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**BULLETIN MATTERS**

"Bulletin Matters" in DB68 began with a statement that differentiating socialism from leftism should be a permanent feature of this magazine. This issue brings up what I think should be another matter of
permanent interest and discussion: the nature of a future socialist society. In fact, several articles in this "utopia issue" deal with the subject, the first two with a matter that seems to drive Leninists, social democrats, and other "market socialists" up the wall: the abolition of money in a truly socialist society.

The feature article, "Smash Cash" by David Ramsay Steele came to us via the good offices of Steve Colman of the SP(GB). It was published in a 1968 issue of Oz, a major British alternative periodical of the sixties. At that time Steele was a member of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. He has since come to the U.S., evolved into a free marketeer and written a book extolling the virtues of capitalism. Norman Armstrong's "Where's the Money Going to Come From" discusses the advantage of a moneyless social system from a

ABOUT THE DISCUSSION BULLETIN

The Discussion Bulletin is affiliated with the Industrial Union Caucus in Education (IUCE). It serves as the financially and politically independent forum of a relatively unknown sector of political thought that places the great divide in the "left," not between Anarchists and Marxists but between capitalism's statist leftwingers and social democrats and the real revolutionaries of our era: the non-market, anti-statist, libertarian socialists. They are organized in small groups of syndicalists, communist anarchists, libertarian municipalists, world socialists, socialist industrial unionists, council communists, and left communists. The perspective of these groups with their rejection of capitalism's wage, market, and money system as well as capitalist politics and unionism constitutes the only real alternative to capitalism in both its market and statist phases.

In the DB the often antagonistic groups that make up this sector can debate and discuss the issues that divide them, gain some understanding of their history and future possibilities and begin a process, we hope, of at least limited cooperation.

The pages of the DB are open to anyone in this political sector, the only limitation being that submissions be typewritten, single-spaced, and copy ready. We do no editing here. As to content, we assume that submissions will be relevant to the purpose of the DB and will avoid personal attacks.

Subscription Information

The Discussion Bulletin is published bi-monthly. Prices below are in U.S. currency.

U.S.: Individual Subscription $3; Library $5
Non-U.S.: Surface Mail Individual sub $5; Library $10
Air Mail Individual sub $10; Library $15

Back Issues: Nos. 1-8 $2 each, Nos. 9+ $1 each plus postage.

Expiration: The last issue of your subscription is indicated by the number on your address label. When your subscription expires, we'll write to remind you.

Sample Copies: A sample copy is sent on request. We mail copies not used to fill subscriptions to people on our extended mailing list.
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, forest, 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.

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 hydro-electricity);
- 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 an economy dominated by large private enterprises and multinational corporations and in other 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.

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 plateau off at a level sufficient to provide for current needs and repairing 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 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 organisation 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 former state capitalist regimes (as in Russia and eastern Europe) 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 interrelated 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.
Abolition of Money! Down through the ages this wild and visionary slogan has been whispered by a subversive few. Ever since human beings discovered cash, they have hated it and tried to rid themselves of it — whilst their own actions have kept it alive. In this respect, money is like syphilis.

Today the whisper has become a shout — though still the shout of a tiny minority. Tomorrow it will be the roar of the crowd, the major topic of discussion in every pub and coffee house, factory and office.

The abolition of money is an ancient dream, the most radical demand of every social revolution for centuries past. We must not suppose that it is therefore destined to remain a Utopia, that the wheel will simply turn full circle once more. Today there is an

they themselves keep the scarcity in existence. The only excuse for money is that there is not enough wealth to go round but it is the money system which makes sure there cannot be enough to go round. By abolishing money we create the conditions where

If we made a list of all those occupations which would be unnecessary in a Moneyless World, jobs people now have to "do which are entirely useless from a human point of view, we might begin as follows: Customs officer, Security guard, Locksmith, Wages clerk, Tax assessor, Advertising man, Stockbroker, Insurance agent, Ticket puncher, Salesman, Accountant, Slot machine operator, Industrial spy, Bank manager, before we realized the magnitude of effects of the patents system, the waste of effort through duplication of activities by competing firms or nations — these are just a few of the ways in which profits cause waste.

What this amounts to is that ninety per cent (a conservative estimate) of effort expended by human beings today is entirely pointless, does not the slightest bit of good to anybody. So it is quite ridiculous to talk about "how to make sure people work if they're not paid for it." If less than ten per cent of the population worked, and the other ninety per cent stayed at home watching telly, we'd be no worse off than we are now.

But there would be no need for them to watch telly all the time, because without the profit system work could be made enjoyable. Playing tennis,
entirely new element in the situation: Plenty.

All previous societies have been rationed societies, based on scarcity of food, clothing and shelter. The modern world is also a society of scarcity, but with a difference. Today's shortages are unnecessary; today's scarcity is artificial. More than that: scarcity achieved at the expense of strenuous effort, ingenious organization and the most sophisticated planning.

The world is haunted by a spectre—the spectre of Abundance. Only by planned waste and destruction on a colossal scale can the terrifying threat of Plenty be averted.

Money means rationing. It is only useful when there are shortages to be rationed. No one can buy or sell air: it's free because there is plenty of it around. Food, clothing, shelter and entertainment should be free as air. But the means of rationing scarcity what was involved. And these are merely the jobs which are wholly and utterly useless. Nearly all occupations involve something to do with costing or selling. Now we should see that the phrase "Abolition of Money" is just shorthand for immense, sweeping, root and branch changes in society. The abolition of money means the abolition of wages and profits, nations and frontiers, rich and poor, armies and prisons. It means that all work will be entirely voluntary.

Of course, the itemizing of those jobs which are financial does not end the catalogue of waste. Apart from astronomical sums spent on the Space Race, and the well-known scandal of huge arms production, we have to realize that all production is carried on purely for profit. The profit motive often runs completely counter to human need. "Built-in obsolescence" (planned obsolescence), the restrictive writing poems or climbing mountains are not essentially any more enjoyable than building houses, growing food or programming computers. The only reason we think of some things as "unenjoyable" and others as "work" is because we get used to doing some things because we want to and others because we have to. Prostitutes despise love. We are all prostitutes. In a Moneless World work would be recreation and art. That work which is unavoidably unhealthy or unpleasant, such as coalmining, would be automated immediately. Needless to say, the only reason these things aren't done by machines at present is because it is considered more important to lower the costs of the employer than to lower the unhappiness of his slaves.

The money system is absolute and antihuman. So what should we do about it? In years to come, with the increasing education and increasing misery of

(from p. 2) perspective a quarter century later than Steele's. It comes to us from the Socialist Standard (Write to 52 Clapham High St., London SW4 7UN England for a free copy).

The print format of both articles challenged the production crew at Box 1564. If we simply reduce the copy to fit our page the print becomes difficult to read without a magnifying glass. By expanding the original via copier we can paste it up horizontally and get a larger print size. It's a bit more awkward to read, though, and it looks as though readers will have to chase this article from page to page as a result. Some day we will get a scanner and solve all these problems.

SLP oldtimers will recognize the "SIU" leaflet. It is probably still the most detailed vision of the new society. The Socialist Labor Party (111 W. Evelyn Ave. #209, Sunnyvale, CA 94086) has allowed the leaflet to go out of print, perhaps because of its emphasis on centralization and top-down control of production. Not
modern life, together with growing squalor in the midst of growing plenty, we can expect the Abolition of Money to be treated more and more as a serious issue, to be inserted into more and more heads. The great mass of individuals will first ridicule, then dare to imagine (Fahrenheit is the first act of rebellion—Freud), then overthrow.

In the meantime, as well as propagating the notion of a Moneyless World, those of us who see its necessity have a responsibility to sort out our own ideas out, in order that we may present an intelligible and principled case. We must stop thinking of the Moneyless World as an "ultimate aim" with no effect upon our actions now. We must realize that the Abolition of Money is THE immediate demand. A practical proposition and an urgent necessity—not something to be vaguely "worked towards."

Unfortunately those who want the Moneyless World frequently wade in a mine of mystification. Above all it is necessary to understand the workings of this society, capitalist society (Moscow, Washington and Peking are all in the same boat) if we are to know how to destroy it.

