who owe anything to Warren or Tucker, as I pointed out, are mostly outside the anarchist movement as Kolhoff knows it; he need not be "concerned" at their presence because they are absent.

KOLHOFF'S "CONCERN" was not shared by the classical anarchists he otherwise thinks cannot be improved upon. Malatesta thought the differences among communist and individualist anarchists were "questions which concern the distant
future," and secondary to the common goal of abolishing the state. Luigi Galleani was a workerist and organizationalist if ever there was one. Between communism and individualism, he wrote, "there is no contradiction, no incompatibility."

For Herbert Read, anarchism's goal "is the most complete unfolding of individualism." Bakunin joined the First International well aware it consisted of Marxists, mutualists, reformist trade-unionists and so forth. The anarchists, far from shunning the social-democratic Second International, had to be kicked out of it. I notice Kolhoff ignores all the evidence of cooperation and cross-fertilization among 19th century radicals I recount in my "Call." Kolhoff in contrast is either contradictory or two-faced. In the "Call" he wants an all-inclusive (his words) anarchist organization; but in "Neo" he writes out of the movement what he says is a large and growing tendency, the "neo-individualist." If they are really, as he says, akin to fascists they have no place in an anarchist organization or, for that matter, any business breathing our air. If they are not akin to fascists — at least no closer kin than syndicalism, Kolhoff's creed, which is unmistakably ancestral to fascism — Kolhoff owes us an apology.

I THINK IT IS CLEAR what's going on. Kolhoff dreams of an all-inclusive formation which is catholic as the Catholic Church is catholic: it aspires to include everybody, but only on its own terms. The "neo-individualists" will be shut out as heretics in the unlikely event they want in. Kolhoffian sectarianism will have their cake and eat it too, they will purport to speak authoritatively for the anarchist movement even as they define the dissidents out of it. (I'd give odds Kolhoff was raised in a hierarchic church — Catholic, Mormon, Eastern Orthodox — as he's openly hurting to set up a surrogate.) Kolhoff foolishly supposes I criticise this scam because I fear its success, but I'm a longtime critic of tendencies, like Leninism, which I'm certain have no future. I write, partly to make sure Kolhoff fails, but mostly to explain why he should fail. To set the record straight. To make sure nobody gets away with anything. I'm bad news for grifters like Kolhoff.

I WAS DEEPLY MOVED by his proletarian pedigree — who wouldn't be? his aunt operates a punch press, surely that authenticates Kolhoff's opinions — although mine is even better, my grandfather founded the UAW local (a very militant local) in Norwood, Ohio. His brothers and sons were mostly either college professors or career soldiers — I suppose I'm a bit of both, erudition armed. I too have been a janitor and a food service worker. Big fucking deal. Kolhoff doesn't say where I "so proudly and pretentiously flaunt" my degree — actually, I have three — since this is another of his fabrications. I learned next to nothing about anarchism in my four years of college (Michigan), my three years of law school (UC Davis/Georgetown) and my three years of grad school (Berkeley). I too sought that out for myself. But I did learn bits of general history, philosophy, sociology etc. which inform my political practice. I don't say "ain't" to pretend I'm a prole because workers find general English more understandable than affected slang or cult jargon. A lot more workers have already read my stuff than will ever pick up Kolhoff's and throw it down in disgust. Anti-intellectualism is counter-revolutionary, because the workers must seize theory and make it their own (seinig, as Stirner would say), abandoning nothing — no factory, no office, no idea — to the class enemy.

SO MUCH FOR Tweedledum, on to Tweedledee, Jon Bekken, the organizationalist who can't get along with people in the IWU, the ACF or any other organization he's been in.

ANUSING WAS the anarchist Bekken's complaint that "in violation of anarchist and federalist principles," some groups in disagreement with the ACF's Basis of Affiliation "bored from within", joining in order to change it†. Didn't Bakunin and his Alliance for Social Democracy — itself the result of anarchist infiltration and takeover of a miscellaneous radical organization — do exactly the same thing in "infiltrating" the First International? Bakunin, not Trotsky, invented emigrism.
BEKKEN'S CANDOR in "refusing to seriously engage Bob Black's arguments for the Abolition of Work" is refreshing if out of character. I recommend the (unequal) exchange in his fanzine Libertarian Labor Review #8 illustrating why the syndies are forfeiting the game to the autonomists. Bekken claims to have appended a summary of my anti-work "arguments" although in fact he has only related a levelled-down summary of my conclusions. But his mistake is natural enough, Bekken himself thinks he is presenting arguments when he is only announcing a list of his conclusions and condemnations (mostly the latter). To present any even slightly unorthodox proposal (like socialist industrial unionism, anarcho-syndicalism, zero-work) in this way is to condemn it before the jury of conventional wisdom, "common sense," the law merchant of the newspaper editors, as per fidiously absurd. He slits his own throat and, as Ed Lawrence would say, he mistakes the elongating wound for a smile.

