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ABOUT THIS ISSUE

Number 74 begins with a reply to Internationalism's article, "DeLeonism and the Democratic Myth," in DB73. Supporting Internationalism is the fact that "democracy" is just capitalism's current method of maintaining social order. Our rulers can and do adjust it to meet their needs. In general the trend has been to less democracy in terms of elections, ballot access for minor parties, and access to the media. And ready to be called from the wings is the alternative, the sort of political repression we associate with fascism. Also included is the article in the New Unionist that prompted Internationalism's original attack on DeLeonist ideas about democracy.

Next Mike Ballard reviews an example of the proletarian literature of the nineties. It's a far cry from... (To p. 7)
DELEONISM AND CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY

[For the complete background of this article readers can consult “South Africa: Successful Struggle for Political Democracy Sets Stage for the Next Successful Struggle for Economic Democracy” in the June 1994 New Unionist (621 W. Lake St. #210, Minneapolis, MN 55408) and reproduced beginning on page 8 of this issue, a response in the Summer 1994 Internationalism (P.O. Box 288, New York, NY 10018), Jeff Miller’s letter in DB67, and Internationalism’s answer by JG in DB73.]

A problem with all polemics, including mine I’m sure, is the tendency to choose language that gives a factual statement the kind of spin (a recently created U.S. political term) we wish it to take. We can find an outstanding example in Internationalism’s choice of the word supporting in the first sentence of the article where Miller and the New Unionist are described as “supporting” the election of Mandela whereas they did nothing of the sort. Rather the article simply observes that the majority of the South African working class, Blacks, can now struggle openly using South African capitalism’s version of democracy to advance their emancipation. Specifically asserted by the article is the idea that no advantage for the working class will flow from elevating a new black leadership, including Mandela.

But the thrust of JG’s article concerns what he regards as the deviation from the “Marxist tradition” that results from the New Unionist’s DeLeonism, a matter we will get into later in this article. Actually, though, JG betrays his and Internationalism’s failure to understand capitalist democracy. To JG the evolution of capitalism’s political state falls into clearly delineated historical periods, one of which ended in 1914. During that period, according to JG, capitalism was prosperous enough to grant our class meaningful reforms. Since then, according to Internationalism’s doctrine, capitalism’s “decadence” has prevented the ruling class from buying off the working class with reforms. Exactly how they can maintain this idea in the face of the historical record of post-WW1 social reforms worldwide defies reason. The most outstanding examples in the U.S. include the social legislation of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal during the depths of the 1930s depression as well as the “war on poverty” and other reform legislation of the 1960s. JG and Internationalism don’t seem to realize that capitalism’s political system like its economic system is constantly being fine tuned to maintain social stability while maximizing profits. The “Contract with America” is only the latest phase.

Bourgeois Democracy and South Africa

The recent history of South Africa shows that repression of the Black working class majority was becoming a losing proposition both in keeping the lid on the class struggle and in its effects on economic development. Capitalism has the same need for social harmony globally as it does nationally. The international economic boycott of capitalist South Africa reflected that need. Also resistance to apartheid posed an internal danger. It was these concerns that prompted the decision by the most powerful of the capitalist factions in South Africa to end apartheid and to coopt Mandela and the African National Congress as partners in running the capitalist state.

The real question here is whether this action by the South African ruling class will advance the cause of social revolution. Miller argues that it will do so by enabling Black workers as well as Whites to organize revolutionary industrial unions and to place on the ballot a revolutionary party calling for the abolition of capitalism and its state. This is the road to revolution advocated by the DeLeonists of all
persuasions as well as the parties of the World Socialist Movement. They see their purpose as that of educating our class to understand the capitalist system and the possible alternatives to it. Their literature points out the capitalist cause of social problems and calls foursquare for workers to vote against capitalism and for socialism.

Internationalism and Genetic Leninism

The next question is why Internationalism opposes measures that enable the revolutionary movement in South Africa to become legal. I can see at least two possibilities. One may be Internationalism's Leninist ancestry. Prior to WWI the absence of capitalist political democracy in such absolutist nations as Czarist Russia and other even more backward countries of Eastern Europe and Asia fostered an illegal, underground socialist movement. A legal mass party which workers could control democratically could not exist. In Russia these circumstances gave rise to the "vanguard" perversion of a socialist movement, one dominated by the leader and his political coterie, rotten with czarist secret agent and dedicated to the manipulation—not the education—of the masses.

Another reason may be the revolutionary romanticism engendered by accounts of the October insurrection in Petrograd. Here a conspiracy hatched by Lenin and his lieutenants set off an uprising by desperate workers in the Czarist capital, a major industrial center. Pawns in the Bolsheviks' grab for power via insurrection, they had no idea where they were headed nor how they would get there. The accounts of October paint a glorious picture from the Bolsheviks' Ten-Days-That-Shook-the-World perspective. They have provided generations of young radicals with fantasies of rocketing around the streets of Petrograd in an armored car, red flags flying, machine guns at the ready, providing Bolshevik leadership to the revolutionary masses. It is this elitist, vanguard view of socialist revolution that I believe may account for the insistence on illegal, physical force by JG and Internationalism.

The utter failure of the insurrectionary model of revolution can be seen in the defeats experienced by revolutionary workers who allowed themselves to be misled by Leninists between the world wars. This was made possible by a side benefit of the Russian Revolution. It gave Lenin and the Bolsheviks the opportunity to take command of the revolutionary wing of the socialist movement worldwide. One of the Twenty-One Points that Lenin insisted on as a condition of a party's joining the Third International was that it go underground or at least have an underground grouping that could lead an armed insurrection. Workers in such diverse places as Germany, Hungary, Canton and Shanghai, China paid with their lives for Leninist leadership. After WWI a variation, the Mao/Castro/Che Guevara peasant-based insurrectionary model became the style. We can see its fruits in Cuba and formerly in Nicaragua, where Leninist leadership built new nationalistic autocracies. Chiapas and Sub-Commandante Marcos are the most recent manifestation.

Marx, De Leon, and Revolutionary Strategy

Now to J.G.'s comments on DeLeonist tactics. Writings by the first generation of socialist theoreticians, Marx and Engels, cover roughly the half century from 1845 to 1895. The second generation—Kautsky, Liebknecht, De Leon, Luxemburg, and Lenin—were writing from perhaps 1880 to roughly 1920. During those decades capitalism was expanding rapidly and with it the number of wage slaves. At the same
time the system's response to the class struggle was undergoing change. As capitalism in the more
advanced West abandoned the violent repression that greeted working class resistance to exploitation,
Marx and Engels abandoned the conspiratorial groupings like the League of the Just and the Communist
League, whose Manifesto they had written. By the mid 1860s they had helped to organize the
International Workingmen's Association, a genuinely working class grouping based largely on the union
movement in the West, a movement that could operate openly in the more advanced industrial countries.
In 1871 the defeat of Paris Commune, the last spontaneous popular uprising on the old model, pretty
much put an end to Blanquist/Bakuninist insurrectionary tactics for over thirty years.

An increasingly secure and confident capitalist class in the more advanced countries of the West began a
policy of expanding the franchise to include the industrial working class and to coopt it. At the same
time Marx's speech on legal revolution at the Hague Conference of the IWA marked his recognition of
the changed circumstances and new possibilities for revolutionary activity. The expulsion of the
Bakuninists in 1872 and the collapse of the IWA left the field open for new political organizations,
electoral parties, that could take advantage of capitalism's new democratic opening in Western Europe
and the U.S.

It was these new socialist and labor parties that organized the Second International. It was also in these
new mass political parties that the idea of a legal, non-violent revolution developed. Unfortunately as
socialist politicians became more successful at playing capitalism's wheeling and dealing political
game, they adopted the role of mediator between capital and labor, at the same time compromising their
revolutionary aims with reform programs that would attract more voters and increase their political
strength. These reform programs called "immediate demands" effectively played into capitalist hands.
At the same time capitalism took the lid off the economic class struggle by allowing workers to organize
into unions. The union movement, because its natural role is that of mediator between workers and
capitalists, is even more prone to compromise and the buying off of its leadership as U.S. labor history
demonstrates.

By the late 1890s this reformism had spawned a reaction. Revolutionary factions opposing the
reformers began to develop in the parties of the Second International. Major splits occurred in France,
Great Britain, and the U.S., the last of which involved De Leon and the Socialist Labor Party where the
reformists and capitalist unionists left the SLP to form the Socialist Party. As editor of the SLP's
English language paper, the People and later its daily edition from 1892 to 1914, De Leon managed to
steer a principled revolutionary socialist course that has no parallel in the socialist movement anywhere
in the world. In the process he managed to antagonize every union bureaucrat and sellout artist, every
"socialist" careerist, preacher, professor, in the U.S. These include the first generation of "socialist
historians," among them his arch enemy Morris Hillquit whose History of Socialism in the United States
denigrated the SLP, revolution, and Daniel De Leon. He died in May 1914 and didn't live to see the
great betrayal as most of the reformist leaders of the great mass social democratic parties of the Second
International--Germany, France, and Austria--rose to support the military ambitions of their respective
capitalist classes by voting war credits.

During the nineties it became clear to De Leon and his supporters that the SLP would develop into
another capitalist party as the opportunists and politically ambitious sought to increase the voter base of
the party by appealing to farmers and small business. At the same time control by corrupt labor leaders, "fakers" as De Leon called them, over the pro-capitalist union movement (the AFL and the Knights of Labor) had reached the point where they offered no room for socialist activity.

The SLP’s first move was to organize a socialist union movement like that of the German Social Democratic Party as an alternative to the AFL/K of L. This Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was based on New York City unions in which SLP members and supporters were influential. Its early success in organizing the unorganized and making some inroads on the AFL fiefdoms succeeded in arousing Gompers and the AFL to a high pitch of opposition. Pro-AFL and other reformist elements in the SLP quickly came to consider the DeLeonists who controlled the party obstacles to what they regarded as SLP success—becoming the reform wing of capitalism’s political spectrum. At the same time the party under De Leon’s guidance took an increasingly anti-reform stand as evidenced by his widely read speeches on the subject in 1896 and 1898. All this spawned the 1899-1900 split.

The next step in the evolution of the SLP under De Leon’s aegis was his synthesis of European syndicalism with the revolutionary electoral politics of the SLP. In his 1904 speech The Burning Question of Trades Unionism and in his 1905 speech on the preamble to the constitution of the IWW, Socialist Reconstruction of Society he formulated a plan for revolution that depended not on leadership but on a working class educated to the need for socialism and having the organizations to accomplish it, a political party to express its will at the polls and an economic organization through which our class can accomplish the revolution by taking over the means of production.