For example there is a commonly held view that Automation is going to settle all our worries, that money will expire automatically as part of a "natural process of evolution." This is quite wrong. As pointed out above, this society only automates to increase profits and for no other reason. Employment may take on machine-cut and represent the beginning of the New Emporium of non-work, of machines of luxury, in the production-class. We

The defenders of this insane society, it is they who stand accused, they who have to supply the arguments—arguments for poverty and enslavement in a world of Ptolemaic

All theoretical constructions which relate to wages, prices, profits and taxes are ghosts from the past, as absurdly outdated as the quilibles about how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. "Incomes policy" is irrelevant—we want the abolition of incomes. "Fighting crime" is irrelevant—we want the abolition of the law. "Workers' control" is irrelevant—we want the abolition of "workers." "Black Power" is irrelevant—we want the abolition of power over people. "The national interest" is irrelevant—we want the abolition of nations.

And let no one raise the banal cry: what are you going to put in their place? As though we would say to a research scientist: "And when you've cured Cancer, what are you going to put in its place?"

Then there is the myth of the small-scale. We cannot go back to being peasants and we should not want to. Keeping several thousand million people alive on this planet necessitates railways, oil wells, steel mills. Only by intricate organization and large-scale productive techniques can we maintain our Abundance. Do not be afraid of machines. It is not machines which enslave, but Capital, in whose service machines are employed, McLuhan with many of them might play Bingo, eventually more and more would aim at higher things.

What is wrong with this projection? Many things, but chiefly two. First, it fails to take account of the systematic nature of society. Second, it assumes that present-day society exhibits a harmony of interests.

In the first place, Lomas says: "Why are these people working? They are not working for the sake of production, for the truth is that if they were removed production could be increased beyond measure." He concludes that they are working because of their attitudes, the attitudes of their employers, the attitudes of the rest of society. But the fact of the matter is that these workers are working for the sake of production— not the production of goods but the production of profits. The reason why things are "made with great ingenuity to wear out" is not because of the attitudes of the people involved. The management may think it's criminal but they are paid to organize things so as to optimize profits. If they produced razor blades to last for centuries, the firm would go broke. It is not the attitudes which are crucial, but economic interests. If a teetotaler owns shares in a brewery, it does not make the booze less potent.

Which brings us to the second point. Today's world is a jungle of conflicting vested interests. The Abolition of Money will represent the liberation of
profits and for no other reason. Employers even take machines out and put workers back in — if they find that labour power is cheaper. Any gain from automation these days is more than cancelled out by the waste explosion. Do not imagine that the slight increases in living standards of the last twenty years are the beginning of a smooth transition to Abundance. Another huge world slump is approaching.

A different illusion, also popular, is that cash can be abolished by example, by opening giveaway shops or by starting small moneyness communities which are parasitical upon the main body of society. These experiments accomplish little. Those people, for instance, who open stores to give and receive books without payment, face a predictable result: a large stock of lousy books.

These projects stem partly from a belief that we need to prove something. Relax. We don't need to prove anything. represents the beginning of the New Consciousness of man-made artifacts. Computers are warm and cuddly creatures. We will have a beautiful time with them.

Many of the worst errors which retard the development of the New Consciousness, the Consciousness of Plenty, are to be found in Herbert Lomas' piece on "The Workless Society" in International Times/43. This at least has the merit that someone is putting forward a case for the removal of money in specific terms. Unfortunately, they are specific non-starters.

According to Herbert Lomas, a political party is to be formed which will take power and proceed as follows. Useless workers in industry will gradually be laid off and paid for not working. The process will be extended until money can be abolished. In the meantime, those being paid for doing nothing will do what they like. To begin

slaves, yes — but also the dispossession of masters, i.e., the working class. We cannot view the government as an impartial panel which looks after the best interests of everybody; it is an instrument used by one set of people to oppress another.

On one point Herbert Lomas is correct. The movement for the Abolition of Money must be political, because when we destroy money we destroy the basis of the power of our rulers. They are unlikely to take kindly to this, so we must organize politically to remove them.

For the moment though, what is needed is more discussion and greater understanding. We must be confident that the movement will grow. We must think, question, and think again — but never lose consciousness of that one, simple, astounding fact: Plenty is here. The Moneyless World is not an ultimate millennium. We need it now.

(from p. 7)

all the leaflet is reproduced here and readers can get a copy of the whole thing by sending a sase to Box 1564. Ernest Mann, who has a thirty-year record of espousing a moneyness economy—the graphic in Armstrong's article comes from him—describes the new society from an individualist communist anarchist viewpoint.

Ed Jahn has done some serious and important reading on the Russian Revolution and its immediate aftermath. His article not only distills this for DB readers but also offers a way of obtaining some of his sources. I'd also like to direct readers to Maurice Brinton's The Bolsheviks and Workers' Control (Black and Red, P.O. Box 9546, Detroit, MI 48202).

Larry Gambone takes Pat Eychison and me to task for what he sees as our unfair reviews of his DB87 articles, and I respond briefly. Dave Perrin continues his discussion with Robin Cox on the subject of reform, a matter of real importance in these days of market socialism. Next Alan Kerr discusses what I consider a serious flaw in
WHERE COMMONSENSE DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

Where's the money going to come from?

Anyone who watches the political programmes at Sunday lunchtime will be familiar with the question "Where's the money going to come from?" On 1 May, for instance, Brian Walden pressed Labour MP Ann Taylor on this question as a rejoinder to her suggestion of increased nursery provision. And Robin Cook, who insisted on the European Social Chapter (On The Record, 29 May), was similarly rebuked by the money question. Labour MPs of course have no real response they can hold against this shibboleth of received wisdom; they believe in the basic precepts which necessitate the asking of the question.

It seems obvious to socialists that an analysis of the nature of money is required here. It can't be simply assumed that money is a type of innocuous representation of actual wealth. On the contrary it must be asked if its overall a hammer, but in none of these functions was it very adequate, its only advantage was that it was cheaper in money than the three separate tools together. Hence a compromise is made between the tool-like properties of the knife and its exchange properties, and insofar as it was made to serve the latter function, it is not really a tool, except, as it were, a tool for making money rather than things.

Even philosophy itself is compromised by its association with exchange value. According to Aristotle, the Sophists let themselves be tainted by the profit motive, for the Sophist "is one who makes money from an apparent but unreal wisdom". The medical profession too becomes confused when its ends are mixed between money-getting and health. Contemporary examples inevitably spring to mind: "health" businesses selling liposculpature, far from providing perfect Walden would believe, or is it the promulgation of an ideological programme?

Admittedly the roots of this "larderism" lie deep in the facts of prehistory, when the store of food for the winter exemplified the model of a limited physical source determined by the real quantity and the real fertility of the land. This model still provides a basic formula for the operation of banks and nations, the only difference being that food has been replaced by an abstract symbol of money, taking the form of bank reserves or national currency reserves representing all forms of production, not just agricultural.

This larderism has a powerful hold on the level of folk economics. On this level, the constraints of fixed budgets emerge in populist style as slogans such as "you can't just print money", "there is no
arithmetical form imposes certain ideological categories and casts its own ethical (or unethical) shadow over our existence.

Nowadays the analysis of money has disappeared, in Orwellian fashion, from economic discourse. But critiques of money extend back over 2000 years. One of the best discussions of money, and one that greatly influenced Marx, is still that of the Ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle.

**Aristotle**

Aristotle attributed two natures to money, that of a means and that of an end. This distinction reflects an ethical critique of the effects of money and how it is used. Some uses of money were acceptable and even laudable, argued Aristotle, as when money is used simply as a convenient means of getting useful things. But other uses, he said, were unacceptable or perverted, as where the exchange of goods was simply a mask for the accumulation of money or spurious wealth. So trading directed towards the use of goods with money merely as a common medium of transaction was seen as good, and trading directed at the exchange of commodities for profit, with commodities used merely as a means of securing this profit, was seen as bad. The distinction corresponds closely, but problematically as we shall see, to the one between use value and exchange value.

Aristotle used the example of the Delphian knife to illustrate the perverting effect of money. The Delphian knife was a tool that was made to be exchanged for money rather than to be used to perform a task. It could be used as a knife, a file, and information on the effects of the operation, as the market sophistry maintains, on the contrary deliberately deceive patients about the risks involved, in order to secure the sale. And it could be argued that in every consumer product, a compromise must be made when the purposes involved in its creation are divided between exchange and use value; between the requirements of the seller and those of the customer.

**Is money neutral or does it stand in the way of meeting needs?**

Aristotle’s distinctions of exchange and use, means and ends, ethics and purely economic factors apply to the modern orthodoxy. The relatively trivial question “Where’s the money going to come from?” becomes the penetrating question “What is money?” The latter question challenges the received categories of exchange relations and demands an investigation into the barbaric practices out of which exchange arose. It is a question that asks is money realistic or astrivistic?