BOMBS AND BOMBS: I've saved the worst for last. On November 22 I received a package, carrying a Wausau (WI.) postmark and a phony Florida return address, containing a bomb. As it came to my home address from an unknown sender I was suspicious and threw it against the wall, averting detonation. This has never happened, to my knowledge, to anybody in the political/cultural fringe.

[At this point I must BLEEP!, over Comrade Black's objections, a short discussion of prime suspects, even though he assures me that they are on the verge of being brought to what passes for justice in the US in the 1980s.]
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ANGRY WORKERS BULLETIN, Issued very irregularly; number 2 was reviewed in the DB a couple of years ago.

BULLETIN OF ANARCHIST RESEARCH, inquiries to T. V. Cahill, Department of Politics, University of Lancaster, Lancaster LA1 4YL. £4.00 for six issues, £8.00 foreign. Number 18, December 1988, has 37 pages plus three pages of collages of the covers of current radical publications, including DB. For many readers the main interest will be the book reviews, of which there are several in this issue, including a couple by Bob Black, one of which discusses Workers' Democracy Press's Labor's Joke Book in a two-page review that begins, "If Labor's Joke Book is humor, the Kinsey Report is erotica."

CLASS STRUGGLE BULLETIN, P.O. Box 89804, Station K, Vancouver, B.C. V5K 4Y7, Canada. Free. Number 1 reviewed in DB 38. No new issues received.

COLLIDE-O-SCOPE, 2140 Shattuck Ave., Box 2200, Berkeley, CA 94704. 28 pages, Free. Number 1 was reviewed in DB38. No new issues received.

COMMUNIST BULLETIN*, Box CBG, Boontown Books, 167 King St., Aberdeen, U.K. Published by the Communist Bulletin Group, 75p or foreign equivalent. Send cash only, no checks. Number 14, the Summer 1989 issue contains articles on the food riots in Venezuela, on Poland, Hungary, and China as well as "The Proletarian Milieu and Regroupment," concerning the internal politics of left communist groups like themselves and ICC. The CBG produced one of the documents published by Subversion and reviewed in a recent DB.

DELEONIST SOCIETY BULLETIN, P.O. Box 285, Greensburg, PA 15601; no recent issue available.
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One green world

All over the world the present economic system plunders and wastes the Earth's non-renewable mineral and energy sources. All over the world it pollutes the sea, the air, the soil, forests, rivers and lakes. All over the world it upsets natural balances and defies the laws of ecology. Clearly this destruction and waste cannot continue indefinitely, but it need not; it should not and must not.

It is quite possible to meet the basic material needs of every man, woman and child on this planet without destroying the natural systems on which we depend and of which we are a part. The productive methods that would have to be adopted to achieve this are well enough known:
- the practice of types of farming that preserve and enhance the natural fertility of the soil;
- the systematic recycling of materials (such as metals and glass) obtained from non-renewable mineral sources;
- the prudent use of non-renewable energy sources (such as coal, oil and gas) while developing alternative sources based on natural processes that continually renew themselves (such as solar energy, wind power and hydroelectricity);
- the employment of industrial processes which avoid the release of poisonous chemicals or radioactivity into the biosphere;
- the manufacture of solid goods made to last, not to be thrown away after use or deliberately to break down after a calculated period of time.

The Obstacle: the Profit System

So what stands in the way? Why isn't this done? The simple answer is that, under the present economic system, production is not geared to meeting human needs but rather to the accumulation of monetary wealth out of profits. As a result, not only are basic needs far from satisfied but much of what is produced is pure waste from this point of view — for example all the resources involved in commerce and finance, the mere buying and selling of things and those poured into armaments.

The whole system of production, from the methods employed to the choice of what to produce, is distorted by the imperative drive to pursue economic growth for its own sake and to give priority to seeking profits to fuel this growth without consideration for the longer term factors that ecology teaches are vitally important. The result is an economic system governed by blind economic laws which oblige decision-makers, however selected and whatever their personal views or sentiments, to plunder, pollute and waste.

This growth-oriented and profit-motivated capitalist system exists all over the world. In the West in the form of an economy dominated by large private enterprises and multinational corporations and in Russia, China and other such countries in the form of a state capitalism.

If needs are to be met while at the same time respecting the laws of nature, then this system must go.

What is the Alternative?

If we are to meet our needs in an ecologically acceptable way we must first be able to control production — or, put another way, able to consciously regulate our interaction with the rest of nature — and the only basis on which this can be done is the common ownership of the means of production.