Internationalism and Leninism

Now to Internationalism’s commitment to those two bastions of Leninist theory, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the soviet or councilist system of revolutionary organization and post-revolutionary government. As to the former, the term “dictatorship of the proletariat” disappears from Marxist theoretical works for over forty years between Marx’s brief reference to it in The Gotha Program (1875) and Lenin’s resurrection of it in The State and Revolution (1917). The reason Lenin revived it is clear enough. He needed theoretical justification for the insurrection he was planning. Czarist Russia where a major part of industrial production was still carried on by artisans in small shops or in small factories, production was still in the same pre-industrial phase that Marx saw in Western Europe in the 1840s on up to 1875. Lenin believed that Russia could skip the period of capitalist development needed to concentrate production and to create the an industrial proletariat. He convinced his lieutenants in the Bolshevik party that they could gain enough immediate support from the desperate Petrograd working class and the soldiers garrisoned there to grab power and hold it. Of course this flies in the face of Marxist analysis as it existed in 1917 and we know it today, but there were enough superficial similarities to Marx’s earlier thinking to convince people who wanted to be convinced. And of course after the Bolsheviks took control of the international revolutionary movement the dictatorship of the proletariat became an article of faith among Lenin’s followers worldwide.

That Internationalism advances the workers’ council concept of revolutionary organization is consistent with its Leninist ancestry. Actually, though, Lenin and the Bolsheviks opposed the spontaneous organization of workers’ councils during the 1905 uprising in Petrograd until Trotsky demonstrated how a minor political grouping with the necessary discipline and an orator or two could put itself at the head
of the workers council and determine its policies. It is the typical organization of a working class which has been driven by desperation to resist capitalism but which, because of the underdeveloped nature of industry or because it has been kept in ignorance of what the next step must be, is unable to organize industrially.

As a revolutionary organization the councils have much in common with Committees of Safety and other pre-industrial revolutionary groupings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Conclusion

One can only hope that ICG and Internationalism will give up their Leninist visions of leading the working class into a Bolshevik dictatorship a la the USSR, China, and Cuba and come to realize that the task of revolutionaries is to educate our class about capitalist cause of their misery and the socialist solution. As to the future, it’s impossible to predict just how our class will respond to the continuing immiseration we are experiencing. It’s possible that, as De Leon predicted, the gang that runs the show will commit some act that reveals unmistakably their arrogance and contempt for our class in a way that will cause a spontaneous outpouring of anger that will make clear to our rulers that we have withdrawn our “consent.” No political take over of the state will be necessary, it will collapse into itself like a black hole carrying with it the accumulated junk of the centuries of class control. As to the nature of the new society, I am enough of a DeLeonist to believe that its foundation will be the social ownership of the means of production and their democratic management the workers, perhaps as described the New System (see DB70).

(From p. 2)

the stuff that was being discussed in the John Reed Clubs sixty years ago. Larry Gambone’s letter criticizes Ed Wizak’s example (DB75) of Chile as a country that shows the precariousness of a purely political change in this age of ruling class access to technology and the media. Gambone also comments on what he regards as Subversion’s brief slip into elitism. AAA shares the Unabomber’s primitivist views but has theoretical reservations about his (her, their) concentration on technology and also practical doubts about his barbarous, not to say primitive, methods—a reversion to the “propaganda of the deed” that once marked the tactics of some anarchists.

Adam Buick and I have another go at the old sectarian battle between World Socialists and DeLeonists. Although I have termed it “sectarian,” we—and others involved in this debate—are arguing matters that will be crucial when capitalism folds. So too are the authors of the next article: another chapter in the ongoing discussion between the U.S. and the Canadian branches of the De Leonist Society about the changes in the cast-in-concrete socialist industrial union program being advocated by the Canadians.

Mikhail Tsviina’s “News and Views” comes to us from an anarchist publication whose name I have lost. Perhaps the source will get in touch. At any rate readers can write to the address given. The term “intellectual” is not one of my favorites, and I wish Chomsky had resisted the urge to use it. Having said that and expressed my own view that intellectuals are usually for sale to the highest bidder, I think readers will be interested in the Chomsky’s views on the subject. SEE’s “challenge” was written by the Grand Rapids ecumenical anti-capitalism group at the height of the furor caused by Charles Murray’s book. We distributed 1200 copies at his appearance at a local college and at various other meetings where the subject was discussed. We even included a few spelling mistakes proving that we are not part
South Africa

Successful struggle for political democracy sets stage for next struggle for economic democracy

The victory of Nelson Mandela and the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa is a tribute to the courageous struggle of the entire black population against the tyranny of apartheid. The creation of a democratic State, where the people elect their political leaders, is a giant step forward for the people of South Africa. The basic political freedoms—the ballot, free speech, press and assembly—are rights the people need in order to attack an even more basic source of oppression than apartheid: the economic exploitation of the working class.

Unemployment in South Africa is estimated at 46%. In some of the black townships it exceeds 80%. Seven million black people live in shanty towns without electricity or plumbing.

The ANC, in its years as an outlawed organization leading the struggle against apartheid, recognized the connections between white rule, capitalism and the economic oppression of black workers.

Apartheid allowed the massive transfer of property, primarily land, from blacks to whites. It provided a huge supply of cheap labor, with no right to organize, for both white farmers and industrial capitalists.

By reserving the best jobs for white workers, the apartheid regime gave them the illusion of having a stake in the system and thereby prevented the development of a united working-class movement. It was a bargain for South African (and foreign) corporations to buy off the white working-class minority in order to secure a superexploited majority of black workers. Even today, white workers—where they still have jobs—get on average 10 times the pay of black workers.

While the ANC correctly recognized these links between apartheid and capitalism, its alliance with the South African Communist Party gave it the Communists’ false and distorted concept of socialism.

The Soviet Union was pictured as the model of socialism, even though it was in fact a labor-exploiting state-capitalist system. The ANC called for the nationalization of basic industries, where workers would work for state bosses instead of corporate bosses, but still would not be working for themselves, with their own elected management, as in a genuine socialist society.

When Soviet and East European “communism” collapsed, the ANC had to give up this economic program as a viable alternative to apartheid capitalism.

Meanwhile, the ruling National Party was under pressure from the rising rebellion of black people on the one hand, and on the other from a growing anti-apartheid sector within the white ruling class itself.

For those English-descended whites, who control more industry and finance in South Africa than the Dutch-descended Afrikaners, whose economic base is in agriculture, apartheid’s restrictive work and residence controls on blacks prevented the kind of fluid labor market that works best for fast-changing industrial capitalism. Workers need to be easily recruited and moved into new factories and mines anywhere in the country if these corporations are to get the jump on their international competition.

Also, because apartheid denied black workers access to skilled jobs, and the educational opportunities of employers to attract generically skilled workers. In skilled labor, enter these wages for apartheid's battered economy.

Apartheid had originally begun in the 19th century and was the focal point of Western and American strategic and economic interests. In apartheid, that demand is destroyed. The demand to destroy apartheid is the work of the ANC, a force that further capitalist development in South Africa.
opportunities to qualify for them, employers had to bid up wages to attract employees from the relatively small pool of skilled white workers. Increasing the supply of skilled labor by allowing blacks to enter these trades would force down wages for skilled labor.

Added to these factors that made apartheid more of an economic detriment than an aid to industrial profit-making was the growing fear that the social upheaval caused by the people's struggle against apartheid would destroy the already recession-wracked economy.

Finally, opposition to apartheid within this wing of the ruling class was clinched by the demands of the rulers of the U.S. and West Europe. For their own strategic and economic reasons, the Western powers feared the growing social turmoil in South Africa and wanted it defused by having apartheid ended. And they pressured the South African government to do so with trade sanctions that further damaged South African capitalism.

The National Party, which had originated the apartheid system, now moved to dismantle it. With the ANC willing to drop its nationalization program with the collapse of Communism (and the end of financial aid from the no-longer Soviet Union), the industrial-financial wing of the white ruling class was assured that their property would not be endangered by a non-racial government headed by the ANC.

The National Party, under the shrewd politician de Klerk, then moved to defuse the social upheaval in South Africa by releasing Mandela from prison and cutting a deal with the ANC.

For the land-based Afrikaner wing of the ruling class, however, apartheid remained a critical guarantee of a ready supply of landless black farm workers, who could be super-exploited at rock-bottom wages. They feared an ANC government would seek to take back the land that had originally been owned by black farmers, and which the white government had taken from them to give to white farmers.

This group split from the National Party to form the right-wing Conservative Party, pledged to retain apartheid, as were the proto-military, neo-fascist Afrikaner groups.

With the successful conclusion of the election, however, the extreme right is finished—at least for now. The real difficulty facing the ANC is how to fulfill its election promises of creating jobs and raising the living standards of black workers.

As part of the deal with the white ruling class, the National Party is included in the government, where it can closely monitor any action it might deem detrimental to the white business community. Since the resources needed for improving the lives of blacks are all owned by whites, the ANC is trapped by its own pledge—and its political reliance on the cooperation of the white business establishment—not to infringe on existing property rights.

It hopes to get around the impasse by enticing foreign investment into South Africa, which it hopes will spur the economy, lower unemployment and increase tax revenue to spend on social programs.

But South Africa is competing with all the other countries of the world for investment. While South Africa has an advantage over the rest of Africa by having an already developed industrial and financial infrastructure, the number-one bait for foreign investment is low-wage labor.

U.S., European and Japanese corporations will want guarantees from the ANC that black South Africans' low wages will stay that way if they open new production facilities there. They will want assurances the government will maintain "social peace," that production won't be disrupted by strikes or political agitation. The capitalists' conditions for new investment and jobs in South Africa will be that the living standards of the majority of South African workers do not improve.

The ANC was allowed into the government because it accepted these economic constraints placed on it by South African and foreign capital. In doing so, it has transformed itself from a liberation movement of black South Africans into an enforcement agent for white business interests.

The reward for the top leadership of the ANC—including Mandela—is to enjoy the same luxurious lifestyle as the white
business and political elites. The ANC leaders now have a stake in the system, a stake that they will soon be defending alongside their white partners against the just demands of the great majority of black people, who remain the victims of the system.

The next phase of the struggle in South Africa is about to begin. This time it will not be on the lines of race, but strictly on the lines of class: between those who profit by exploiting labor, aligned with their political agents of all races, and the workers of all races, whose lives are impoverished by being the victims of exploitation.

The goal of this struggle is to add to the already achieved political emancipation of black people the economic emancipation of the working class. It is a struggle not confined to South Africa, but one still needing to be fought to its conclusion in every country of the world.
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Stewart Home’s words scream off the pages of his novels like the tires of a muscle car torqued to the max by a driver bent on reaching 60 mph in 4 seconds flat. Like De Sade, Home writes the fiction of the unrestrained libido responding to the “primitive rhythm of the swamps”. Like Durutti, Home’s heroines and heroes don’t waste time or mince words when it comes to the pursuit of revolution.