It is clear that ideas as much as facts are central to the workings of money. For example, the principle that whatever projects are envisaged must come out of existing funds. Fiscal spending, so it is said, represents a real practical limit which it is impossible to surpass. Behind this is the idea of a finite cache of wealth, a fund or a larder, in which things have been stored, and out of which things can be withdrawn at a later date. Is this really a practical matter, as no doubt Brian bottomless pit”, “you can’t have your cake and eat it”, “you don’t get ought for nought”, “money isn’t made in heaven it’s earned here on Earth”, “there’s no such thing as a free lunch”, etc. Ah, the stuff tabloids are made of. And on the academic level, the principle seems to be simply elevated by nobler terms of expression rather than critically evaluated. Lord Robbins urged us to accept economics as the eternal problem of matching infinite wants against finite resources; the fundamentals of Mercantilism insist that “no man profiteth but by another’s loss”. All these aphorisms, ranging from crudity to casuistry, suggest a store of goods gained by toil in the summer as protection from the oncoming winter.

Despite creditable origins, this economic picture is logically flawed by its attempt to project the properties of a primitive domestic situation upon the complexities of the modern macroeconomic world. Some systems do follow the model of a fixed fund of goods, but the patterns of complex interaction between humankind and the biological and physical world, are, or can be, either synergistic or mutually exclusive. In the case of synergy, the more you take out of them, the more you have left; in the case of exclusivity, activity in one area has no effect on activity in another. The universal form of money makes all activities mutually burdensome, and insists, for instance, that the growth in education must be paid for by cuts in health, or in investment in transport must be paid for by defence. Thus a kind of universal parasitism is established. One must question the nature of a formula of mutual
burden which happens to have the very useful effect, for the Establishment, of dividing factions of society as competitors for limited resources.

The concepts of synergy and mutually exclusivity seem to violate the plausible, but examples are easy to find. The human body is synergistic in that the more you expend its energy as in exercise, the more energy you have as in fitness. If the linear economic model was applied to the body, you would get fit by sitting still and eating, thereby accumulating capital as fat. Mutual independence is clearly a fact of the natural and human worlds; there is no logical or physical connection between distant objects and activities. A bee taking honey in Glasgow is not constrained by one doing the same in London, yet Strathclyde is constrained by public spending in the Home Counties. Why do we impede ourselves in this way? Well, the popular wisdom is that there is only one pot of honey (money), for which we vie for attention. We should learn something from the symbiotic ecology of insects.

Free lunch
An even more serious error of money symbolism concerns the frontier of possible growth. The pseudo-physical arithmetic limit on economic development seems to be rooted in the Physiocratic principle that all wealth comes from the Earth, or the similarly-arbitrary Mercantilist precept that all wealth comes from the trade, or for that matter from the Marxist view that value is added by labour. But not only are the Earth's resources, in contradistinction to the come from?) then that ideology isn't innocuous but a necessarily ethical, and tension between the two natures of money, one related to use, and one related to
money model, symbiotic; they are also supplemented, as is the human body, from an external source. The human body is an organism in the world and receives its energy through food, and the Earth is a planet in the solar system, that likewise receives, free of charge, an inexhaustible input of fuel from the star in the middle of the solar system: the sun.

The sun is the free lunch that orthodox economics can't come to terms with. The money system operates on a closed world assumption, on the much-stated monetarist principle that money is made here on Earth, it doesn't come down from the sky. In fact all the wealth-making processes on the Earth are driven by extraneous energy that does come down, as it happens, from the sky. If money fails to reflect this reality and its function becomes not to reflect actual resources but to impose an ideological limit on their development and distribution. And if those limits demand that the homeless cannot be housed and that the hungry cannot eat (because where's the money going to unethical, force.

So Aristotle's point is proved: the effect of money does poison the transactions and distributions it enforces its rule over. But not just directly because of the profit motive or exchange, but indirectly because of the general nature of the abstract form of exchange which embodies false assumptions about the nature of the world: the assumption that the fiscal frontier is the final frontier.

But to make Aristotle's analysis fully consistent we ought to abandon the means/ends distinction which had a confused relation to the use/exchange distinction, and say not that there are two types of money (use money and exchange money) but that money necessarily is exchange value, that exchange value is necessarily perverse, and that true usefulness is necessarily contrary to the abstract value which money imposes on the physical world.

If Aristotle had accepted this analysis it would have solved a number of problems for him. Instead of having an exchange, he could have rejected exchange completely and have said that the evaluation of goods should be dependent solely on their quality as defined in use. In a socialist system it is indeed use value that is the criterion of true wealth, and the spurious abstraction which exchange relations arbitrarily, and harmfully, apply to useful things would be simply removed.

If the premise of inherent scarcity is abandoned, as it can be when the qualitative, generous and realistic physical frontier is substituted for the miserly quantitative economic frontier, then it is no longer necessary to measure all goods by one universal standard as a means of rationing them. Is money the measure of all these things or are humans? Let us say the latter and thus advocate, along with an Aristotle-made-consistent, the abolition of exchange and the abolition of money. And if money is abolished, the question, where is the money to come from, is obviously redundant.

NORMAN ARMSTRONG
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In a revolutionary period in history, when mankind must choose between an outworn social order and a new order, the question HOW becomes every bit as important as the question WHAT.

The great social question of our age which demands immediate solution is: Are we going to keep the system of private ownership? Shall we attempt to preserve a social system that has proved its incapacity to solve the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty? Do you favor prolonging the life of a society in which a few own all the means of wealth-production, in which labor-saving machinery, instead of lightening labor's toil, throws workers out of their jobs onto the industrial scrapheap? Must mankind pass through still another vicious cycle of depression, crisis and war? Or shall we do the common-sense thing, make the means of production our collective property, abolish exploitation of the many by the few, and use our productive genius to create leisure and abundance for all?

If you agree with us that society must be reconstructed, then there are certain things we must understand. The first is that we can expect no help whatsoever from the beneficiaries of capitalism. Here and there a capitalist may see the handwriting on the wall and join with the workers, but as a class the capitalists, like the slave-owning and feudal classes before them, will strive to prolong their poverty-ridden, war-breeding system. The workers of hand and brain must build this new world and emancipate themselves through their own class-conscious efforts.

The second thing we must understand is this: Though the workers are in the overwhelming majority, and have tremendous potential power, they can apply their collective strength to the task at hand only through organization.

How must the American workers organize to effect their emancipation?

We have a Constitution that provides for its own amendment, or, in other words, that legalizes revolution. In the language of Abraham Lincoln: “The right of peaceable assembly and petition and by Article V of the Constitution—the right of amendment—is the constitutional substitute for armed revolution.”

This means that by organizing politically the working class places itself firmly upon the institutions of civilization, and avails itself fully of the constitutional right of political agitation and the ballot. This is the peaceful method. It permits the forces of progress to proclaim their purpose in the broad-open day, and there mobilize themselves for political victory and the conquest of the capitalist political State.

But no ruling class in history has ever willingly relinquished its power and privileges. There is nothing in the history of our own ruling class to indicate that it differs in this respect from the slave-owning and feudal classes of old. Therefore, behind the Socialist ballot the workers must organize a power capable of enforcing its mandate. Socialist Industrial Unionism is that power. Unlike AFL-CIO unionism, which boasts of being a bulwark of capitalism, Socialist Industrial Unionism declares its intention to abolish class rule.

The source of all power is economic. Armies, particularly modern armies, cannot operate unless they are constantly supplied with a multitude of items which flow uninterruptedly from industry. Although an army is a military power, it is dependent on industry, hence on the workers who operate industry.

Modern capitalist production has achieved such magnitude that it has greatly expanded the potential economic power of the workers. This is true because the workers run industry from top to bottom and are, therefore, in the best strategic position to take possession. “Take possession” is precisely what we must do in an orderly and yet resolute manner the moment the victory at the polls is proclaimed. This is not a general strike (which leaves the workers in the open terrain), but a GENERAL LOCKOUT OF THE CAPITALIST CLASS!

Finally, the Socialist Industrial Union supplies the instrument for the administration of production under the Industrial Republic of Labor. It is at once “the battering ram with which to pound down the fortress of capitalism, and the successor of the capitalist social structure itself.”