By common ownership we don't mean state property. We mean simply that the Earth and its natural and industrial resources should no longer belong to anyone — not to individuals, not to corporations, not to the state. No person or group should have exclusive controlling rights over their use; instead how they are used and under what conditions should be decided democratically by the community as a whole. Under these conditions the whole concept of legal property rights, whether private or state, over the means of production disappears and is replaced by democratically decided rules and procedures governing their use.

This is why a fully democratic decision-making structure must be an essential feature of the system that is to replace private
and state capitalism. The centralised, coercive political state must be dismantled and replaced by a decision-making structure in which everyone is free to participate on an equal basis.

It is possible to envisage, for instance, the local community being the basic unit of this structure. In this case people would elect a local council to coordinate and administer those local affairs that could not be dealt with by a general meeting of the whole community. This council would in its turn send delegates to a regional council for matters concerning a wider area and so on up to a world council responsible for matters that could best be dealt with on a world scale (such as the supply of certain key minerals and fuels, the protection of the biosphere, the mining and farming of the oceans, and space research).

A Needs-Oriented System
Given the replacement of the coercive political state by such a democratic decision-making structure, the network of productive units could then be geared to meeting needs. We deliberately use the word “geared” here because what we envisage is not the organisation of the production and distribution of goods by some central planning authority but the setting up of a mechanism, a system of links between productive units, which would enable the productive network to respond in a flexible way to the demands for goods and services communicated to it.

If the existing situation, where needs are not met in such basic fields as food and housing, is to be avoided then people must be guaranteed access to the goods and services to satisfy their needs. We think the best way to do this is not for some central authority to distribute purchasing power to people but to let people choose for themselves what their real needs are and then to take, in accordance with this choice, what they need from the common store of goods. In other words, a system of free access to goods and services in which money would be unnecessary and so would cease to be used.

Signals to the network of productive units as to what to produce would thus come from what people actually chose to take from the common stores under conditions of free access. This would essentially be a question of stock control which we can envisage being done, in the first instance, at local community level. In this case needs would be communicated by local communities to the productive network as demands for given amounts of specified goods and materials. This would then be communicated throughout the system, from supplier to supplier and if necessary to other regions or to the world level, again as demands for given amounts of specified goods and materials.

Such a system of production to directly supply needs would be essentially self-regulating as the productive system would be responding to real needs in much the same way as the market system is supposed to respond to monetary demand. It is the alternative both to the mechanisms of the market and to central state planning.

Naturally, if people are guaranteed the satisfaction of their needs in this way then work will also be radically transformed. From being a drudgery performed to obtain a money income, work can become meaningful. What will be produced will be useful things that people really need. The whole employee/employer relationship will come to an end. Instead there will be free and equal women and men working together to produce what they need.

In these changed circumstances work can become a voluntary service organised on a democratic basis. People will be able to choose the work they do, in a sector of production they feel suits them. Productive units can be run by a democratic council elected by all those working in them.

In the needs-oriented society we are describing here the concept of “profits” would be meaningless while the imperative to “growth” would disappear. Instead, after an initial increase in production needed to provide the whole world’s population with an infrastructure of basic services (such as farms, housing, transport and water supplies) production can be expected to platform off at a level sufficient to provide for current needs and repaying and maintaining the existing stock of means of production.

What is envisaged here is a society able to sustain a stable relationship with nature in which the needs of its members would be in balance with the capacity of nature to renew itself after supplying them.
We Call It Socialism

So, to sum up, the alternative to the present capitalist system of profit-seeking and monetary accumulation involves:
- the absence of any property rights, private or state, over natural and industrial resources needed for production;
- the existence of a non-coercive democratic decision-making structure;
- the guaranteed access for all to what they need to satisfy their needs;
- the orientation of production towards the direct satisfaction of real needs in a flexible and self-regulating way without the intervention of money and buying and selling;
- the organization of work as a voluntary service under the democratic control of those working in the various productive units.

We call this system "socialism", but it is the content, not the name, that is important. In any event, it obviously has nothing in common with the existing state capitalist regimes (as in Russia and China) or proposals for state control (as by the Labour left) which are often erroneously called "socialist".

Getting from Here to There

The means by which the new society can be achieved are determined by its nature as a society involving voluntary cooperation and democratic participation. It cannot be imposed from above by some self-appointed liberators nor by some well-meaning state bureaucracy but can only come into existence as a result of being the expressed wish of a majority - an overwhelming majority - of the population. In other words, the new society can only be established by democratic political action and the movement to establish it can only employ democratic forms of struggle.

Because the present system is, as a system must be, an inter-related whole and not a chance collection of good and bad elements, it cannot be abolished piecemeal. It can only be abolished in its entirety or not at all. This fact determines the choice as to what we must do: work towards a complete break with the present system as opposed to trying to gradually transform it.