These proletarian punk/hippie/red-skin protagonists run wild through the streets of a London painted blood red and pockmarked with the random terror and banality of war—class war. The enemies of these lumpen/working class men and women are an odd assortment of fascists, liberals, Leninists, conservatives and self-seeking opportunists. These denizens of class rule are met with utter contempt by Home’s liberated characters as they variously smash would be dominators and fuck the deserving among the masochists, while they discover each other along the myriad of public places and transit points dotting the greater London metroscope.
Admittedly, Home’s plots have a surreal quality to them. The sex is, to be frank, very frequent and extremely varied. The violence is bone crushingly graphic. The politics are intoxicating, concise, critical, crude and to the point. The writing is minimalist.

In PURE MANIA, Home sets up a scenario where rival rock bands compete for the sympathies of a subculture, struggling to find its way to predominance. Meanwhile, in an alliance with militant vegetarians—the Vegans—a former CND man, turned 40ish, neo-nazi boot licker, gets turned again, this time towards the anarcho-organic revolutionary ideals of a younger, sexually liberated feminist. A sub plot, concerning the business and politics of rival rock ‘n roll bands weaves its way through the novel, culminating in an explosive finale which brings the rockers and the Vegans together, in all places, an art museum. Looks like class conflict will be on the agenda of this London, until, of course, classes are made to disappear.

DEFIANT POSE gives the reader yet another glimpse into Mr. Home’s imagination. It is again the city of London as stage. The city, it seems, has been increasingly dividing itself into sharply defined political spheres. The fascist leader of the “Cockney Nation” must compromise his “principles” when he is blackmailed by the crypto-leninist cop of the British state’s super secret “Seven” branch. The little Cockney fuehrer is commanded to start a race war in order to allow the “anti-fascists”, under the leadership of a submerged leninist vanguard, to seize power and impose order on the fragmenting British society. The protagonist, an anarcho- nihilist skinhead/bisexual “bootboy”, makes his living turning out homemade porn films in his apartment—films with a revolutionary message. He routinely video tapes his sexual encounters with consenting adults, while for example, reciting memorized passages of the ECONOMIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL MANUSCRIPTS of Karl Marx, as an aside to other oral gymnastics. The “boot boy” will eventually be one of the sparks which set off a train of events leading to the sacking of Parliament, destruction of monuments—Big Ben comes crashing to the ground—and a street fight to end all street fights as a united, colorful working-class whips the fascists’ ass.

If for no other reason, you should read Stewart Home because he’s a kick—a working class cultural kick at the ruling ideas and ruling class of our times. Beware though. The milieu his characters move within may not be your “cuppa”. But with that said, if you still dare, pick up these books and turn the page; you have nothing to lose but a few hours of TV.

Mike Ballard
mikeballard
tristan@iww.org
http://www-ieland.stanford.edu/~miballar/
Dear DE.

I am afraid I don’t agree with Ed Wizak’s comments on the WSM’s majoritarian position and the Allende government of Chile. There is no comparison. The UP never even got a simple majority, the highest percentage was 45. You can’t fuel a revolution with a minority like that. You need the vast majority of the population, which I assume is the WSM position. If 80-90% supported the UP, it could never have been overthrown.

Wizak overlooks the fact that not just latifundist reactionaries were opposed to the UP. Many middle class people and not a few workers were opposed to it out of fear of Stalinism. They did not particularly fear Allende, the SP or the Radical Party UP members, rather the CP and the MIR. These mostly Christian Democrat supporters, at the time a party more like the BR. Labour Party than a right-wing grouping, did not want Chile to become another Cuba. In supporting the military takeover, they never dreamed that a bloodbath would occur. Nor was worker unrest simply CIA inspired. After making all kinds of promises the UP found things getting out of control. It was quite natural that certain sectors of the working population would turn against the government - even though it was supposedly “their” government. By no stretch of the imagination could the UP be considered socialist. State capitalist or state socialist, but certainly not what most DB correspondents would mean by the term.

Subversion - an excellent critique of the left, that vanguard of bureaucratisation. However your interpretation of democracy and the reasons for leftism’s development are crude. It is as though E.P. Thompson and Christopher Hill had never existed. You need to do a real in depth study of social history rather than reduce a highly complex development down to rhetoric about con jobs. In other words, you still remain in the left, you haven’t broken with that reductionist, conspiratorial, and hyperbolic frame of mind that characterizes leftism. And please do your homework before you start telling us what to believe.

Blaming working people for accepting “bourgeois democracy” also smacks of leftist elitism. The fact is, democracy originally meant direct democracy and this was how the working population saw it and was what they strived for. The fact that they were defeated and elite democracy replaced the original concept is not really their fault. Condemning the notion of “the people” is also anachronistic. Modern classes were not fully formed in 1789. There was no real industrial bourgeoisie and the few manufacturers in their tiny factories were originally master craftsmen. Politically, on one side, stood the financial or mercantilist bourgeoisie tied to the ancien regime and on the other, the artisans, peasants, professionals and nascent industrialists, i.e., the people. Hence, the concept was not fraudulent, but was an accurate description of reality. So too with populist movements in the US. "People" meant the farmers, artisans and industrial workers who faced a common enemy in the railroad barons and banking interests.

Larry Gambone
WHOSE UNABOMBER?

Techno-rogues and technophets we have had with us for some time. The Artificial Intelligence pioneer Marvin Minsky, for instance, was well-known in the early 1980s for his description of the human brain as "a 3 pound computer made of meat." He was featured in the December 1983 issue of Psychology Today, occasioning the following letter:

Marvin Minsky:
With the wholly uncritical treatment--nay, giddy embrace--of high technology, even to such oxenences as machine "emotions" which you develop and promote, Psychology Today has at least made it publicly plain what's intended for social life.

Your digression into work as a prime contribution to high tech's accelerating motion toward an ever more artificial, de-individualized, empty landscape.
I believe I am not alone in the opinion that vermin such as you will one day be considered among the worst criminals this century has produced.

(Signed) In revulsion, John Zerzan

A dozen years later the number of those actively engaged in the desolation of the soul and the murder of nature has probably risen; but support for the entire framework of such activity has undoubtedly eroded.

Enter Unabomber (he/she/they) with a critique, in acts as well as words, of our sad, perverse, and increasingly bereft technological existence. Unabomber calls for a return to "wild nature" via the "complete and permanent destruction of modern industrial society in every port of the world," and the replacement of that impersonal, unfree, and alienated society by that of small, face-to-face social groupings. He has killed three and wounded 23 in the service of this profoundly radical vision.

There are two somewhat obvious objections to this theory and practice. For one thing, a return to undomesticated autonomous ways of living would not be achieved by the removal of industrialism alone. Such removal would still leave domination of nature, subjugation of women, war, religion, the state, and division of labor, to cite some basic social pathologies. It is civilization itself that must be undone to go where Unabomber wants to go. In other words, the wrong turn for humanity was the Agricultural Revolution, much more fundamentally than the Industrial Revolution.

In terms of practice, the mailing of explosive devices intended for the agents who are engineering the present catastrophe is too random. Children, mail carriers and others could easily be killed. Even if one granted the legitimacy of striking at the high-tech horror show by terrorizing its indispensable architects, collateral harm is not justifiable.

Meanwhile, Unabomber operates in a context of massive psychic immiseration and loss of faith in all of the system's institutions. How many moviegoers, to be more specific, took issue with Terminator 2 and its equating of science and technology with death and destruction? Kay Davidson's "A Rage Against Science" (San Francisco Examiner, 4/30/95) observed that Unabomber's "avowed hatred of science and technological trends reflects growing popular disillusionment with science."

A noteworthy example of the resonance that his sweeping critique of the modern world enjoys is "The Evolution of Despair" by Robert Wright, cover story of TIME for August 28. The long article discusses Unabomber's indictment soberly and sympathetically, in an effort to plumb "the source of our pervasive sense of discontent."

At the same time, not surprisingly, other commentators have sought to minimize the possible impact of such ideas. "Unabomber Manifesto Not Particularly Unique" is the dismissive summary John Schwartz provided for the August 20 Washington Post. Schwartz found professors who would loftily attest to the unoriginality of fundamental questioning of society, as if anything like that goes on in classrooms. Ellul. Juenger and others with a negative view of technology are far from old hat; they are unknown, not a part of accepted, respectable discourse. The cowardice and dishonesty typical of professors and journalists could hardly be more clearly represented.

Also easily predictable has been the antipathy to Unabomber-type ideas from the liberal-left. "Unabummer" was Alexander Cockburn's near-hysterical denunciation in The Nation, August 28/September 4. This pseudo-critic of U.S. capitalism rants about Unabomber's "homicidal political nulliness," the fruit of an "irrational" American anarchist tradition. Cockburn says that Unabomber represents a "rotted-out romanticism of the individual and of nature," that nature is gone forever and we'd better accept its extinction. In reply to this effort to vilify and marginalize both Unabomber and anarchism, Bob Black points out (unpublished letter to the editor) the worldwide resurgence of anarchism and finds Unabomber expressing "the best and the predominant thinking in contemporary North American anarchism, which has mostly gotten over the workerism and productivism which is too often used to share with Marxism."

In spring '95 Earth First! spokesperson Judy Bari labeled Unabomber "a sociopath," going on to declare, definitively but mistakenly, that "there is no one in the radical environmental movement who is calling for violence."

This is not the place to adequately discuss the politics of radical environmentalism, but Bari's pontificating sounds like the voice of the many anarcholiberals and anarchopacifists who wish to go no further in defense of the wild than tried, ineffective civil disobedience, and who brandish such tawdry and compromised slogans as "no deforestation without representation."
The summer '85 issue of Slingshot, tabled of politically correct Berkeley militants, contained a brief editorial trashing Unabomber for creating "the real danger of government repression" of the radical milieu. The fear that misplaces blame on Unabomber overlooks the simple fact that any real blows against the Megamachine will invite responses from our enemies. The specter of repression is most effectively banished by doing nothing.

For their part, the "anarchists" of Love and Rage (August/September) have also joined the anti-Unabomber leftist chorus. Wayne Price's "Is the Unabomber an Anarchist?" concedes, with Bob Black, that "most anarchists today do not regard the current development of industrial technology as 'progressive' or even 'neutral,' as do Marxists and liberals." But after giving this guarded lip-service to the ascendancy of Unabomber-like ideas, Price virulently decries Unabomber as "a murderer dragging noble ideas through the mud" and withholds even such political and legal support that he would accord authoritarian leftists targeted by the state. Love and Rage is defined by a heavy-handed, manipulative organize-the-masses ideology; approaches that are more honest and more radical are either ignored or condemned by these politicians.