All power to the Socialist Industrial Union!
This Form of Government Sued the Pre-Industrial Age

A hundred and fifty years ago production was simple. Nearly all communities were more or less self-contained, i.e., they produced flour, leather, cloth, lumber, and most of the things they consumed, locally. Geographical representation — representation from states and Congressional areas — harmonized with the economic as well as the social needs of the people.

Gradually at first, then rapidly after the Civil War, local manufacture gave way to national manufacture and distribution via an intricate network of railways. The self-contained community disappeared. Instead, each community became dependent on all others for the goods it consumed.

Today our productive mechanism is as complex as it is vast. It cuts across all arbitrary boundary lines and can no more be controlled and directed by Congress than a locomotive can be driven with a bull whip. To direct the huge and complicated industrial machine under a collective society requires an Industrial Form of Administration.

A lone fiddler needs no leader, but an orchestra does. The orchestra leader is not there to bully anyone or rule anyone. His baton is not an insignia of tyranny. He is a necessary and important part of the orchestra itself.

Our industrial system of production is in the nature of an orchestra. If it is to function smoothly in the interests of all the people it must have directing authority. Socialist Industrial Union councils will provide this directing authority through democratic processes that will reserve all power to the great rank and file of the workers.
The workers who run the industries today, under capitalism, will run them tomorrow, under Socialism. The difference will be (1) that tomorrow, under Socialism, production will be carried on to satisfy human needs—instead of for sale and profit—and (2) the despotic management of capitalism will be replaced by the workers' own democratically elected and democratically controlled industrial administrators and representatives.

The workers will vote in their industry, elect their foremen, administrative committees and representatives to local, departmental and national industrial union councils, and finally to the All-Industrial Union Congress which takes the place of the outmoded and corrupt political Congress of class rule. Thus, the workers themselves, organized in the factories, mills, mines and stores, and on the farms, ships and railroads, will constitute the basis of a Workers' Democracy—the most complete democracy ever achieved since the breakdown of the tribal councils of primitive man.

It is important to note that Socialist Industrial Union Administration constitutes an entirely new concept of government. It replaces political, or geographic, constituencies with industrial ones. Thus, instead of sending representatives to Congress from states and congressional areas, we will send them from the various industries of the land.

Instead of the complicated tasks arising from conditions of class rule, the duties of the Socialist Industrial Union Congress will be the relatively simple ones of deciding how much is producible and how much is needed. How many tons of bituminous coal are needed? That information goes to the Mine Workers' Industrial Union. How many pairs of shoes? That goes to the Leather Workers' Union. And so forth and so on up and down the line.

"Form follows function" expresses the philosophy of a school of industrial design. It is a brilliant generalization, and it expresses perfectly the logic of Socialist government based on industry.

The function of government under Socialism is that of administering social production for the benefit of all.

But to administer social production requires, first of all, that government be based on the industries. Its form must be industrial. It must conform to the structure of the industrial apparatus that has developed under capitalism.

(Note: The term "industries" here includes education, public health, recreation, etc. Each of these would be administered by its own Socialist Industrial Union organization, and each would have a status comparable to the auto, steel and other industrial production industries.)

The chart above is not a blueprint. It depicts the principle of Socialist Industrial Union organization, using the Automobile Workers' Industrial Union as an example. It shows how the workers in the various shop units are organized within a single plant union, as, for example, the Ford plant at River Rouge. Then it shows how the workers in the various plants turning out the same product are organized into a Local Industrial Union of the Automobile Industry.
All the Local Industrial Unions of the industry (from Los Angeles, Detroit, Flint, Milwaukee, etc.) are integrated in a National Industrial Union that will assemble all pertinent facts and information, and direct and coordinate over-all production in the auto industry.

Finally, the workers in the automobile industry, together with all the workers in the other industries, are represented in the Socialist Industrial Union Congress—which takes the place of our present outmoded political Congress. Its duties will be the simple ones of directing and coordinating our productive mechanism so that an abundance for all is produced with a minimum of human effort.

RANK AND FILE

Rhetorically, we may have the right to recall our political representative today, under capitalism. Actually, this “right” is meaningless so far as the workers are concerned. Workers have neither facilities nor organization through which to exercise their “right.” But under Socialism, when representatives are elected from industries owned, and managed and controlled by the workers, they can be recalled as easily as they were elected to office.

There can be no bureaucrats in the Socialist Industrial Union Government. This will be a living, vibrant democracy in which all power is in the only safe place for power to be—with the workers integrally organized in every industry in the land.

In the Socialist Industrial Republic all final authority will be vested, not in leaders, but in the rank and file of workers. The rank and file will elect administrators and representatives on all levels, and these will have the privilege to serve, but never the power to rule.

By “all levels” we mean the administrative posts in the shop, the plant, the local and national industrial union councils, and the Socialist Industrial Union Congress.

Moreover, the rank and file will have the power to recall and remove any representative who, in their judgment, fails to measure up to what is expected of him. Reflect on this!
Critical Problems -- Simple Solution by Ernest Mann

If we wish to preserve our life-support system we need to discover what is motivating people to destroy it.

It is easy to see that profit and wages are made from encouraging the use of chemicals on the land, clear-cutting of forests and that industry makes more profit by polluting than by reclaiming and recycling its waste.

Over-population will also eventually destroy the habitability of Earth. Anyone can see that the more that "sex" is encouraged, the more the population grows, thus more customers are born, thus more profit potential. Some religions use this same reasoning and discourage contraceptives. Sex stimulation in advertising is also used to sell more products, thus make more profit. It is also sold by itself in the form of sex magazines at a profit. Sex stimulation leads to rapid population increase.

It is certainly not difficult to see that both of these terminal diseases, pollution and rapid population growth, are caused by the profit and wage economic system.

As long as we use an economic system that motivates people with profit or wages, no matter how many laws we pass or what we do... as soon as our back is turned, people will do destructive things to get more MONEY!

If you can agree to this, then we can proceed to create an economic system that does not depend on profit or wages to motivate people to work.

We must realize that money has created nothing; that it is peoples' labor that has produced all of our goods and services. People discovered the natural resources and people extracted them from the earth and delivered them to factories that people built. People used the machines and tools that people built and refined the raw materials. People produced the products with machines that people built. People distributed the products with the conveyances that people built. Money built nothing! Peoples' mental and physical labor did it all. Therefore, we don't need money, if we can think of another motivation that will get people to do the necessary work.

The Christian Science Monitor reported that in 1980 there were 84 million volunteers in the USA. Not wages nor profit motivated these people to work. Why do volunteers work? Because they think that there is a job that needs be done and they do it. Some volunteers work just to have something useful to do. Some work to get acquainted with more people. Volunteers are treated much better than paid workers. There are probably many more reasons. Volunteers already have enough money to live on. Many volunteers have full time jobs and do volunteer work in addition.

Perhaps in a sane and logical economic system people will work for the same reasons that volunteers work today.

Which came first, the chicken or the egg? There are lots of very fine plans on how to care for dear old Mother Earth and most of them are very good. But they just don't motivate Big Corporations or people who are struggling to make as much profit or wages as they can. So doesn't it seem evident that we must begin an immediate effort to change the motivation of the economic system from profit and wages to volunteerism? We can't expect the profit and wage system to save our life-support system. The profit and wage system was not designed with a self-destruct button.

We are not going to get a volunteer economic system unless people understand how it works and its necessity. So let's try to get more people promoting and explaining this logical economic system. It was used successfully for hundreds of thousands of years until some wise-guy invented slavery and money. When you take pay, you must obey!

The volunteer operated economic system, which might be called a Priceless Economic System (PES), will create a Paradise on earth. That in itself should be enough incentive to get people to do the necessary work on this planet.

There will then be no profit in starting wars. No profit in polluting. No profit in causing starvation. No longer a reason to steal. There would be abundance for all and no money worries. Wouldn't a world like that be almost like Paradise, at least compared to the one we have now?
Buckminster Fuller said that about 90% of our work is unnecessary. So let's stop work to fill the demand instead of trying to create a demand for inferior goods. Besides, we'll only make superior products for everyone. We'll make products that will last a long time and not need to be fixed or replaced very often. We have the capability, but at present, not the motivation.