Gradual reform cannot lead to a democratic, ecological society because capitalism is an economic system governed by blind, uncontrollable, economic laws which always triumph in the end over political intervention, however well-meaning or determined this might be. Any attempt on the part of a government to impose other priorities than profit-making risks either provoking an economic crisis or the government ending up administering the system in the only way it can be - as a profit-oriented system in which profit-making has to be given priority over meeting needs or respecting the balance of nature. This is not to say that measures to palliate the bad effects of the present economic system on nature should not be taken but these should be seen for what they are: mere palliatives and not steps towards an ecological society.

The only effective strategy for achieving a free democratic society in harmony with nature is to build up a movement which has the achievement of such a society as its sole aim.

For further information detach the coupon below and post to: THE SOCIALIST PARTY(OW), FREEPOST, LONDON SW4 7BR (no stamp required)

Please send me further information

Name: ..................................................

Address: ..............................................
Dear Discussion Bulletin,

Thanks for sending me several issues of your publication. The reasons I haven't subscribed are, one, I don't exactly fit into the categories you describe as representing non-market socialism (I'm an evolutionary anarchist), and two, I don't believe that rigid macro-social planning is realistic or ethical. I think that people who want to create a cooperative economy (with or without some markets) need to get together in one geographic location and do it among themselves instead of plotting how to transform the entire society, which will undoubtedly be resisted by significant numbers of people (and not just slum lords and sweat shop operators). And life is so complex that no one can plan everything for an entire society. Society is a Hube Goldberg mechanism that can certainly be improved, but it's doubtful it can be smoothly transformed in a short period of time and still work, especially when the participants will range from skeptical to hostile.

I was an IWW member for about two weeks. I tried to organize workers at the greenhouse where I was working and discovered that the working class only cares about money and looking out for #1. I passed out leaflets to 90% of the production workers (to about 70 people) and got 0 responses. One employee turned around, went back inside, and got the owner and personnel manager (who then threatened to have me arrested, which I knew was a bluff). The working class apparently doesn't mind working 7 days a week, getting exposed to pesticides and herbicides, and being ordered around like slaves, as long as they get their paycheck (I was going to say "make the payments on their Trans Am's and power boats," - that would be exaggerating, but not in every case). Even if we did succeed in organizing a union, the company just would have moved or shut down.

The only people who are going to lift a finger, in my opinion, to create a freer and more cooperative society are those who actively support those ideas. If they could succeed in creating something that works among themselves, they would have no trouble luring people away from capitalism. But the tough part is getting something going. As long as we're spread all over the continent and insist on splitting hairs about the organization of the perfect society, this is very unlikely. But we could develop our own means of production and distribution, as least partially, or even more likely, produce something cooperatively that could be sold or traded for other products. Then people would see it and say, hey that sure beats working for a boss.

Well, that's my two cents worth. Just thought you'd like to know I have been reading your magazine.

Ed Stamm
P.O. Box 1402
Lawrence, KS 66044
01-14-90

P.S. Enclosed is a small contribution towards your printing fund to help you get out of the hole. Remember this when the revolution comes, and don't put me up against the wall for being a counter-revolutionary.
Dear readers,

In 1920 a pamphlet by Herman Gorter written in 1920 was reviewed "Open Letter to Comrade Lenin". My criticism of that article is not meant to enhance my ego but is a blow for labor in the ever present class struggle between capital and labor. Since the Bolsheviks seized control in Russia people believed that the world is changing for the better because of a live Marxist model. While Lenin and Trotsky were in exile they accepted help from capitalists and bankers as well as promises. During the difficult early years of the new social system, much American grain was donated to make success possible. Realists that they were capitalists knew that they would profit because labor in the Soviet Union is exploited very despotically. It was in the interest of capitalism for the masses to believe that socialism is established for good or bad and prominent writers helped in the deception. Their eager audience were misinformed people who falsely believed that state ownership is socialism. Soon before she was assassinated the great Marxist Rosa Luxemburg wrote that the new Russia doesn't have socialism because Comunist Party rule is replacing democracy everywhere. Although Lenin said that the end justifies the means, he had no plan to peacefully restore democracy to the people. His successors had no intention to restore democracy either. It is the duty of Socialists to give that new system a correct name to put a halt to destructive confusion. It was playing into enemy hands to address one responsible for great misinformation as comrade Lenin.