But this selective mini-survey of opposition to Unabomber does not by any means exhaust the range of responses. There are other perspectives, which have largely, for obvious reasons, been expressed only privately. Some of us, for one thing, have found a glint of hope in the public appearance, at last, of a challenge to the fundamentals of a depraved landscape. In distinction to the widespread feeling that everything outside of the self is beyond our control, the monopoly of lies has been broken. It might be said that Unabomber's (media) impact is here today, only to be forgotten tomorrow. But at least a few will have been able to understand and remember. The irony, of course, is that lethal bombings were necessary for an alternative to planetary and individual destruction to be allowed to be heard.

The concept of justice should not be overlooked in the Unabomber phenomenon. In fact, except for his targets, when have the many little Eichmanns who are preparing the Brave New World ever been called to account? Where is any element of personal responsibility when the planners of our daily and global death march act with complete impunity?

The ruling order rewards such destroyers and tries to polish their image. The May 21 New York Times Magazine's "Unabomber and David Gelernter" humanizes the latter, injured by a Unabomber bomb at Yale, as a likable computer visionary preparing a "Renaissance of the human spirit." From no other source than the article itself, however, it is clear that Gelernter is helping to usher in an authoritarian dystopia based on all the latest high-tech vistas, like genetic engineering. Is it unethical to try to stop those whose contributions are bringing an unprecedented assault on life? Or is it unethical to just accept our passive roles in the current zeitgeist of postmodern cynicism and know-nothingism? As a friend in California put it recently, when justice is against the law, only outlaws can effect justice.

The lengthy Unabomber manuscript will go undiscussed here; its strengths and weaknesses deserve separate scrutiny. These remarks mainly shed light on some of the various, mostly negative commentary rather than directly on their object. It is often the case that one can most readily learn about society by watching its reactions, across the spectrum, to those who would challenge it.

"Well, I believe in FC/Unabomber--it's all over the country...his ideas are, as the situationists said, 'in everyone's heads'; it's just a matter of listening to your own voice," from a Midwesterner in the know. Or as Anne Eisenberg, from Polytechnic University in Brooklyn, admitted, "Scratch most people and you'll get a Luddite."

And from the Boulder Weekly, Robert Parkinson's July 6, '85 column sagely concluded: "Amidst the overwhelming madness of unbridled economic growth and postmodern disintegration, is such nostalgia, or even such rage, really crazy? For many, especially those who scrape by in unfulfilling jobs and peer longingly toward stars obscured by beaming street lights, the answer is probably no. And for them, the Unabomber may not be a psychopathic demon. They may wish FC the best of luck."

AAA/PO Box 11331/Eugene, Oregon 97440

(From p. 7)

of the cultural elite. The DB ends as usual with some notes, announcements and short reviews.

BULLETIN MATTERS

Finances

The bill for copier repair from last June finally arrived. The total was $136, and the DB's half, included in this report, brings expenses for these two months far above receipts. We are still in the black, but another big ticket item looms on the horizon, the annual non-profit bulk mailing fee, which rose last January to $85, is due by the end of December. The cost of mailing the DB has risen as witnessed by

(TO p. 17)
Dear Frank

I too am prepared to let readers judge for themselves whether or not the SPGB holds "a purely parliamentary conception of revolution" by reading the chapter from our pamphlet you reproduce in DB73.

The trouble is, Frank, that you have read the chapter with a preconceived view. You have already concluded that "the role of workers once they have voted for socialism appears to be little more than waiting for the political state and the new socialist administration to institute socialism". This is not what the chapter actually says but merely what it "appears" to you to say. But at least it provides a definition of the sort of view that a group that was committed to "a purely parliamentary conception of revolution" would have to hold.

What the chapter actually says (read it again) is that it is the "socialist movement" which will prepare programmes of action in advance of the actual winning of political control (and these programme will concern economic and other matters as well as the reorganisation of the administrative and decision-making structure which this particular chapter is concerned with), institute common ownership, extend democratic control, abolish the state, etc. In other words, the socialist movement as a whole will do these things, not just the particular persons it happens to have mandated and delegated to undertake particular tasks on the political field.

It is also significant that the term employed is "socialist movement" rather than "socialist party", thus bringing out that the movement for socialism will not be narrowly political but a broad social movement embracing other things besides the winning of political control (which in any event is not the goal but merely a means towards achieving the social revolution which is the goal). These other things will include education, the arts, relations between the sexes as well as the control and running of industry, so we really are talking about a broad revolutionary movement.

But how can this movement for socialism organise itself? Anyone who knows anything about the SPGB will know that one of the things we have always said is that workers don't need leaders. "Leaders Get Lost!" has been one of our slogans over the years. So what we envisage is organisation without leaders. This can only be on the basis of mandated and revokeable delegates.

And this is where you make your second mistake: you assume that when we say workers vote for delegates we mean they will vote for them in the same way they vote for elected politicians today, i.e. they put an 'X' on a ballot paper (or whatever) and then go away and do nothing, leaving the elected person a free hand to get on with the job. But this is not at all what is involved in the concept of a delegate.

A delegate is not someone you simply vote for and then leave them to it. A delegate is someone you continually mandate and keep an eye on to ensure that they actually carry out your mandate. So delegating someone is not at all a passive thing; it implies active participation. Since it is impossible for the working class as a whole to do everything at a mass meeting of the whole class, delegates are necessary, indeed inevitable. And this is true whether or not the working class organises to win political control.
Presumably you envisage delegates and voting for them existing in your non- or anti-political conception of revolution. But would it be a valid argument to say: "the role of the workers once they have sent delegates to the Workers Councils appears to be little more than waiting for the members of the Workers Councils to institute socialism"? And if not, why not? Why can you envisage workers actively controlling delegates they send to some central federation of Workers Councils but be unable to do so with any delegates they might send into parliament or local councils?

Finally, to finish on a point of agreement, I agree with you that it is pointless to seek to lay down now how the revolution should proceed. That's not up to us but will be decided by the socialist majority (hopefully including us) at the time. But I also agree with James Connolly who, when asked if he agreed with the new preamble the IWW adopted in 1908 which (ostensibly) repudiated the principle of political action, replied: "It will be impossible to prevent the workers taking it".

Yours for Socialism,  Adam Buick, 40 Granville Gardens, London W5.

Dear Comrades,

One of the major tragedies of the Russian Revolution has been the suspicion created among our class as to the real motives and objectives of socialists. And this suspicious attitude is found even among members of revolutionary parties and groups, all of whom regard other such groups with the deepest distrust. We look for evidence of their evil intent in their very utterance and publication. Even worse, we may not believe that they consciously seek to subvert the socialist goal; it is enough that they are the unwitting, misguided carriers of policies that we choose to believe will betray the revolution when it comes. It is in this deeply suspicious, not to say paranoic, spirit that I respond to Adam Buick's letter.

First consider the term "socialist movement," which Adam implies differs from the Socialist Party of Great Britain but would help in the preparation of programs of action. The problem is that I suspect that any "movement" that Adam and the SPGB consider socialist will be identical to the SPGB and its "Companion Parties" which constitute what the SPGB now regards as the World Socialist Movement. All of these accept the SPGB's eight-point "Declaration of Principles." Any group which doesn't accept these eight points isn't socialist. If I am wrong about this, perhaps Adam will list for us the other socialist grouping, that he and the SPGB believe are entitled to be included in the socialist movement.

Now to the matter of "delegates." Here we have something new. I was under the impression that the SPGB intended to carry out the abolition of capitalism through parliament where it will have won control through elections. If the "delegates" Adam is talking about are the members of parliament, how do the voters have any more control over their actions than they do now? Also, simply calling the representative of workers a delegate and saying that he is mandated doesn't really change anything. It is the nature of political leaders—and the people who will be elected will be just that: leaders—who look out for themselves and "do politics." As for the mandate and the possibility for recall of an erring socialist delegate, its effectiveness, as we have it in the U.S., is nearly zero.

Last, Adam seems to have DeLeonists confused with those Leninist types who insist on
making the delegated workers councils, which Lenin, Trotsky, and the Bolshevik Party found so easy to manipulate, the revolutionary institutions in the highly industrialized West. The advantage of the socialist industrial unions, advocated by DeLeonists, is that they are based on the workplace. When our class has reached the point where it feels confident enough, it can make the collective decision to walk into the workplaces, organize production and begin production for use rather than for the market. This is the revolution. We don’t have to mess around with the banking system, property titles and deeds, and stocks, bonds, and money. In other words we don’t have to “dismantle” capitalism. Whether our class will decide afterward to elect socialists to office and legally put an end to capitalism and the state hardly matters. Perhaps we will let the displaced capitalists and their politicians continue to play their game, like British aristocrats with their titles, robes, tiaras, and rituals that seem to make them happy.

Most DeLeonists agree with the SPGB on the need for political action, at least in the abstract, partly because organizing as a political party confers legality on the movement and distances it from groupings that lay themselves open to repression and police surveillance because of their openly physical forceist policies. In this connection, James Connolly’s remark about the IWW giving up political action referred to the 1908 IWW convention at which the anarchist element was able to strike the political clause from the Preamble to the constitution. It resulted in the SLP’s exit from the IWW and the organization of the Detroit IWW which retained the political clause.

I too wish to end this on a positive note. To my way of thinking the SPGB and its companion—as well as dissident—parties, the SLP along with all dissident DeLeonists groups, and the anarchists of some—but not all—persuasions constitute the real revolutionaries of our times. I suspect that the growth of a revolutionary movement among our class could be hastened by greater cooperation among us. Unfortunately I don’t have any ideas about how to accomplish this.

Frank Girard

(From p. 14)

the $120 we now spend for postage. The cost of paper has also skyrocketed in recent months. The cost of five reams of the cheapest legal size copy paper needed for an issue has risen from around $17 to $25 in less than a year. How can we small businessmen hope to survive?

Contributions: Phillip Colligan $7; Mario Petrilli $4; Rado Mijanovich $35; Harry Wade “In memory of Ben Perry” $50; Willy Eckert $7; Mike Ballard $5; Lynn Olson $2; Paul Burkett $7. Total $117.

Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE September 2, 1995 $97.30

RECEIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subs and sales</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy repair</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage due</td>
<td>$10.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To p. 24)
"DEMOCRACY--POLITICAL AND INDUSTRIAL"

In accordance with our declared intention, reported in previous issues, we here continue reproduction of the inter-party debates on our position paper of the above title. The following is an exchange between our society and Ann Braunstein of The De Leonist Society of the U.S.