We won't save our habitable Earth unless we each start promoting a priceless economic system, where volunteers do what they see needs to be done. We cannot rely on Big Corporations (BC's) to save the Earth. They are systematically destroying it to make Bigger Profits! We cannot rely on Government to save our Earth. It is giving the BC's the green light to do its worst, the fastest. We got to do it ourselves. We each need to quit our polluting. We each need to quit buying anything that's production caused pollution. We need to quit buying things that pollute. This will stop the BC's pollution or they will go out of business fast! The bigger they are, the harder they fall!

Have you ever wondered why it is nearly impossible to get one self to stop buying things that we know pollute? The same holds true for products, that were produced by processes that polluted. Even though we know we shouldn't be buying the stuff -- we do. Our will power seems to close its eyes and we buy the polluting product and think no more of its wrongness. Do you suppose the mass media could have anything to do with this madness? With its hidden suggestions does it somehow hypnotize us to buy and close our minds to the pollution factor? Do they have the technology to do that? Would the BC's stoop that low to make more profit? Well, they start wars and revolutions to make big profits.

People who have taken the time to think even a little bit, realize the mass media is controlled by the Big Corporations. They don't even have to own them. The BC's can buy the media by withholding or overcharging on the supplies and basic materials that the media need. So even the little mass media companies must follow the status quo's party-line.

People who watch TV, movies, videos, listen to music and radio, read newspapers, magazines and novels -- are having their trains-of-thought led straight down the mass media tracks that lead to consumerism and debt which is synonymous with indentured servitude. That is why we do this mindless consumerism trip. We don't even notice where we're on this track. When we figure this out, we can take a side-track and get off. Then we can build our own track to lead our trains-of-thought to the stations of Freedom and Happiness.

It should be obvious then, that we got to stop taking-in the mass media if we prefer to lead our own thoughts on the tracks of our choice. You will find that much of the underground media (where people are not making a profit and are not financed by the BC's) will give you truth. Also take the time to observe and figure things out for yourself.

It gradually becomes easier to not be a mindless consumer when one is not absorbing the hidden suggestions in the mass media. Soon there isn't much of anything that one desires from the stores.

We each need to get our ass back to the land and get the good feelings of independence, security and satisfaction that one gets when we produce our own food and whatever else we can. It is hard to explain the various good feelings one gets from living on ones own piece of ground out in the country, where the birds sing, the air is pure, neighbors are not crowding you and you just feel more relaxed and happy. Also, if you are smart, you don't have a big mortgage tying you to the city. Buy the cheap land which is beyond commuting distance from big cities. Deal in cash and reject credit and mortgages. Get rid of all your debts, one way or another. Lower your expenses to be less dependent on money and/or a job in the big city.

---

1 Critical Path, R. Buckminster Fuller, 1981, St. Martin's Press.
There is plenty of land for everyone on Earth. In 1980 there was 1.28 acres of food growable land for each man, woman and child on this planet. That is not counting the mountains, deserts, rivers, lakes and oceans where some people are now living. The organic farmer Masanobu Fukuoka in his book, ONE STRAW REVOLUTION, says that one fourth of an acre of land is all that is needed to feed one person.

With the PES we won't have to worry about being robbed anymore. The PES will nearly empty the jails and prisons. 94% of the people in jails and prisons\(^2\) in 1980 were in for one form of stealing or another and some even had to kill in order to do so. When everything is free there will be no reason to steal. Probably many of the remaining six percent were in for political reasons and some just went bizerk, because of the insane, wasteful and illogical system we are using.

We need to focus our thoughts not only on our own survival but on informing more people about how to get their Freedom and to let them know about the advantages and joys of the self-reliance and independence that we are feeling as we get our freedom from the money/credit/barter system. We need to give them information on how easy it is to garden and the good feelings one gets from it.

The PES system (where everything is free for everyone) gives everyone security. It gives everyone a job they can enjoy. It will give everyone very short working hours and they will have fun at their work, which is a lot more than people can say about their jobs today.

Bucky Fuller, with his World Game, took an intensive inventory of the world's resources and discovered that there is an abundant supply for even a larger population. He found that certain resources were kept scarce on the market to keep prices high.

When products are free and there is abundance and no resale value, there will be no rationing. Take more than one needs. There would be no status in having more. Hoarding would just be a useless burden.

To get the Priceless Economic System started, all we need to do is inform the working people of the PES. When they understand it they will all agree to quit taking pay on the same day and begin giving all products and services free-of-charge from then on. What a simple non-violent way to change-over to a logical system. Then there will be an all volunteer work force. There will then be no monetary cost of goods, so there will be no problem in giving them free-of-charge. Natural resources are not produced by people, so they can't own them if people no longer agree to the rules of the profit/wage system. Nature provides these things, free for the taking.

Volunteers must be treated better than paid employees or they won't work. So we'll have happy work places.

There will be no need for money, credit, barter, banks, stocks, bonds, insurance, sales, advertising, politics and lots of other jobs will also become unnecessary.

This scheme gives each person the freedom to immediately begin their own program to save the habitable planet they are standing on. They don't need to wait for a committee meeting next month. They don't need to argue with a dozen people about a method. They don't have to petition the government. They don't have to go to a demonstration and get smashed. They don't have to write a proposal for a grant, i.e., they don't have to beg.

One can just sit down and thoughtfully make up a list of what one is going to do to get in harmony with nature and how one will let others know about it. Then they can begin right then to take action on their list and continuously improve their written plan as they proceed. This method starts getting things done immediately and gives one the good feeling that one is one's own boss in the most important work on Earth. We will be creating part of Paradise in the here and now, for our own life as well as for others. Won't this be more satisfying than continuing with our present entertainments?


The Death of Socialism in Russia: Not Premature Birth, But Murder

This is prompted by Adam Buick's article, "Marxism versus Leninism", reprinted in Discussion Bulletin #60. "Having seized power before the working class (and, even less, the 80 percent peasant majority of the population) had prepared themselves for socialism, all the Bolshevik government could do ... was to establish state capitalism ... while imposing their own political dictatorship over the working class."

At one time, that statement would have pretty well represented my views on the subject. But I've spent some time studying the Russian Revolution, using information sources that were new to me, and as a result I find these views to be seriously wrong. I find that the revolution was much better, and the Leninists much worse, than that statement gives them credit for.

If being prepared for socialism consists of voting for socialist political candidates, then the Russians of 1917 were certainly prepared, because in a series of elections that is exactly what they did. It's true that Lenin's party got only a fraction of the votes. But the rest of the votes were almost all cast for other socialist parties. It may be said that these other parties were politically incorrect -- but that doesn't change the fact that the voters wanted socialism, not capitalism. The Leninist takeover was directed against socialists, not capitalists.

The way people vote, however, is at best only a very indirect reflection of what they are actually prepared for. Far more important than how they vote is what they do in the place which is the center of economic life -- the place of work.

For the majority of Russia's people in 1917, the place of work was a farm. For a substantial minority, it was a factory, mine, or mill. For another substantial minority -- because Russia was in the middle of the First World War -- it was an army unit or warship. In Russia in 1917, people in all these kinds of workplaces were trying to take them over so as to own them in common and to control them democratically.

Socialism means common ownership and democratic control of the means of production; and the means of production are made up of workplaces. So the Russians of 1917 were not just voting, but also acting, to establish socialism. They were not doing this absolutely everywhere, but they were doing it in workplaces that made up the largest part of the economy.

They did so most completely in the farming villages. Russian farmers made the land into common property. They controlled it through a traditional institution for which the Russian word is "mir", the village community. This is well documented in a book I have previously recommended to DB readers, Zhores Medvedev's "Soviet Agriculture". As Medvedev points out, the possibility that this might happen was accepted by Marx, though denied by "orthodox
Marxists'. The "80 percent peasant majority", far from being unready for socialism, had by their actions already begun to build a socialist society. From Lenin's point of view, however, they were politically incorrect, and what's worse, unwilling to pay the taxes that his government demanded.

After its military coup, Lenin's party made impossible demands on the farmers that quickly led to war. When it won this war, Lenin's party replaced control by the village with control by the party. It replaced common ownership with other forms of ownership -- first government ownership (under Lenin's policy of War Communism), then private ownership (under Lenin's New Economic Policy), then government ownership again (under Lenin's successor, Stalin). This shows that the Leninist takeover was directed against socialism in agriculture.

A second area where the Russians had established socialism in the workplace was the Navy and the industries that supplied the Navy. By contrast with the farming villages, which were technologically backward -- though socialist nonetheless -- the Navy and its suppliers were technologically advanced. Ships are complicated machines. They require skilled workers to run them, to outfit them, and to repair them. The skilled workers who did these jobs for Russia were concentrated in the Baltic seaport called Kronstadt.