When the Nazi Party seized control in Germany, people did not regard it as a Christian victory even though most of the victors were baptised and were against non Christian Jews. In the same way we should not regard the Bolsheviks as socialist even though they are opposed to capitalism and have studied Marx. The Nazis have no identity with Christianity because they are racists and hate those who disagree with the party line while Christ preached love for all people. The Bolsheviks recruited experienced Czarist officers and bureaucrats to help the new society along with the political elite that they were. The new combination of masters were like feudal lords because of their despotic rule. The great American Marxist, Daniel DeLeon predicted that when capitalism fails or breaks down and Socialism is not established then Industrial Feudalism will follow. The short lived capitalist government that the people established when the Czar was overthrown was taken over by the Bolsheviks in a coup d'etat to start a new order. The term Industrial Feudalism that DeLeon first used does not describe the new social system as well as Centralized Feudalism because initially the economy was mostly agricultural and to a small extent industrial but the new society was run from the top down. Current events indicate that the masses demand liberation but Marx predicted that no ruling class gives up its control and privileges without a struggle.

Fraternally Yours,
Monroe Frussack
CALL FOR INSURRECTION

This is a straightforward appeal to fellow members of the DB Committee. Too long have we been content to merely support the DB financially and, sheep-like, ignore the invidious editorial policies of Frank Girard. You know what policies I mean: Absurdly unbridled free speech that subjects us to continual harangues by various petulant personalities against other personalities. Also repetitious communications from nice people who like to see their name in print but long ago ran out of new ideas. Not to mention incomplete sentences.

The contributor who has just succeeded in pushing me over the edge is Bob Black and his cutesy "Comments on the Latest Prussian Censorship Instruction" in DB 38. Black, as you may be trying to forget, read a proposal by Mike Kolhoff suggesting a possible anarchist organization and took violent exception to it. Girard, laboring under some misguided and masochistic need to display whatever diatribes are mailed to him attempted to edit Black's anti-Kolhoff letter in a way that would not offend persons who get upset by immoderate language. The obvious alternative of telling Black to do the editing and ignoring any unresponsive replies does not seem to have occurred to the DB editor.

I am not advocating or encouraging the censorship of malicious drivel by Black. I am denying that censorship in any reasonable sense has occurred. However, Bob Black, Esquire may define the term, censorship prevents the appearance of something in the public media generally (e.g., banning a play from appearing anywhere), or preventing some work from appearing where the writer presumably has organizational rights (e.g., The Revolutionary Vanguard Mouthpiece refuses to print a critical letter from a party member). Rhetorical use of the word "censorship" is one thing, but if Black seriously thinks that Girard's bleeping is really censorship then I demand that Black, at his own expense, reproduce unedited copies of this letter and post them on the vacant walls in his neighborhood and mail copies to everyone in the telephone directory. Anything short of this will be condemned as intolerable censorship.

The purpose of this letter, of course, is not to criticize the unpalatable and backbiting effusions exhibited by the Black types but rather the wimpy editorial policies of Girard. He is, after all, only contributing considerable time, labor and money into publishing a forum intended to foster the exchange of information and ideas among those professing to favor the destatification of society. Doesn't this entitle him to our personal abuse? Fellow members of the DB Committee, arise!

Ben Perry
Dear Comrade Girard,

Some time ago DB readers were informed that a British fellow (a member of the SPGB) was nearly finished writing his sympathetic biography of the SLP's Daniel DeLeon. The late Louis Lazarus of the U.S. Industrial Union Party helped with this Book's research. So the question is what happened to this DeLeon Biography? When will we see it? Or who has it and how much?

And while I am at it, I want to say there does not seem to be much discussion in the Discussion Bulletin. I would like nothing better that see an end to the ceaseless attacks and counter attacks among anarchists. If anything, they prove Marx was right about their political ancestors. And the political leaflets seem like nothing more than filler because there are so few articles. I would suggest longer periods between issues rather than issues with mere filler material. This would seem to cut costs.

The Ohioan

*  *  *

Dear Ohioan and Other Comrades,

I'm happy to report two hearsay but credible statements: (1) The DeLeon biography—I don't even know its title—has been published in Britain (distributed in the U.S. by St. Martin's Press, probably at the cost of an arm and a leg.) Hold off for further price news. (2) Its author, Dr. Steve Coleman of the SPGB, will be in the US between April 17 and May 1. Readers interested in meeting the greatest living socialist soapbox speaker should contact me.

Frank Girard

---

CONFERENCE ON WORKERS' SELF-ORGANIZATION:

Building a New Labor Movement

Location: Sabathani Community Center,
Minneapolis, Minnesota. May 4, 5, 6, 1990

Workshops include: international labor solidarity, women and wage labor, office workers, heavy industry, healthcare workers, cultural organizations, labor-community coalitions, problems of building revolutionary unions.

Speakers include Staughton Lynd, Peter Rachleff, Dave Roediger, and representatives of Pittston and P-9 strikers.

For full brochure or registration ($20), write: WD Press, P.O. Box 24115, St. Louis, Mo. 63130. In Minneapolis call 612-823-2593.