Dear Comrades:

I have studied your position paper "Democracy--Political and Industrial." It is my opinion that it proposes a step backward and not forward, and I vote against adopting it as a position paper of the DeLeonist Society.

You state that the Socialist Industrial Union Congress would be qualified to deal only with matters related to manufacture and distribution of products and not qualified to deal with social issues. I disagree.

The SIU Congress would have representatives from every segment of society; every branch of manufacture, education, medicine, the many sciences, the environment, natural resources, recreation, the different arts, etc., etc. Is there any one of these "industries" that does not involve "social issues"?

And it is definitely not "elitist" to believe that those who specialize in a particular "industry," and who no longer must function under the restraints that capitalism imposed on them, would indeed be qualified to address and advise the Congress on matters that involve their "industry."

Since, to your way of thinking, the Socialist industrial unions and the SIU Congress are not suitable vehicles to deal with social issues, you argue that we must have a separate political organization once again based on geographic constituencies to deal with those issues. That, to me, is the very antithesis of the integrated Republic of Labor.

To explain why a separate political organization is needed, you say that the workers in the industrial unions could not "be reasonably expected to welcome, much less sift through and evaluate for possible social legislation and administration an expected flood of recommendations...on urgent social matters" while on their jobs.

You do not tell us why the workers must carry on their discussions and evaluations while "on the job," and why these very same workers would "have the time and be in the necessary relaxed frame of mind to do justice to the aforementioned social questions" in a political geographic setting, but not in their industrial unions which would be in place from the start. (And, incidentally, many of the matters you list as "issues," are issues in our present class-divided society, and would not be issues at all in a sane Socialist society.)

It is your assumption that only those engaged in active production would have a voice and vote in the industrial unions. Since in all DeLeonist literature it has been stated that the employed and unemployed would be integrated into the industrial unions, is it not conceivable that every individual would remain a lifetime member of his or her union? However, it is not our place now to set down the specifics; we can only speculate. I think the following, which appears in an old Labor News pamphlet, says it best:

"The Socialist Republic is not to be poured like cast iron into a mould fashioned by
"The constitution of the Socialist Republic will grow out of and be a concrete expression of the experience of the movement which brought it forth. It will most surely recognize, protect, and guarantee the rights of the individual in his or her use of the basic opportunities of life; and its experience will determine the best way of maintaining those rights in perpetuity."

Fraternally,

(signed) Ann Braunstein

Dear Comrade Braunstein:

Replaying now to the arguments you raised in opposition to our thesis, Democracy—Political and Industrial.

First it should be noted for the record that in objecting to our proposed blend of political and industrial democracy (i.e., that socialist democracy should henceforth be based not only on industrial but also on geographic constituencies), neither you nor Comrade Banks nor Comrade Emanuel nor Comrade Teichert chose to confront the central contradiction which we drew to your attention in the opening page of our thesis, to wit:

"Does the difficulty not now become apparent? 'The people' will enjoy free speech under Socialism; 'the people' will have 'a democratic mastery of their lives'; 'the people' will enjoy unfettered freedom 'to question, to criticize and to suggest'—in short, while 'the people' will have all this, will they also have a vote? No, not according to the above delineation! While 'the people' will at last have 'a democratic mastery of their lives,' the said mastery does not accord them the right to vote! Not the people as a whole but only that segment of them actively engaged in production will have both voice and vote!"

In short, it seems evident to us that rather than deal with that difficulty you and the other responders have sought to rationalize the problem out of existence by the novel expedient of attempting to squeeze the entire adult population into the confines of the industrial constituencies!

However, upon due reflection it should become obvious to you (and to the other comrades) that even apart from its forbidding physical aspect, such exercise must needs be incurably flawed from the start. Merely consider your second and third paragraphs as they relate to one another:

"You state that the Socialist Industrial Union Congress would be qualified to deal only with matters related to manufacture and distribution of products and not qualified to deal with social issues. I disagree.

"The SIU Congress would have representatives from every segment of society: every branch of manufacture, education, medicine, the many sciences, the environment, natural resources, recreation, the different arts, etc., etc. Is there any one of these 'industries' that does not involve 'social issues'?"

First as regards your question, "Is there any one of these 'industries' that does not involve 'social issues'?" If you will re-read our thesis
you will see that we had already covered that point. Quoting from its page 2, as follows:

"Today, however, the 'legislative work' that would confront a Socialist Industrial Union Congress is 'easy' and 'simple' no longer; on the contrary, it has become infinitely complex. Now as we near the end of the century it is obvious that Socialism must inherit a host of grave social problems generated and/or exacerbated by moribund Capitalism; now a Socialist Administration would have to deal not only with questions directly related to production but also with questions indirectly related to it, many of which require value judgements not amenable to production per se." (And here we suggested 8 examples of such)

But now as to what we see as an "incorrigible flaw" in your position. Disagreeing with us that the SIU Congress would not be qualified to deal with social issues, you claim the Congress would be so qualified because it "would have representatives from every segment of society: every branch of manufacture, education, medicine, the many sciences, the environment, natural resources, recreation, the different arts, etc., etc." But we can think of two very important and very large "segments of society" that do NOT fit into the industrial union framework, segments that appear to defy efforts to so fit them--segments of society that are therefore disfranchised! We refer to retirees for one, housewives for another, and will take up this matter in some detail before closing.

Proceeding now to deal with the remainder of your points seriatim:

(1) Question: "And it is definitely not 'elitist' to believe that those who specialize in a particular 'industry,'...would indeed be qualified to address and advise the [SIU] Congress on matters that involve their 'industry.'"

Comment: At no time did we say it was! In fact we are quite certain that representatives of "particular industries" will constantly be called on to 'address and advise' both the SIU Congress (on matters related to their industries) as well as the proposed political legislative assembly (on matters of social policy). What we took exception to was what we regard as the Weekly People's unfortunate assertion that teachers could "address and advise" on social policy generally "with far more understanding and intelligence than a political party." (Our emphasis.) Taking "political party" (or political representatives) to mean input from society-at-large, we think that while society should listen to teachers (or any other segment of workers) it is crucial to democracy that society should have the last word on social policy which, in the case of the "education industry," means what is to be taught! And while we would not argue that teachers in general could be expected to be as well versed in specific subjects as are the teachers of those subjects, we nevertheless believe that society has the "understanding and intelligence," as well as the duty, to itself determine broad educational curricula under which it might wish its offspring to be nurtured. What we visualize here are two branches of government working together, the political determining social policy and the industrial (SIU) executing that policy. We might add here that, far from being deprived of democracy, active workers would be doubly blessed in that they would have their voice and vote on the in-
ustrial field (on matters directly related to their industries), also on the political field (on questions of social policy).

Finally under this head, by way of clinching our point, we would again quote the passage from Thomas Jefferson that appeared in the May-June, '94 issue of the De Leonist Society Bulletin.

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise that control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."

(2) Question: "...you argue that we must have a separate political organization once again[sic!] based on geographic constituencies..." (Our emphasis.)
Comment: We do not argue for a re-institution of geographic constituencies but for their retention!

(3) Question: "That [i.e., geographic constituencies] to me, is the very antithesis of the integrated Republic of Labor."
Comment: We are puzzled why you project the geographic and industrial constituencies as being in opposition to one another. We see each form performing a necessary function in socialist democracy—the one industrial, the other political--two branches of government working in close and harmonious relation.

(4) Question: "You do not tell us why the workers must carry on their discussion and evaluations while 'on the job...'' (i.e., while in the workplace.)
Comment: But of course it is not WE but THE SLP PROGRAM that did the telling! For instance:

See again our analysis of the Weekly People's October 26, 1963 Question Period column (page 4 of our thesis). Quoting as follows:

"'A Socialist Industrial Union government...opens all the avenues of information and creates meaningful forums for the discussion of social as well as economic problems.' (Our emphasis.)

"Comment: Where are the forums on social problems to be opened up? and Who will be involved in their discussion? Answer--'In every school, factory, mine, ship, distribution facility, etc., questions of public interest...may be discussed by the rank and file in shop councils...''

*Quoting from the leaflet, SOCIALISM THE WORLD OF TOMORROW:

"Possessed of a voice and vote where they work [leaflet's emphasis], all who perform socially useful tasks will democratically elect from their ranks the representatives who are to administer the economy on all levels from the local to the national. Moreover, in their various economic units (shops, schools, hospitals, etc.) they will regularly and frequently discuss the problems of their respective industries as well as those of society in general, and thereby help to formulate the nation's programs."
Quoting from the chart depicting Socialist Industrial Union Representation: "YOU CAST YOUR BALLOT IN YOUR SHOP FOR....PLANT COUNCIL" etc.

But what of social issues? Since neither the chart nor SLP literature makes other provision, the shop is presumably the place where the rank and file workers would not only "discuss and evaluate" social issues but the place where they would also "cast their ballots" for resolution of these issues!

(5) Question: "You do not tell us...why these very same workers would have the time and be in the necessary relaxed frame of mind to do justice to the aforementioned social questions" in a political geographic setting, but not in their industrial unions which would be in place from the start. (And, incidentally, many of the matters you list as 'issues', are issues in our present class-divided society, and would not be issues at all in a sane Socialist society.)

Comment: We did attempt to tell you! Quoting from page 4 of our Position Paper:

"The SIU's job will be to conduct production to the end that an abundance is produced with a minimum of labor--to not only ascertain, in De Leon's words, 'the wealth needed, the wealth producible and the work required,' but also to perform that work. How can workers reasonably be expected to do this while simultaneously spending the great amount of time that will be required to review, discuss, debate, formulate and implement solutions for the many social problems not directly related to production? Just ask yourselves if, when at work, you have, or would have had, the time or even the inclination to attempt this manifold task. No comrades, it is in their leisure hours, after workers have performed their industrial chores, that they will have the time and be in the necessary relaxed frame of mind to do justice to the aforementioned social questions."

We stick to our position that such combination of demands upon workers' attention would prove, to put it mildly, highly impractical! If no other "setting" than the industrial constituency had been conceived for resolution of social issues, then of course that would be that. But this is not the case. The geographic constituency was conceived long, long ago, is here now, and stripped of class content appears to us the one practical answer to the problem. You have yet to tell us why it cannot serve the needs of socialist democracy. Incidentally, as to your suggestion that the SIU would not be overburdened with social issues because "many" of those extant would disappear under Socialism: while over varying periods of time many would undoubtedly do so, you appear to discount the probability that from time to time new issues would arise.

(6) Question: "It is your assumption that only those engaged in active production would have a voice and vote in the industrial unions."