Kronstadt is known today to a few people as a place where people rebelled against Lenin's policies and were massacred. Of the few who have heard of the massacre, hardly any know what led up to it. An excellent history that shows what led up to it is Israel Getzler's "Kronstadt 1917-1921: The Fate of a Soviet Democracy" (Cambridge University Press, 1983).

In Kronstadt, as in most cities of 1917 Russia, the working people replaced the previously existing local governments with "Soviets", a word that means "Councils". The Soviets were assemblies that governed the local community. In the case of Kronstadt, this community consisted of the port city itself and the Baltic fleet. Kronstadt grew a network of elected committees, connected to the Soviet, that governed each place of work. I don't know whether Soviets in other cities had such a connection to the workplace. But at least in this one location, common ownership and democratic control of industry was a living reality -- until Lenin's party took over.

Lenin's party took over the Kronstadt Soviet by more-or-less democratic means, so that it can be argued that, at some moment in time, it actually was the choice of the working people of that area. It then quickly moved to prevent the working people from ever choosing any other party, by prohibiting opposition to its policies. The Soviet became a party front. The workplace committees were taken over, then replaced, by party cells. These changes were enforced by the Cheka, a paramilitary force, established by Lenin, known today as the KGB. Eventually Kronstadt's working people rebelled, demanding a revival of socialism; and that's why they...
were massacred. This shows that the Leninist takeover was directed against socialism in industry.

A third area that may be of particular interest to Discussion Bulletin readers was the railroad industry. I have seen only one brief, tantalizing reference to it -- E.H. Carr, "The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923", Volume 2, Appendix D. Brief though it is, it clearly states that the railroad workers took control of their industry and successfully managed it through their labor union.

While it lasted, this union must have looked very much like Daniel DeLeon's vision of Socialist Industrial Unions. This would have been about the time that Lenin was saying words that DeLeon's followers have taken as endorsement of their ideas. I've never heard from DeLeonists that there was an actual living example of their vision in the Russian revolution; presumably they never found out about it. In any case, Lenin's party destroyed it.

To make a long story short, the Leninist takeover was directed against socialism everywhere. The problem with Lenin is not that he tried to establish socialism prematurely. Maybe he said that was what he was doing. But like many another politician, what he said was doing and what he actually did were two different things. What he actually did was to wage a brutal and successful war against the new society to which Russia was giving birth. He was not a midwife but an infanticide. The infant Russian socialism did not die of premature; it was murdered.

(If you want to read the Medvedev or Getzler books, and can't get them any other way, I can provide photocopies for the cost of copying and postage, probably about $10 apleice. Write to make arrangements to:

Ed Jahn
4409 Oak Creek Court #501
Fairfax VA 22033)

(from p. 9)

the programs of both the SP(GB) and the SPGB: the idea that socialists must take over the political state via elections in order to establish socialism. We find the same idea in the SLP's program. I think this remnant of nineteenth century thinking has been responsible for much of the mischief done under the name of socialism.

The last item is Gerald Maher's article from the New Unionist (621 W. Lake St. #210, Minneapolis, MN 55408) which spells out the current extent of capitalist expropriation of labor's product. As usual we end with some notes, announcements, and short reviews.

FINANCES

There was a time when the DB was nearly always in the red, and we were kept alive by the fact that donations usually amounted to twice the receipts for subscriptions. More up-to-date management practices and the threat of moving operations to Mexico have lowered labor costs to the point where we have an embarrassment of riches, so to speak. We are looking around for tax shelters and the possibility of the...
There is little point in Pat Eychison attacking me for my review of MacGregor's book on Hegel and Marx. I expected my review to be read as a contribution to a critique of Marx and not the gospel. Maybe MacGregor is a off base - I do not know, but at least I try to be open-minded. Now Pat may not be a religious fundamentalist, but he certainly comes on like one who has had the existence of God questioned in his presence.

I seem to have read the "wrong" books - only the most important Hegel scholars of the 20C, but they don't know anything compared with Pat shouting and waving his little tract by Engels. Certainly he shouldn't cut his throat over Hegel, however if reading him can give some insight into Marx's flaws or lacunae, what could possibly be wrong with that? As for needing to read Sheehan since being "apparently unaware" of the struggle to complete marxism, well I did read it...about ten years ago and was only moderately impressed.

Pat's "completion of marxism" was a disaster ending with the destruction of Marx's theory and its replacement by a rigid and vulgar ideologies. Only a handful of thinkers were in some manner faithful to the spirit of Marx - such as Joseph Dietzgen or Daniel Deleon.

I am accused of "playing around in the shallows" for suggesting that Marxism has limits. Agreed, the accusation would be correct in reference to a genuinely scientific theory - one that grows and develops along with society - but what I am attacking is ideology and a dead, fossilized one at that - the antithesis of everything Marx stood for.

Frank at least has a sense of humor and I thought the whole ANTI-GAMBONE a complete leg-pull until I read it again. Frank's point 2 - Yes, I do affirm Hegel's psychological approach to class, but only as an minor addition to Marx's view - not a replacement. One would be incredibly foolish to junk the economic for the psychological.

Point 3. How the do you know what I long for? There is absolutely no way you can accuse me of endorsing a conflict-free transition. I have always said that transition would entail some measure conflict such as strikes, riots, demonstrations and occupations. What I do dispute is civil war.

Point 4 Frank claims I believe Hegel's revolution is occurring and in doing so ignores my statement that "such a view is overstating the case." What I am really saying is more evidence exists for Hegel's position than the sudden seizure of power by the working class. Do you think the workers are about to seize power? Do you really believe that workers have no more input into the work-place than they did 170 years ago? To say that any of this is going on does not imply that the co-operative commonwealth is around the corner.

Yes, I have heard of de-industrialization etc. How could one not unless sealed up in a cave for the past decade. What you are doing here, and I am sure you are not aware of it, is engaging in a polemical device, i.e., attempting to make the opponent look stupid, in lieu of coming up with a solid argument. And since with
the dialectical viewpoint everything exists in contradiction, it stands to reason there will exist counter-tendencies to socialization, one of which is capital flight - something that I have very plainly stated in my articles.

Frank seems to have lost his sense of humor and becomes overly sensitive when he briefly reviews "Limits Part 2." Really, you were not on my mind at all when I wrote this, rather the whole rotten edifice of Lasallean-Rautskite orthodoxy. When criticizing someone I speak to them directly, not in such an oblique (and cowardly) manner.

I thought the matter of evolution vs. revolution was settled between us a long time ago. Now, indeed, do I advocate Fabian tactics or support Bernstein's use of them? Fabianism is one of the vilest forms of elitism and statism. I think it possible, note well, possible, to build a mass movement promoting a transitional program of revolutionary or structural reforms. Hardly Bernsteinism or Fabianism. (I think what Robin Cox says in DB68 makes a lot of sense. Is he a "Fabian" too?)

The characterization of my position as Bernsteinism is one more example of the use of a polemical device. This device is where you strip away all the nuances and qualifications of an opponent's position and leave a crude caricature - a simple-minded position that anyone can knock down. And the Bernsteinist conception (or at least the popular version of it) is simple-minded. (just as simple-minded as the "Crash Theory").

If somehow I have managed to leave the impression that a peaceful, revolutionary, gradualist approach that totally rejects revolution is the answer then I do my mea culpas and state plainly, yes, I do believe in revolution, I just don't believe that it happens overnight nor as a result of a "collapse of capitalism."

What am I thinking about when I criticize "pie in the sky revolutionaries"? Certainly not you, Frank, you have more sense than that. However, take the WSP, which waits for the day all the workers will vote socialist and the millenium will be here. In the mean time we can do nothing. (I have a copy of the WESTERN SOCIALIST from 1969 ridiculing anti-war protestors, as only one example) Then there is the SLP, who if I understand them, aren't all that different, the exception that workers must form SITU's as well as vote. And far worst, are the types who live for the day civil war is declared. All these people do is encourage passivity, theoretical stagnation and isolation. Ok, Enough already! Don't create differences where they don't exist or waste time quibbling over nuances.

Larry Gambone

Dear Comrades,

In this brief reply to Larry Gambone's "Reply to Frank and Pat" I'll try to be less obnoxious. It isn't easy to combat error and hunt down heresy without giving offense. Perhaps I can begin by asking fewer rhetorical questions that give a sarcastic twist to what I am saying like "I wonder if he has heard of deindustrialization...." I also regret errors of interpretation like my understanding that Larry had
Dear Comrades,

I hesitate to return to the fray in my discussion with Robin Cox on reformism, in case I provoke another six page (!) response, but one or two things still need clearing up.