Sponsoring organizations include: Alliance for Cultural Democracy, Industrial Workers of the World (San Francisco Branch), New Union Party, Northland Press, Socialist Party USA, Socialist Party of Texas, Solidarity Club of Youngstown, Workers' Democracy, and Workers Solidarity Alliance (New York).
Dear Frank,

Frank Giraud points out that the statements "capitalism was once progressive in its productive capacities" and "capitalism was once OK" are not at all identical. He also, correctly, realizes that such a distinction is not impressive to those trying to advance a critique of industrial production per se. His distinction between statements about the positivity of capitalism remains somewhat academic if it is true that production in itself is a basic vehicle of alienation and destruction of nature, inner and outer. The two statements become identical insofar as productive capacity is seen as a positive good and not a malignancy.

In this vein, his other two points, that industrialism poses the issue of preservation of the world ecology, and that the anti-industrialism outlook presents no "scenario" or "time table" for its implementation, trivialize the real question as to the nature of technology/division of labor. The growing emptiness and coldness of bourgeois society proceeds apace with the anti-sensual means of its reproduction, technical as well as political. This cannot be reduced to a matter of the ecology "issue" as if only a bit of Greenism would suffice along with a politics otherwise sound. Such a "critique" would just be a way of avoiding a fundamental reassessment that may already be too late.

And pointing out that there is no handy blueprint to give out regarding de-industrialization and its dislocations comes rather close to implying that things even now are not so bad. At the very least, the absence of such blueprints does in no way mean that the critics of a techno-world are unaware of the gravity of our common situation.

John Zerzan
410 Adams
Burgue OK 97402

---

Dear Comrades:

I think Comrade Zerzan is torturing logic when he suggests that anyone who speaks well of the increased productivity of industrialism is, objectively, a defender of capitalism.

But be that as it may, I think Comrade Zerzan and I differ partly because we come from such different political backgrounds. Except in its anarcho-syndicalist form, the anarchist tradition, which influenced Comrade Zerzan's ideas, always presupposed a dispersed, communitarian, agricultural/handicraft society in which the factory system had no part. From that concept the primitivism of Comrade Zerzan and his fellow thinkers is a short step. Marxist socialists, on the other hand, never rejected the factory system, industrialism, and the city -- partly because we saw increased production, even under capitalism, as the factor that would make socialism possible -- if we could just get our fellow workers to destroy the old system and institute a socialist society. We also saw another factor: the anger of our class at the exploitation and alienation would be one of the forces that would drive them into the movement to destroy capitalism.

Today we political descendants of Marx and Engels must realize that when a world revolution abolishes capitalism the socialist society will have to limit industrial expansion. Planet Earth cannot maintain
worldwide consumption on the scale of that prevailing in the U.S. Even if the resources for such consumption were available, we would drown in the waste. At this point, it would seem that our position and that of Comrade Zerzan should be headed toward convergence.

They aren’t, though. For one thing, no socialist revolutionaries from our end of the political spectrum, living in advanced capitalist nations, have ever really addressed the issue. None of us are very eager to tell our class that a socialist revolution will mean giving up a lot of what capitalism has taught us to believe is the good life. I think, though, that when our class begins to give us a hearing and asks what socialism will be like, we are going to have to answer with environmental considerations in mind if we expect to be taken seriously.

The difficulty I have in understanding Comrade Zerzan’s ideas is that he and his co-thinkers seem to accept forever the role of prophets crying in the wilderness. For how can they expect to gain converts? Who could be expected to support what they seem to be calling for: nothing less than a great dying off of the human population? Their thinking has as its logical consequence, not just the inconvenience of not having transportation or computers, but rather the mass death that will result in the northern U.S. in the days and week and winters that follow the turning off of natural gas, the end of food shipment, the end of electrical power. Do primitivists really expect to be taken seriously, or are their ideas being presented just to jolt us into thinking about the environment?

Frank Girard

Dear Friends,

We are a small group in Hong Kong and we support the fight for democracy in China and Hong Kong. We have functioned since June 1989 as the United Front for Peace and Democracy and staged a number of street theatres in support of the Chinese Democracy Movement. These were widely reported in the media in Hong Kong.

Apart from street theatres, members of our group have also taken part in many other activities in support of the Chinese Democracy Movement and we have also joined forces with other groups in Hong Kong in actions condemning the suppression of the basic democratic rights of the Hong Kong people to demonstrate and assemble by the British colonial government. Together with other groups, we are seeking the repeal of the Public Order Ordinance, the enforcement of which is a blatant violation of human rights.