Comment: Correction! This is no assumption on our part but (as detailed on page 3 of this letter) is a condition that is explicit in the SLP program!

(7) Question: "Since in all DeLeonist literature it has been stated that the employed and unemployed [your emphasis] would be integrated into the industrial unions..."

Comment: In our view the references in SLP literature to the fact that the SIU will include both the "employed and unemployed" refer to the
SIU’s formative period under Capitalism when all active (and potentially active) workers will be included in its ranks. In addition, where the context becomes a socialist society we have yet to discover where the literature states there will be unemployed workers to integrate.

(8) Question: "...is it not conceivable that every individual would remain a lifetime member of his or her union?"

Comment: Certainly it is conceivable, but to what end in the case of retirees except recognition of services rendered to society? This aspect of the matter is closely related to the question of practicality previously touched on. Consider for example:

* We believe your implication that retirees might well continue to participate in workplace forums is based upon the unwarranted assumption that retirees in general would desire to do so.

* It is also reasonable to assume that, with few exceptions, retired workers would tend to lose touch with the productive processes in their former industries and would therefore no longer qualify for voice and vote on day-to-day industrial matters.

* Retirees are on average living longer than before thus comprise a larger segment of society. Not only that, but Socialism holds the promise of early voluntary retirement thus a likelihood of a still wider gap between the work force (the active producers) and the rest of society. The logistics of seating everyone concerned (work force plus retirees) at forums within the workplace does not appear to have a practical solution.

* The proposition that retirees should participate in the forums of their former workplaces has in our opinion still another unrealistic side. It is based on the assumption that, by and large, retirees will continue to live in the same locality, or even in the same region, as before.

* In addition to retirees there is yet another large segment of adult society that stands outside social production, and this is perhaps the most important but least acknowledged of all. We speak of housewives! In what forums are they to gather to exercise voice and vote?

(9) Question: "However, it is not our place now to set down the specifics..."

Comment: We see no reason to take issue with the specifics of Socialist Industrial Union organization as detailed by De Leon in his March 23, 1910 editorial entitled Industrialism. (See pamphlet INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM --Selected Editorials.) What we take issue with is an apparently recent misconception on the part of our U.S. comrades that society-at-large can be compressed into the perimeter of the Socialist Industrial Union! For as De Leonists we hold that it is not only our "place" but our duty to question whenever we believe a question is necessary.

* Let us repeat the essence of what we conveyed in our thesis, Democracy—Political and Industrial:

With hindsight it has become obvious to us that the greatest obstacle to acceptance of political democracy (the geographic constituency) has been and is an erroneous and persistent habit of thought, namely, that class rule and political democracy are two sides of the same coin! De Leon’s substitution of the industrial constituency for the geographic constituency for the dual purpose of dislodging the capitalist class and administering socialist production was unquestionably a giant step for-
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GENERAL COMPLAINTS

Greetings from the weak link of the worldwide revolutionary resistance!
In spite of the word 'news' in the name of this bulletin it has always been views that dominated it. Just as any other publication from the former USSR, ours is very opinionated, not to say sectarian (we haven't got a sect). Since, due to our irregularity, we fail to deliver news that doesn't sink, we always make reviewing some tendencies in the anarchist scene here our main prerequision. This time too, we offer you the following general complaints. (Well, there will be some news and events.)

The period since the previous issue of "News & Views" (August 1993) was characterized by the more and more evident wanning away of the ideological federations (that is the Confederation of Anarchist Syndicalists (KAS) and the Federation of Revolutionary Anarchists (FRAN). A third federation, the Association of Anarchist Movements (ADA) never was an ideological federation and due to its very informal character just can't die, because it was never actually so much alive. This fact however shouldn't bother you so much, since in places there's enough will to continue anarchist activities, they are still carried out - on a more humane and non-sectarian basis. Unfortunately not everywhere it is so and anarchist groups that actually do something can be counted by numbers, plus, information exchange between different groups is in fact falling apart due to the fact that almost all the anarchist info-bulletins collapsed - the Petersburg-based "An-Press" which was published by libertarian capitalists is now defunct while its publishers finally did what they should have done long ago - joined some liberal party. "KAS-Contact" that was moved from Moscow to Tomsk 2 or 3 years ago finally collapsed, too, and was moved to Irkutsk where it was being published very irregularly due to lack of actual information and activities and technical problems. The only bulletin that carried some occasional news that was buried under heaps of gossip was Moscow IREAN's "Novy Nestor", that many people were forced to read since there was nothing else. (When I say the bulletin was filled with gossip and not
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REVELATION OF THE SPECTACLE IN THE SOCIETY OF EVERYDAY LIFE

The book is a transcript of the original document. The text seems to be discussing the implications of a spectable in society, possibly related to industrial and economic issues, and is marked with a date of August 10, 1994.
REVOLUTION OF THE SPECTACLE IN THE SOCIETY OF EVERYDAY LIFE

The lack of appeal of 'radical' ideas and actions to the general population forces 'radicals' to think of new ways to seek popular support. The latest frenzy in the anarchist, communist and proto-fascist circles is the concept of being 'cool' and presenting your ideas and activities in the most spectacular way. The first to dive into this marketing strategy was Raimondas Limonov, a scandalously-famous Russian writer, founder of the speculator-extremist National-Bolshevik Party. That Limonov, this reincarnation of Malcolm MacLaren, decided to gain some popularity and money on the scandals surrounding his political activities was quite predictable. What was hard to predict was the recent obsession of profy Traditional Young Comunists (PKSM) with creating a new image of communism, which is to be marketed to the youth.

I doubt that they would ever have arrived at such a 'modern' concept, had they not been surrounded by some 'anarchists', who were in fact the main orchestrators of this frenzy. Already a while ago some people from INAP headed to the Statler-heist 'Student Defence' 'trade union', where some anarchists and other ideologically pure were also involved. Anarchists wrote some 'cool' articles for the Young Comunists' paper giving these boros some brand new ideas and images - some class war, some poorly-digested feminism, etc. 'Student Defence' managed to organize some 'cool' protest in April last year with some occasional 'anti-capitalist actions', which were afterwards disproportionately blown up in their papers. All that the concept of 'spectacular revolution' was given real shape with statements like 'to make a revolution today... it is enough to film the moment of rebellion and make a video'...

On January 17, 1995 Young Comunists organized a theoretical-practical conference on 'New Revolutionary Communism', where they talked a lot about the need for a new ideology. Also they spoke a lot about the 'simplifying' between the new left and new right and the necessity of acting together on some concrete issues. The reason for that was found in the numerous historical examples of Comunists acting together with 'left fascists'. However, the reasons for such activities and their possible outcomes were not analyzed at all. It seemed that analysis of any kind is out of their reach. These tendencies were rather well articulated in the papers of INAP, PKSM and the National-Bolshevik Party recently and thus it became possible for the Russian Section of the Last International and the Clandestine Committee for the Eradication of Professional Revolutionaries, Militants and their Sympathizers to go to considerable lengths denouncing all these stupidities of these self-proclaimed 'radicals'. The communiqué of these organizations called "A Call for Obsolete Comunists: An Appeal to the Victims of the Theorectico-practical Conference..." attacked the superficial claims about putting the spectacle to the service of revolution, the discovery of the similarity between the new left and the new right that we should somehow 'use' and the general stupidity of the above-mentioned tendencies.

CHRONICLE

On December 7, 1994 about a dozen anarchists picketed the Indonesian embassy in Moscow, protesting against the continuing occupation of East Timor and the genocide of its population. A couple of articles about
the tragedy of East Timor was published in some (almost mainstream) paper, thus putting an end to the 20-year-old silence. A note that we can do this propaganda on this topic. Protestors handed a letter to the ambassador. Unfortunately, this time the Moscow office of the BHP (a company extracting oil from East Timor in spite of occupation) wasn't spraypainted or threated, but we'll sure do it next time.

Protests against the war in Chechnya sparked some life into the anarchist scene in Moscow. Anarchists participated in most of the demonstrations and pickets against the war. On December 12, which saw the biggest demonstration against the war (seven thousand people, ranging from Communists to liberals and the Chechen community of Moscow), they tried to organize a small "radical" march on the Defence Ministry together with some young Communists, Trots and radical liberals, but were stopped by the police. Several people were arrested later in the evening. On December 19 five activists of radical Democratic Union and anarchists painted the Defence Ministry with anti-war slogans and even "bombed" it with fireworks. Some of them were reported to the police and arrested, but the court set them free without any fines. There was also some leafleting in Moscow metro (which is now filled with policemen and military, looking for "Chechen terrorists"), with a couple of people arrested and fined, and some spray-painting around the city. On January 30 some Moscow anarchists and radical liberals from the Democratic Union (DS) spraypainted 13 military call-up stations with anti-war and anti-imperialist slogans. They are also planning an active campaign against the military call-up this spring.

In Nizhny Novgorod (former Gorky) the local Anarchist Club, Rainbow Keepers and the local Green Party launched a campaign against the military institutions and the war in Chechnya. Local call-up stations were spraypainted with slogans like "Russia shouldn't be a gendarmerie", "Turn your arms against those who send you to kill!" and "Here are the headquarters of the fascist army". This happened after the local authorities demanded that the demands of protesters who were organizing pickets. Well, if they still will be dealt, anarchists promised to go further than words.

Khabarovsk in the Far East is also bubbling - some anarchists made a radio show "While Mommy Watches Santa-Barbara", bringing some music and attitude to a young audience. Khabarovsk anarchists also launched a campaign against bus controllers, agitating for going without paying, collective blocking of controllers and damaging some bus equipment. This campaign is an answer to another increase in the cost of public transport. Among the other activities of these joyful Far Easterners, we cannot continue organizing a rock club and a "free university" (regular seminars and discussions on different topics).

In Tver, a city located in the middle of the road between Moscow and St. Petersburg, anarchists participate in a campaign against the construction of a superhighway between the two capitals. Construction of the superhighway, that will have a deep lase, is likely to destroy the natural underground water system of the region.

On February 11 activists from various anarchist, ecological and radical liberal groups held a discussion in Moscow. Originally, the topic of the discussion was rather broad - from the traditional ways of organizing in this country (and why they can't help us achieve anything) to the role of family, and the arising broader community to end to the 20-year-old silence of Russian society on this topic. The discussion has been around for several years already, but didn't pay attention to what was really wrong with the existing forms of organizing (i.e. ideological groups). Anyway, since recently we witnessed the creation of some down-to-earth groups oriented on specific issues (mainly ecological), the radical movement is moving in the right direction. It's a pity that this is done in some unconscious fashion. As the discussion proceeded, issues of cooperation between different groups were discussed, namely around the anti-war and anti-draft campaign. It was more or less agreed to hold regular meetings and stop inter-personal and inter-group whisperings that were going on for several years. The groups that decided to participate in the future meetings included the Confederation of Anarcho-syndicalists, the Group of Radical Anarch-syndicalists (GRAS), Rainbow Keepers (anarcho-ecological group), "A" Cultural Centre, "Chernousovo-95" ecological group, the Democratic Union (radical liberals), The Emma Goldman Dancing Brigade and some other activists that are active in other groups. (All of these groups are rather or very tiny.)