Robin claims that only economic reforms are reformist. My point was that there is no clear-cut distinction to be made between supporting working class efforts to achieve economic and political reforms. Some reforms of both types are useful and can be welcomed and supported, most cannot. Robin replies by saying that unlike economic reforms some political reforms are necessary for the establishment of socialism e.g. the enfranchisement of the working class, so there is a difference after all. However, he must concede that "the issue becomes more complicated in a situation where those elementary or essential political rights already exist." Precisely. Robin should also note that it would be possible to argue that certain economic reforms are necessary for the establishment of socialism too - for instance, the abolition of slavery, fought for by early capitalist reformers. Therefore, the reason why "there is no equivalent sense in which the [SPGB] advocates [sic] a set of economic reforms as an essential precondition for the advancement of socialism" is the time-frame within which the SPGB has operated. If the SPGB had been around at an earlier period in capitalist history it almost certainly would have supported the abolition of slavery - an economic reform - as a precondition for socialism. On this ground alone, Robin's argument fails. Again there is no clear-cut distinction to be made between economic and political reforms. The only criterion on which a socialist political party should operate on this question is the merits of each case, whether the reform be economic, political or a mixture of the two.

I might also add that to my knowledge - and I challenge Robin to dispute this - the SPGB has supported the efforts of the working class to bring about a number of reforms of various kinds that are in its interests but has never advocated a single reform itself (and reforms, I might remind him, are specific proposals to alter the operation of the capitalist system on which support is then sought) and has never given support to the programme of a pro-capitalist organisation. And I do not follow the leap of logic which drives Robin to infer from my talk of "expressly reformist pro-democracy groups" that the electoral and constitutional reform outfit Charter 88 is presumably not reformist. It was precisely such groups I had in mind when I used that phrase. If Robin is searching for an example of an expressly non-reformist pro-democracy group, look no further than the SPGB.

Finally, I claim that advocacy of political reform programmes by groups like Charter 88 in Britain - admitted by Robin not to be included in his definition of reformism - is an unnecessary diversion away from the struggle for socialism. Robin says "I'm not too sure that this is the case". I must inform him that his view is certainly not taken by the SPGB:
"A majority seeking to replace capitalism by socialism only requires one thing of an electoral system under capitalism — that it should allow majority opinion to reflect itself as a majority of seats in parliament. We are not interested in whether the system ensures a strong and stable government of capitalist political parties. As the existing electoral system in Britain does allow a majority viewpoint to be translated into a majority of seats, we see no point in diverting our energies from our task of working towards the emergence of a socialist majority." (Socialist Standard editorial, November 1989)

The SPGB has said much the same thing about advocating constitutional reforms. It would therefore seem that the SPGB sees such political reform campaigning as reformist and diversionary. Robin still has a long way to go to convince me of the soundness of his tentative opposition to this. Perhaps we can have a chat about it some time.

Fraternally,

Dave Perrin

39 Frances Ave., Little Acton, Wrexham, Clwyd,
England LL12 8BL

(from p. 23)

corporate take over of some struggling social democratic or leninist journal or other. Over the years, though, we have been kept alive and in a condition where we could keep U.S. subs at $3 per year by the contributions of friends.

CONTRIBUTIONS: Harry Wade $20; Willy Eckert $7; Tom Tully $8; Will Guest $4; Julian Prior $10; J.B. $1; Anonymous $35. Total $83. Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE October 28, 1994 $238.79

RECEIPTS
Contributions $83.00
Subs and sales 148.00
Total 231.00

DISBURSEMENTS
Postage $37.50
Postage due 5.89
Printing 32.46
Annual bulk mailing fee 75.00
Total $140.87

BALANCE December 19, 1994 $314.82

Fraternally submitted,

Frank Girard
for the DB
Discussion Bulletin

As Frank Girard puts it, in issue no. 67, my letter in that issue regards, "...the Socialist Party of Great Britain (dissident group) as well as a personal difference with the SPGB regarding the role of the party and the state during an upswing in revolutionary sentiment among workers."

I will try to add further to Frank's fine words.

The "dissidents" mentioned by Frank are the, recently reconstituted, Socialist Party of Great Britain. They were "reconstituted" in June 1991 by two Branches newly expelled from the Socialist Party of Great Britain/Socialist Party.

As must be clear to all, I myself have no real education or ability. Still, I want to try to learn from and join the reconstituted Party. I cannot talk about any complex, difficult points. That must remain a subject for you dear educated and able reader.

However, to me, "revolutionary sentiment among workers" needs awareness of our interests, and the basis for them. So we can organise and change society, in our interests.

Now. Turning to my letter itself. It contains these following words:

"As the SPGB, make very clear; Socialists must organise for Political Power, through election."

Where is the "personal difference"? I hope there is no personal difference at all. Let us see.

Let us look back at some early (1932) editorial from the original Socialist Party of Great Britain. This can be still more useful, if the recently reconstituted Party, itself, will tell us what policy is meant, where the editorial qualifies it's case, with the word "unless".

It says:

"Given a majority of the population determined to achieve socialism and politically organised for that purpose, they could obtain control of the political machinery by the vote unless the capitalists then in power decided to suspend democratic elections."

From editorial, page 156 of June 1932 Socialist Standard.

What policy does the reconstituted Party, itself, stand for in the event of the "suspended" elections?

Does it stand for trying to take society over without Political Power as, for example, some "anarchists" have thought? Or. Secondly. Does it stand for campaigning (as socialists) to "unsuspend" elections, to organise and change society with Political Power, after this has been done?

The second (or socialist) interpretation would be exactly what I myself have said; to exactly the same "event".

As I say, for example, in the letter published in Discussion Bulletin. It contains these following words:

"...Socialists must organise for Political Power, through election."
If readers want to comment further, I'll be very pleased to hear from you. I especially look forward to the reply from the reconstituted Socialist Party of Great Britain. Many thanks to Discussion Bulletin, and to Frank Girard, for this chance to "Discuss".

Here is more of that early (1932) editorial from the original Socialist Party of Great Britain:

(1) The working class need to obtain control of the political machinery before they can institute socialism. Having obtained control of Parliament and the machinery of local government, the workers would enact the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and distribution.

(2) Given a majority of the population determined to achieve socialism and politically organised for that purpose, they could obtain control of the political machinery by the vote unless the capitalists then in power decided to suspend democratic elections. In either event it would have been shown that the majority wanted socialism. If Socialists had obtained control of the political machinery, including the armed forces, the capitalists would not be able seriously to impede the passing of legislation. They would not have at their disposal the means of resisting by force.

If, on the other hand, the capitalists were in power and had suspended democratic elections in order to prevent the Socialist majority from obtaining control of the political machinery, steps would have to be taken to make the position of the usurping minority impossible. In view of the fact that the organised majority would be hostile to the Government and able to interfere with the smooth running of industry, the Government would find it in the long run impossible to make capitalism function in a way satisfactory even to the capitalists. The political position of the Government would be weakened owing to its undemocratic basis and the state machine would be unable to function on account of the conflicting views among civil and military employees.

When it is recalled that capitalists have in the past had to institute democratic elections in order to make capitalism stable and efficient, even with the population overwhelmingly in favour of capitalism, it will be perceived how hopeless would be their position if they tried to go back on democratic methods in face of a united Socialist majority. Any attempt on their part to carry on without a mandate from the electorate would be bound to break down in time. Even the capitalists themselves would be forced to see the necessity of choosing socialism in preference to chaos.

From editorial, page 156 of June 1932 Socialist Standard

Yours for Socialism,
Alan Kerr, 13 Huntings Farm, Green Lane, Ilford IG1 1YE England

deserted Marx's economic interpretation of history for Hegel's psychological interpretation. Let me finish by saying that I know other readers share Larry Gambone's and Robin Cox's position. They too believe that by building alternative institutions within capitalism our class can gain self confidence and the conviction that cooperation is a viable alternative to competition. I think they are wrong, but I certainly don't want to alienate them. One more thing, I think Larry's DB88 article, "The Limits of Marxism Part 2," as well as the entire subject of the nature of the socialist revolution deserves further discussion. I have an article already begun for DB70.