It will be a long fight for democracy and freedom in Hong Kong and China. Many have lost their lives in China. Some have gone into exile. Some are still on trial. But more than a few have been arrested and are facing the prospect of long imprisonment. As part of a campaign to focus concern on those arrested, we are publishing posters/information sheets of these democracy fighters on a monthly basis. These are available in both English and Chinese. One side will be a photo and the other side will contain a short biography and selected writings of the student/worker/intellectual now imprisoned.
by the Deng-Li-Yang clique. We know of no sure or best way to secure the release of the detainees. Amnesty International works for the release of political prisoners by asking its members to write to government leaders expressing deep concern. May be you and your friends/group would like to do the same for the democracy fighters. Use other means to voice your concern and protest as you deem appropriate. For our part, we will send you further issues of Democracy with as they come out.

Keep in touch. Keep up the fight!

Lee Tiu See/ Editor, Democracy Wall
P.O. Box 31340/ Causeway Bay
Hong Kong

Fraternally, 

Dear Frank,

What do I mean by an anarcho-Marxist?

If one returns to the debate between Marx & Bakunin, which though neither the origins of anarchism nor of Marxism, is still the parting of the ways; we see:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marx held</th>
<th>Bakunin held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that there could be a transitional workers' state, but he never defined what this state would be like, that no transitional state could be controlled by the workers, but that in certain circumstances a brief dictatorship by the earlier revolutionary leadership could be justified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that exploiting classes in their day play a progressive role &amp; should be supported, no support to such, however progressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that each new society rises within the core of the old &amp; displaces the old order that revolution is spontaneous and generally cataclysmic,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the &quot;liberation of the working class...&quot; need for a conspiratorial revolutionary leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that only the working class can play a revolutionary role under capitalism that the peasantry &amp; the lumpen-proletariat are more militant and are the vanguard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is obvious that none of the groups to which you are oriented fit nicely into either category. One other division needs to be mentioned, but this immediately cuts across the category anarchist.
Marx held that socialism is scientific, & socialists must be.

Bakunin feared scientists as the new priesthood, an elite using jargon to mystify the masses and subordinate them.

Kropotkin who was a more accomplished physical scientist than any contemporary (or perhaps subsequent) marxist, said that the claim that political theory could be treated like a physical science is scientifically pretentious nonsense.

SIUism either in its syndicalist or its De Leonist form (not to mention all those intermediate SIUist groupings that like those two renounce any intention of taking over the state) obviously derives from Marx the concentration on the working class & on building the new society within the shell of the old; but its though it rejects the conspiracy and dictatorial ideas of Bakunin, it shares his rejection of the transitional workers' state.

Spontaneous communism either in its Malatestan or its Councillist form while accepting Bakunin's spontaneity thesis rejects his leading conspiracy, agrees with him on the state, but otherwise is closer to Marx. (Malatesta always disliked being called a Bakunian, and published an insistence that there were basic distinctions between their views.)

The SPGB was founded with a formally strict Marxist programme, but has moved to something approaching William Morris who was closer to Kropotkin than to Marxism, and - in most cases - its criticism of De Leonism parallels the councillist criticism of syndicalism, suggesting a spontaneist vision of social transition.

Though some syndicalists (notably Sam Dolgoff) reconcile Bakunin with SIUism, this is generally a theoretical abstraction, with no immediate programmatic manifestation.

So I think that the term is apt.  

Laurens Otter
DEMOLITION DERBY, CP 1554, Succ. B, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3B 3L2. Free; number 1 reviewed in DB38.

DISCUSSION BULLETIN, P.O. Box 1564, Grand Rapids MI 48501. Bimonthly; six issues $3. You now hold number 40 in your hand.

ECHANGES, "For information about Echanges, subscriptions and also pamphlets, write to... ECHANGES ET MOUVEMENT, BM Box 81, London WC1 N3 XX, U.K." English and French editions published four or five times per year, Echanges is the only regular English language councilist publication in existence and one of the few truly international journals in our political sector. It is sparked by the energy and thinking of Henri Simon, author of several pamphlets on events in Poland and Eastern Europe during the Seventies and Eighties. It also publishes pamphlets, among which are Pannekock's Workers' Councils in four parts as well as a pamphlet on Italism of the People.

FACTSHEET FIVE, 8 Arizona Ave, Rensselaer, NY 12144. $2 per copy; $11 for a six-issue sub. Although it isn't a political magazine, we wish to include Mike Gunderloy's bimonthly, 116-page survey of out-of-the-mainstream (not to say off-the-wall) publications. Most of these are personally published "zines" presenting their publishers' ideas about music, comics, etc., but Comrade Gunderloy, whose sympathies seem to lie with the anarchist wing of our political sector, includes reviews of any radical publications that reach him.