DON'T EAT YOUR REVOLUTION! MAKE IT!

On November 7 all the Stalinists gathered on Olygolanskaya Square in Moscow under the still-standing huge Lenin. Later they headed to Red Square, followed by some small groups of Trotskyists and even some anarchists who successfully created an illusion that "young people" were with them. While the latters' red-and-black banners and dull papers were surely unable to destroy the traditional way of celebrating the October revolution day, the assault came from where nobody expected it. As the demonstrators were going down their route they inevitably confronted a small group of some vocal revolutionaries who were standing on the side of the road under the banner of 'primitive communism' (made of fake red fur) who were fearlessly banging their black and chrome collage. As the crowd passed by them and tried to find out what they wanted to say, the atmosphere was getting more and more tense. "The Blind" (that is the name of an artistic group) announced that people who gathered at the demo had nothing to do with revolution, that they "live", their revolution and shit it out, that the only thing they can do is ask the government for more money. Their poster announced "Proletarians of all lands, enough eating!" Instead of asking the government for money, The Blind announced, we should make another revolution and realize the real - primitive - communism. We should care less about material things and instead turn our attention to people around us. After the demo passed and the shouts "They are Jews, Zionists! Go back to Israel!" addressed to The Blind finally dissolved in the air, the 'primitive communists' headed back home and were stopped by police, who asked for their IDs. In spite of that, the affair ended peacefully.

STRANGE FRUIT

On September 5 some Moscow anarchists and punks were trying to defend their 'property rights' to a basement that was for some time used as a non-commercial club named first after the infamous sell-out Jerry Rubin and later after Ho Chi Min (due to the fact that the club was established not far from a square named after him and a mural dedicated to Ho). On New Year's Eve anarchists had a rather nice party there. As a few punks and their friends entered the club, the manager asked some questions about their ID cards. The whole crowd, including the two young anarchists, were forced to be identify themselves. The two anarchists, who had a paper with the photo and signature, refused, saying 'property rights'. They were taken to the police station, where they were questioned and released. Comrade Lenin: You can't live in society... You can't live... (Clenching his fists, angrily.) You can't, you can't, you can't!!!

MVA: Announcer: Assistant, please turn on the music, comrades Lenin and
as a non-commercial club named first after the infamous self-out Jerry Rubin and later after Ho Chi Minh (due to the fact that the club was situated not far from a square named after him and a surreal monument to Ho). On New Year's Eve anarchists had a rather nice party there after which the club finally moved out - into nowhere. Since both the Jerry Rubin/Ho Chi Min Club and the "A" Club which was run by anarchists were harem-like, they decided to join their forces. There are some reasons to believe that this union will bring about not only a cheap club where kids can hang out, but some constant place for radical meetings and activities. So far we found a basement that was given to us and now we are looking forward to cleaning it up and using it for meetings and some kind of infoshop and anarchist library.

THE ABC OF LIBERTARIAN LENINISM
(This will be a comic)

Characters:
- Male announcer - a hero of some comic, more or less like a Superman
- Comrade Lenin - the leader of proletarian revolution, founder of Leninism

Male announcer: Contrary to what is usually believed, Leninism too has strong libertarian potential. Unfortunately anarchists tend to disregard it while they point out that only one occasion Lenin supposedly "stole" their ideas when he wrote "State and Revolution". If we dig a little deeper, we will discover the unknown terrain of Leninism which is highlighted by aphorisms, not less poetic than those of Bakunin, Marx and the situationists. Please, comrade Lenin, give us just one example.

Comrade Lenin (sitting on a chair, his arms on his knees, seems a little depressed, announces in mechanic voice): You can't live in society but free from society.

Male announcer: Brilliant, don't you think? For years and years philistines exploited just one of the numerous creative methods appropiated by Marx from Hegel, namely Marxist dialectical double-speak. Here we find another creative tool for building a critical social theory, the one that can be called critical reductionism. Let us now take the same phrase, but this time without the last word. Please, comrade Lenin!

Comrade Lenin: You can't live in society and be free...

Male announcer: Terrific! But we still haven't seen the rest of the method. Let's take out some more words. Please, comrade Lenin!

Comrade Lenin: You can't live in society and be...

Male announcer: Fantastic! Do you understand now what a great potential libertarians missed when they claimed Leninism to be inherently authoritarian? Contrary to this narrow opinion it is as critical as, say, young Marx... Let's see, what will happen if we take out some more.

Comrade Lenin: You can't live in society... You can't live... (Glenching his fists, angrily.) You can't, you can't, you can't!!

Male announcer: Assistant, please! Can you take comrade Lenin and provide him with another dose of morphine? His authoritarian syndrome is back, we need to calm him down!

COMING SOON:
In the next issue of News&Views I hope to give some materials about:
- Anarchosocialist groups in Russia and their activities, both in the recent years and the ones that they plan for the next summer
- The activities and the current state of syndicalists groups and projects
- "The wonderful world of ZAIBI", THE most interesting (anti)music (anti)group and some of its ideas

Contact us:
via e-mail: cube@glas.apc.org
via regular mail: POB 500, 107061
Moscow, Russia

Compiled by Mikhail Tsvoym.
Long live the ANC (Absolutely No Copyright!)
Materials published above reflect only the personal opinion(s) of the author(s), but this doesn't mean they should be treated differently from the positions of the so-called federations.

If I can't be a graphomaniac once a year, I'm not part of your revolution! (Sorry for all the non-existent English words that I put into this bulletin.)
Noam Chomsky

"The Responsibility of Intellectuals"
Cambridge, MA - June 23, 1989

These questions of the vocation of intellectuals can be approached along two dimensions: descriptive and normative. We can ask what the practice of intellectuals is, and what moral responsibilities attend these practices. I am often asked to talk about the topic and I always feel a certain discomfort, particularly when I am asked to talk about it in 14 minutes, as I was tonight. One reason is that the questions are just too abstract; they are too far removed from the choices and decisions that really matter, and in fact, raising the questions at this level of abstraction can very easily serve as just another one of those devices that we construct for ourselves, constantly, to protect ourselves from facing serious problems of moral responsibility, and that is a lot more comfortable and convenient than actually facing them. A second reason for some discomfort over the topic is that at an abstract level the answers, at least to the normative questions, seem entirely obvious.

Any person, naturally, bears responsibility for the predictable human consequences of his or her actions—that is more or less trivial—and here I include the failure to act (looking the other way). That is also a choice with human consequences, plainly—the lesson that should have been seared into our souls forever by the Nazi experience. In one important study of the Holocaust, Norman Cohen observes that "there was not very much popular enthusiasm for Hitler's genocide, even among Nazi party members. The leadership," he writes, "required no more than a mood of passive compliance: apathy, willingness to look the other way, concentrating on personal gain, and succumbing to the symbolism of national grandeur and power." That too is taking a stand and we rightly attribute moral responsibility to those who made that choice, and of course even more to those who chose to support, or to implement what Nazi ideologists called "the defensive action against the Jewish world criminals," many noted intellectuals among them. We see here, incidentally in the slogan, an instance of what we might call Orwell's First Law, namely "the state is always engaged in defense—no matter what the facts may be." We can add to it Orwell's Second Law that relates to our topic: "the vocation of the responsible intellectual is to establish and protect that sacred truth."

If we regard ourselves as moral agents, the general answers to the questions of moral responsibility at least are fairly obvious. When we turn to the intellectuals, other questions arise. We might first of all ask ourselves whether we really want to think of intellectual work as being the province of a special class of people. I think we should not, and to the extent that such work is so restricted, it is a social defect to be overcome. I presume that it is a fundamental human need to try to understand the world around us, to appreciate its cultural wealth, to contribute to it as we can, and no person should be deprived of these opportunities any more than a person should be deprived of food and shelter. But let's take the world as it is, with certain privileged sectors that do have the opportunity and the training and the resources to devote themselves to work of the mind. By virtue of these privileges, their responsibilities are plainly greater. The reason is that the range of their choices is greater and the consequences of making those choices are greater. So when children die of disease and malnutrition in El Salvador and Nicaragua, intellectuals at home have a greater responsibility than those who are not in a position either to promulgate or to expose the lies that mask our direct contribution to these ends and thus facilitate the crimes.

Now we all understand this perfectly well when we contemplate the crimes of official enemies. So for example, a few days ago there was a front-page story in the New York Times reporting that the Soviet press had published a Solzhenitsyn essay entitled "Live not by Lies" which was directed particularly to intellectuals. The message of his article was: "if you are too fearful to revolt against injustice or to speak the truth, at least do not repeat the lies." And there was also an implicit message here in the report of the story, a message of self-congratulation: no such lessons are needed for us.

Well let's look a bit more closely. Leading scholars assure us that the war in Vietnam was "undertaken in defense of a free people resisting communist aggression"—that is Robert Tucker in the featured lead article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, referring to the United States attack against South Vietnam in the early 1960's to protect the client dictatorship that Washington had installed. And of course, no justification need be offered to back up such obvious truths, and none is. [John Lewis] Gaddis goes on, even blandly, to refer to what he calls the "Eisenhower
Administration’s strategy of deterring aggression by threatening the use of nuclear weapons in Indochina in 1954 when French forces found themselves facing defeat at Dien-Bien-Phu at the hands of the Communist Viet-Minh,” who were the aggressors, attacking our French ally defending Indochina against its own population.

Well, if you take a superficial look at the problem of the intellectual vocation, it might lead you to believe that there is a gap between the normative and the descriptive, maybe even a chasm. The normative injunction of course is Solzhenitsyn’s ringing phrase “live not by lies,” and the actual practice is to fabricate serviceable lies. When we look more closely, however, I think we find that the normative and the descriptive are not as far apart as one might imagine. Now, that is not because the practice is closer to standard rhetoric than I have indicated, but it is because the public rhetoric happens to be not the same at all as the private council.