Frank Girard
Manufacturing workers produce $114,100 each per year — and keep $385 a week

By Gerald Maher

Have you ever noticed newspaper articles claiming that workers must spend increasing portions of each year working to pay taxes before they work for their own needs? One tax-reform outfit, for example, claims that “tax freedom day” for the average American worker did not arrive until May 8 this year.

The truth of the matter is that taxes, directly or indirectly, are paid out of surplus value—that share of value contained in the products and services that workers create with their labor which they never see or enjoy.

Whatever the earnings of this or that worker—whether salaried or hourly wage—the value of the workers’ product and their earnings are two vastly different things. In fact, each worker must produce more value than he/she receives in compensation or it would be impossible for the employer to make a profit.

This is not about the employer’s “right” to make a profit or to determine how much is a “fair” profit, but to illustrate that workers comprise the vast majority of the consumer market in a world economy that is consumer driven.

Studies indicate that in a typical eight-hour day the value of a worker’s product in the first one- and-a-half to two hours will equal his or her day’s wages. The other six to six- and-a-half hours of productivity remains with the employer, from which profits are extracted, plus the “costs of doing business”—and taxes.

The following figures for 1991, the most recent available, are taken from the Census of Manufac-tures issued by the U.S. Census Bureau:

- U.S. workers in 20 manufacturing industries produced, on average, $114,100 per worker per year, at a rate of $56.70 per hour. In a 40-hour week, therefore, each worker added $2,268 to the value of the product.
- Yet, the average gross wage for the same set of workers came to $460 for a 40-hour week.
- Estimating deductions for a married man with two children leaves a “take home” of $385—and that is for workers in better-paying manufacturing jobs. The total tax burden of $75 is a small fraction of the total $1,883 deducted from the worker’s product each week.

Of course, there are classifications of work where the value of production is not the same in relation to wages as this example. But, whether we are considering young women flipping hamburgers for minimum wage at the local drive-in, or an auto worker on a highly automated production line, the net effect is that worker—consumers cannot buy back the products of their own labor.

The result is ever-recurring recessions. Having begun my working career in 1933, I can testify to witnessing the depths of the Great Depression of the 1930s, and the interminable repetition of a nation pulling its boot out of one recession while sliding it into the next one about every five years since the end of World War II.

Recessions continue to punctuate our lives as we are again and again faced with an absurd catastrophe—an epidemic of overproduction and underconsumption, resulting in millions of workers being deprived of their livelihoods because they produced too much. Because they are underpaid for the values they produce, they are unable to buy back the value of their production. The last recession, which saw its beginning in the spring of 1990, was the ninth since World War II.

Forbes magazine has, for the past 10 years, published an annual issue rating the wealthholding propensities of America’s richest individuals by listing the estimated net assets of each. In 1982, their total holdings were estimated to be $92 billion. In the 1994 issue, the total was over $200 billion.

Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve estimates that 60% of the population own zero or negative net asset value—they owe more than they own.

As long as we endure this pyramid structure of wealth distribution, in which the rich get richer and wealth continues to gravitate to the tiny minority at the top, the number of the properties and deprived majority will continue to expand toward the base.

Politicians, whether Democrat or Republican, will continue to provide empty promises and hand-aid solutions that can only continue this shameless wealth and needless poverty. Only an economy that is owned and democratically managed by the workers who produce all the wealth can deliver lasting prosperity and economic security for all.

### PAYCHECK STUB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing Value Produced</th>
<th>$2,268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Worker Per Week (1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Take-Home Pay Per Worker in Manufacturing</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deductions Per Worker Per Week</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes money for company's retained profits, stockholder dividends, interest payments, rent, insurance premiums, executive salaries, legal fees, sales, advertising, all taxes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOTTOM LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Assets of 400 Richest Americans</th>
<th>$300,000,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets of 150,000,000 Poorest Americans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

CONFERENCE. From the Winter 1984 Radical Philosophy Newsletter we learn of the next Socialist Scholars’ Conference to be held April 7-9 at the Boro of Manhattan Community College, New York City. Billed as "the largest North American meeting of left academics," it lacks an address through which readers can communicate with organizers directly. We suggest that DB readers, whether or not they are philosophic or academic, write to Betsy Bowman of the APA at 26-3 Mt. Archer Rd., Lyne, CT 06371.

CHARLES H. KERR (1740 West Greenleaf Ave., Chicago, IL 60626) recently published a four-page tabloid catalog of new books. These include C.L.R. James’ A History of Pan-African Revolt; a new edition of Carwardine’s The Pullman Strike; and Progress Without People: In Defense of Luddism by David F. Noble. Mentioned approvingly by Chomsky in his October 17 speech at the Chicago campus of the University of Illinois, Noble’s book is well worth reading and deserves a review of its own. Also given is the backlist including some old original Kerr titles as well as about four pamphlets by John Keracher dating back to the Proletarian Party phase of Kerr’s history. Missing, unfortunately is Keracher’s How the Gods Were Made.

NOTES ON ANARCHISM by Noam Chomsky. An anarchist conference near Grand Rapids last month led me to consider the possibility of printing and selling some full size copies of the same essay that ran in DB85. Chomsky OKed the venture after the fact. If you would like a copy of the essay in larger print and in pamphlet format, it is available. $1 postpaid from the Discussion Bulletin, PO Box 1564, Grand Rapids, MI 49501.

SOCIALIST STUDIES, New York Labor News, 111 W. Evelyn #209, Sunnyvale, CA 94086. In 1981 the Socialist Labor Party began a series of cheap reprints of articles from the then Weekly People. Over forty titles were published in the Socialist Studies series between 1981 and 1984. Some sold for as little as $.15. Last February the NYLN began issuing certain, apparently more popular, titles in a pamphlet format as well as some new titles. The most recent of these is Nationalism: Working Class Nemeses (14 pages, $.50) by Bernard Bortnick, a member of the SLF’s National Executive Committee. A well-reasoned discussion of socialism and nationalism with special reference to Russia, Yugoslavia, and Israel among others, it was delivered first as a speech and then reprinted in the People. Other titles include Is Cuba Socialist? (24 pp. $.75), The History Behind the Holocaust (20 pp. $.80), two short speeches by Robert Bills, the SLF’s national secretary ($.25 each), and Early Efforts at Socialist Unity by Nathan Karp (16 pp. $.50). The last of these, although it contains useful information, suffers from the selective treatment one often finds in organizational histories. In this case the author managed—for what reason I leave to the reader’s guess—to discuss this topic without mentioning Daniel De Leon’s stenographic reported 1906 speech on the unifying the SLF and the Socialist Party, published by NYLN under the title Unity or the two-day 1917 Unity Conference, authorized by the NECs of both the SLF and the SP, the stenographic report of which
runs to 424 pages.

TEMP SLAVE! WORK! WORK! Four issues of this totally irreverent, bitterly humorous magazine have been published so far. The most recent with 36 pages. Another issue is due in February. Temp Slave appears to be less interested in organizing temps than in expressing their anger at finding themselves working for sub-poverty wages after having played by all the rules that are supposed to guarantee success. Some of this stuff is really great including, but not limited to, graphics like Tom Tomorrow cartoons and the "10 Tenets of Temping," which begin with "Work as slowly as possible" and end with "Play dumb." $2 per issue, $4 for the first three issues, and $6 for a four-issue sub from PO Box 8284, Madison, WI 53708.

LESSONS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION by N. Lenin was published originally in July 1918 by the British Socialist Party as number 9 in its International Socialist Library and sold for 3 pence. It was reissued a couple of years ago by the Tait-Poultie Fund, 91 Church Ave., Meanwood, Leeds LS6 4JX, England, at 2 pounds (about $4). To the 27 pages of the original pamphlet have been added five pages of introduction dealing largely with the Socialist Labor Party, De Leon, and Lenin. The copy from which this pamphlet was reproduced is part of the Tait Collection of the Stirling University Library in Scotland. The collection includes the records of the dissident Scottish DeLeonist group known as the British Section of the International Socialist Labour Party (BSISLP), and the introduction reflects that connection.

Part I of Lenin’s text, "Radical Questions of the Revolution," was written in July 1917 and deals with events subsequent to the February revolution. In Part II, "All Power to the Soviets," Lenin contrasts the revolutionary government the Bolsheviks advocate to the counter revolutionary, quasi-capitalist state of Kerensky. Part III "What Are the Soviets?" is published as a four-page insert and seems to be a justification for dissolving the Constituent Assembly.

--fg