FIFTH ESTATE, P.O. Box 02546, Detroit, MI 48202. Quarterly, 32-page tabloid; $1 per copy, $5.00 per year, U.S.; $7.00 foreign. In the past fifteen years of its existence FE has evolved into the leading voice of anarchist primitivism of the sort espoused by John Zerzan. Typically the Winter 1990 edition [Vol.24 No.3 (333)] features a seven-page article, "Stopping the Industrial Hydra: Revolution Against the Megamachine," but there is much more to FE than that sort of thing. Articles on capitalism's effect on the cultural as well as the natural environment, a mail order book service, a fine letters-to-the-editor page, and other articles and columns written with wit and insight by members of the editorial collective make FE worth reading.

HERE AND NOW, c/o Transmission Gallery, 28 King St., Glasgow G1 5GP, U.K. (U.S. Individual Mail Order: Flatland, P.O. Box 2420, Fort Bragg, CA 95437) Three-issue sub $2, $3 abroad. Number 3 Contains a long report on the "Muslim mobilization" against Rushdie's Satanic Verses. Others discuss Eurocommunism, the poll tax rebellion, Charter 88, and Scottish nationalism. Also, an article by Phil Mailer discusses such autonomous workers' groups as the Italian Cobas, Coordinadora, and spontaneous strike groups.

IDEAS & ACTION, P.O. Box 40400, San Francisco, CA 94140. I&A is the
quarterly publication of the Workers' Solidarity Alliance (affiliated with the International Workers Association). Number 12, fall 1989, billed as the "Special Issue for the 1989 Anarchist Conference," is a 16-page tabloid with articles on the WSA's sixth convention, events in China, the Pittston strike, a two-page statement of the WSA's principles, and other articles promoting the WSA, as one might expect in an issue of this sort. IWA also sells pamphlets through its mail order service.

INDUSTRIAL WORKER, 3435 N. Sheffield Ave., Chicago, IL 60657. The IW is a monthly 8-page tabloid published by the IWW since 1905. $10 per year. Volume 87, Number 2 has articles on the return of anarchosyndicalism to the USSR, the use of the criminal syndicalism laws against Earth Firsters, a very witty article on the need for glasnost in the US, and others. The IW is easily the most aesthetically satisfying tabloid published in our political sector.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Spanner is a new quarterly in our political sector. I'd describe it as a bigger and better British version of the DB. The first issue, 52 8 1/2 by 11 pages, includes the following articles: "The Green Wave," "Common Ownership," "The Road to Socialism," "Standing Marx on His Head," and "The Tyranny of Economics." As might be expected, this first issue was a bit long on articles and short on letters. But the articles were certainly controversial. It is not a SPGB publication, but much of its material comes from that perspective. £1/$2 per issue from BM Spanner, London WC1N 3XX, England.

Organizational Platform of the Libertarian Communists. Somehow this title doesn't fit a programmatic statement by Russian anarchist exiles like Nestor Makhno, Ida Mett, and Piotr Arshinov, members of the group that published Diozo Trudn in France and produced this highly controversial "platform" in 1928. Their experiences during and after the Russian Revolution convinced them of the importance of anarchist organization among working people and of anarchist unity if they were to influence events during a revolutionary situation. It was debated at anarchist conferences and engaged the interest of a star-studded cast: Fabbri, Malatesta, Berkman, Berneri, and others. In his preface to this edition Alan MacSimin, a DB subscriber, writes, "Lest anyone doubt its relevance today, it must be said that the basic ideas of "The Platform" are still in advance of the prevailing ideas of the anarchist movement internationally." Required reading, I should think, for all opponents and proponents of anarchist unity.

(catalog) AT DISTRIBUTION, 3 Balmoral Place, Stirling FK8 2RD, Scotland. The 42-page catalog, which includes titles from publishers in the English language all over the world—including Charles H. Kerr in the U.S.—contains only a small part of the titles we have available. Interested persons can get other specialized listing. It includes journals and periodicals.

For Communist by Guy Aldred, [1935], 122 pages. "A Communist
Manitesto/ Defining the Workers’ Struggle and the Need for a New Communist International/ With a History of the Anti-Parliamentary Movement, 1905-1935’ A recent reprint by Unpopular Books, Box 15, 138 Kingsland Road, London E8 2HS, England. L2.50/ $5.00. Books about Aldred’s life and works have been reviewed before in the DB. He remained a vigorous opponent of both the social democratic and leninist perversions of socialism until the very end. In 1935 when he wrote this he was still trying to rally the opposition worldwide. Much of this fascinating volume consists of reviews of what Aldred considered libertarian socialist groups worldwide. In the US these included Paul Mattick’s United Workers’ Party and, for goshakes, Albert Weisbord’s Communist League of Struggle. Also received from Unpopular Books were The Echo of Time by Jacques Camatte and None Shall Escape: Radical Perspectives in the Caribbean by Fundi, Caribbean Situationist. We don’t have the prices of these; readers should write for info. Unpopular Books also has in the works pamphlets on “What is Communism?” and “What is Situationism?” as well as a pamphlet about events in the USSR.