There is a very strong tradition in the West holding that precisely in free societies where the state lacks means of coercion and people can express their beliefs and act upon them, precisely under those circumstances, intellectuals have a special responsibility; namely, to ensure that people think only the right thoughts. Now these concerns go back to the origins of modern democracy. At a rhetorical level of course, we are supposed to believe that a democratic society should provide the means for people to take some meaningful part in shaping public affairs, with free access to information and opinion, and opportunities to form their own ideas and to express them effectively—that is the public rhetoric. But it is worth recalling that since the origins of modern democracy, a contrary view has been widely held, probably dominantly held. One 17th century English historian, expressing a very common concern, wrote that the “Radical Democrats” who were trying to realize democratic values “were destroying the foundations of any government.” He said that “ignorance and admiration arising from ignorance are the servants of civil devotion and obedience. The radical democrats have made the people so curious and arrogant that they will never find humility enough to submit to a civil rule.” These same themes remain dominant to the present. Now this profound contempt and fear of democracy is revealed when modern liberal theorists explain that the job of the intellectuals is to create “necessary illusions” and “emotionally potent oversimplifications” as part of a process of “manufacture of consent” and they must do this if the “specialized class,” who alone “understand the common interest,” are to be able to rule undisturbed. I happen to be quoting Rhenhold Neibhur and Walter Lippman, but the thoughts are conventional and by no means idiosyncratic.

One variant of these ideas appears in Leninist conceptions of a vanguard party; another variant is the standard doctrine of Western theorists that if the voice of the people is heard, it is necessary to ensure that the voice says the right things by devising means to control the public mind, and the vocation of the intellectuals, if they are serious and responsible, is to carry out these tasks.

The point is more general: in any society where power to make crucial decisions is concentrated, but formal mechanisms exist to permit public participation, it is necessary that these mechanisms somehow be emptied of content. One mechanism is to divert or mislead the public and to limit opportunities for free inquiry and expression—all for the common good, of course, as conceived by the powerful.

These are major themes of modern political history and we delude ourselves if we merely attend to the appealing rhetoric and do not penetrate to the reality that lies behind it. Attending to these realities, we obtain a proper standpoint for assessing the vocation of the intellectual as it is quite typically practiced. It is the exceptions to the pattern that are remarkable. And if we are willing to be honest with ourselves, which is typically not a very gratifying experience, we will also be able to judge the burden of responsibility and how it is borne, and most important, to take the choices that integrity demands.

TURNING THE TIDE
76 1/2 Lincoln Ave.
St. Albans, VT 05478
Ph: 802-524-0478
S.E.E. CHALLENGES THE BELL CURVE'S ASSUMPTIONS

THE SOCIETY FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY (SEE) does not deny the right of Calvin College, or any other cadre of "cognitive elites" (hereafter referred to as "cogs"), to present a forum for the opinions of Charles Murray. Murray's views are too controversial, however, to be given a privileged and unchallenged platform. The Bell Curve may be part of a deliberate attack on the most vulnerable segments of society. It is certainly an example of the kinds of policy currently being proposed to the ruling elite by their cogs.

1. We will leave it to the scientists to impugn Murray's use of tainted data and flawed methods. SEE rejects Murray's premise that the continuance of corporate capitalism is in the best interest of a majority of the people. All of Murray's arguments stem from this one unstated assumption: Capitalism delivers the greatest good to the greatest number.

We at SEE rather believe that the status quo menaces the human prospect. We blame the status quo for contributing significantly to the social and environmental problems we live with today—from domestic violence to war, from poverty to pollution—in the ruthless pursuit of control over the world's resources in defiance of principles of rational and humane economic development.

THE SOCIETY FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY advocates social ownership of resources and worker/community partnership in controlling the means of production and distribution. The application of democratic principles to economic, social, and environmental problems only awaits the people's decision to abolish the status quo.

2. We at SEE despise Murray's conformist definitions of "success" and "intelligence."

IQ tests are designed to measure a narrow range of cognitive abilities, specifically linguistic and logic/mathematical aptitudes which make one employable within hierarchies of the status quo.

In the final analysis, a high IQ may relate to one's potential for success
as a corporate executive, a lawyer, a banker, a politician, a military tacti-
cian, but other factors figure heavily as well in achieving this kind of "su-
cess": connections, looks, mere ruthlessness.

THE SOCIETY FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY argues that if intelli-
gence does not include creativity—the ability to respond to beauty, to make
people happy, to love, to live, to be generous—then it means nothing and
will not contribute to the ultimate success and happiness of humankind.

3. We at SEE are deeply suspicious of a book that can discuss crime
without mentioning white collar crime. We question Murray's motives in
linking race to intelligence to economic status to crime.

We suspect that Murray argues in bad faith when he speculates that the
depravity of the underclass may be somehow attributable to their racially
determined subhuman intelligence while failing to mention the criminality
of CEO's who knowingly sell exploding Pintos. He seems unaware or un-
troubled that corporate interests are protected by political and military cogs
who organize and order bombings from Baghdad to Hanoi. CIA cogs dire-
rect the ongoing terror and genocide in Guatemala, El Salvador, Chile,
Panama, Haiti, etc, and conduct a significant portion of the world's narcot-
ics traffic. Murray, meanwhile, is dismayed to see the poor in an increas-
ingly hopeless situation resorting to illegal activities and striking out mostly
at other poor people! This seems disingenuous. Furthermore, to suggest
that the poor owe their lesser or loser status to racial inferiority and low
intelligence merely adds insult to the injuries sustained by people of color
(and to a lesser extent, the white working class) through hundreds of years
of capitalist colonialism.

Get involved: Attend a viewing of Charles Murray's Calvin College ap-
pearance on Saturday, Feb. 11, 1995 at 2 PM in Room 203 of the GUV Eberhard
Center, 301 W Fulton. Following the video Richmond Willey (of SEE) and
James Bradley (of Calvin College's mathematics department) among others
will take part in a panel discussion. The public is welcome!

For copies of "Frauds at the Heart of The Bell Curve," and "The Wall Street
Journal's Bell Curve Promo Ploy," send a self-addressed stamped envelope to:
SEE, PO Box 1564, Grand Rapids MI 49501
LENTICUALS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

Montreal has reactivated itself. The DB received review copies of Los Angeles, CA 90016. L'Epargne en Argent (11 pages, 8 1/2 by 5 1/2, $1.60) traces political correctness, PC, back to authoritarian strands in the workers movement dating back even before Lenin and the Bolsheviks to the positivist ideas of "scientific" socialism that informed socialist thinking in the nineteenth century. Gambone argues that it was this concept that gave rise to the idea of a correct "political line" we associate with Marxist-Leninists. He then goes on to trace its influence in the New Left and in the contemporary leftwing. He sees it as a brake on organizing for socialism and suggests ways of combating it.

Revolution & Reformism: The Split Between "Moderates" and "Revolutionaries" in French Anarchosyndicalism (17 pages, $2) illustrates Gambone's familiarity with the history of the various strands of the libertarian socialist, or impossibilist, movement, in this case the history of the French syndicalist movement. The Confédération Générale du Travail or CGT was born in 1895 and grew rapidly for a decade or so. It differed from the American IWW in that it possessed a group of theorists whose writings influenced labor and socialist thinkers worldwide at a time when reformism and compromise were on the rise in both the social democracy and its labor union movement. Among these were Daniel De Leon and radical unionists like Trautmann and others who adapted syndicalism to U.S. conditions and organized the IWW. Readers will find parallels with IWW history, including factionalism that sought to transform it into a pure and simple union, takeover attempts by the Communist Party, and switches in tactics as direct action proved useless in many situations. It covers the period to 1926 when the communists finally took it over.

In Syndicalism in Myth and Reality (14 pages, $2) Gambone corrects many misconceptions about the strength and influence of anarcho-syndicalism. Most readers familiar with the IWW, for example, assume as I did that its heyday ended with the repression it experienced during WWI and the criminal syndicalism laws that followed. The membership tables Gambone has published tell a different story. IWW membership in 1912 was 18,400, and that of the Canadian IWW was 9000. In 1922, four years after the war, the IWW had 40,000 members while the Canadian syndicalist One Big Union (OBU) had 41,000 members. Syndicalism had spread internationally too. There was a Chilean IWW with 20,000 members and syndicalist unions in Argentina, France—the CGT with 600,000 members, Spain, Germany, Holland, Mexico, Portugal and Uruguay. In 1939 the IWW still had a membership of 20,000, but syndicalism was clearly in decline around the world. Gambone sees the cause as the destructive role played by the Communist parties and an unfortunate tendency toward factionalism and sectarianism within the movement. He gives the example of syndicalists in Mexico City, who refused to support the approaching revolutionary Zapatista forces because the peasants carried religious banners. Gambone sees current trends that may revive revolutionary unionism, among them the movement on the part of capital to leave more of management to the workers. The pamphlet has excellent notes and bibliography.

The Impossibilists (38 pages, 8 1/2 by 11, $4) consists of "selections from the press of the Socialist Party of Canada and the One Big Union 1906-1938" preceded by a five page historical sketch of the SPC OBU. For readers like me who are interested, it offers the first information I have seen on the
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origins of the peculiarly Canadian experiment in syndicalism, the OBU, and its connection with the Socialist Party of Canada. Gambone describes some of his selections as follows:

The articles presented here give the range of opinions and interests of the Impossibilists. The Next Act In World Drama foretells how society was evolving into state capitalism and how the socialist movement could well be pushed aside by its statist simulacra. (as it was) A Reply to John Alexander and Nationalization of Industry are harsh rejections of state ownership and control of industry. The Fallacy of Nationalization and Socialism and the CCF continue the theme at a much later date. What We Want, Emiliano Zapata and A Business Without A Boss explain what the Impossibilists would like to see in place of "industrial feudalism" and state capitalist "socialism".

The development of the OBU movement is clearly foreshadowed in Future Activity of Trade Unions and the process that gave rise to revolutionary syndicalism is spelled out in The Burning Question of Trades Unionism. The differences between revolutionary syndicalism and business unionism are explained in What Is The OBU? and discussed further in Will Industrial Unionism Suffice? The Closed Shop and Industrial Liberty will suprise many present day trade unionists with its firm rejection of the closed shop and dues check-off.

Rather than the mechanical materialism of "diamat" some members of the SPC and OBU preferred the libertarian philosophy of Joseph Dietzgen, whose thought in contemporary parlance would be called "holistic". Proletarian Logic, Centenary of Joseph Dietzgen, and Dietzgen and Relativity discuss the relevance of the "proletarian philosopher", who like most Impossibilists, was a self-educated workingman.

Bolshevism is criticized for its authoritarianism and dictatorship in any form is specifically rejected in Is It The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat? While the October Revolution is supported in On Copying The Bolsheviki, Communist tactics are deemed unworthy of export. Russia Never Was Socialist exposes the state capitalist nature of the USSR. Trotsky is defended against Stalin, while Leninism is also clearly rejected, in The Eclipse of Trotsky.