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This seems to be our Einstein issue. A history of his "Why Socialism?" as well as the two articles that accompany it, the SLP leaflet "Scientist Einstein Goes Unscientific on Socialism" and Einstein's essay "Living Philosophies," appears on page 3. Next Adam Buick adds to the DB74 critique of Internationalism's polemic on the DeLeonist stand on capitalist democracy and South Africa as viewed by the New Unionist. And Kenneth Ferris reviews Margaret Randall's book about her second trip to Nicaragua to interview women on the effects on them of the replacement of state capitalism with private capitalism.

Kamunist Kranti in Faridabad India, publishes a weekly Hindi language workers' paper, the Faridabad Majdoor Samachar. On occasion KK sends us English language texts on various matters, the most

(to p. 14)
WHY SOCIALISM? By Albert Einstein

Introductory Note

Albert Einstein wrote “Why Socialism?” as the Cold War was beginning to develop. It appeared in the first issue (May 1949) of *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, published by Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, who identified socialism with the USSR and the emerging Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe.

The reader gathers that Einstein was not clear in his mind about the exact form a new society would take, but the following passage and indeed the last two paragraphs of his essay suggest his reservations about the “actually existing socialism” of the USSR: “...a planned economy is not yet socialism. A planned economy as such may be accompanied by the complete enslavement of the individual.” Also worthy of note are his clear exposition in Marxist terms of the way capitalism operates and his plea for a humane socialism.

“Market socialists” take note.

In 1950 *Monthly Review* published the essay as its first pamphlet, and it was reprinted, also in 1950, as the first in a collection of Einstein’s articles and speeches, *Essays in Humanism*, by Philosophical Library. I have no further information about its publishing history except that the Florida group, Action Network for Social Justice (ANSJ), published an abridged version in 1994, the cover of which is used in the pamphlet version of the essay (see below).

The SLP’s “Scientist Einstein Goes Unscientific on Socialism” was written by Stephen Emery and first published as an “open letter” to Einstein in the *Weekly People* and then distributed in thousands of copies as the leaflet you see reproduced here. No record exists of Einstein’s having taken notice of the open letter. Emery remained an active member of the SLP until his death earlier this year.

(to p. 7)
WHY SOCIALISM?

Is it advisable for one who is not an expert on economic and social issues to express views on the subject of socialism? I believe for a number of reasons that it is.

Let us first consider the question from the point of view of scientific knowledge. It might appear that there are no essential methodological differences between astronomy and economics: scientists in both fields attempt to discover laws of general acceptability for a circumscribed group of phenomena in order to make the inter-connection of these phenomena as clearly understandable as possible. But in reality such methodological differences do exist. The discovery of general laws in the field of economics is made difficult by the circumstance that observed economic phenomena are often affected by many factors which are very hard to evaluate separately. In addition, the experience which has accumulated since the beginning of the so-called civilized period of human history has—as is well known—been largely influenced and limited by causes which are by no means exclusively economic in nature. For example, most of the major states of history owed their existence to conquest. The conquering peoples established themselves, legally and economically, as the privileged class of the conquered country. They seized for themselves a monopoly of the land ownership and appointed a priesthood from among their own ranks. The priests, in control of education, made the class division of society into a permanent institution and created a system of values by which the people were thenceforth, to a large extent unconsciously, guided in their social behavior.

But historic tradition is, so to speak, of yesterday;
nowhere have we really overcome what Thorstein Veblen called "the predatory phase" of human development. The observable economic facts belong to that phase and even such laws as we can derive from them are not applicable to other phases. Since the real purpose of socialism is precisely to overcome and advance beyond the predatory phase of human development, economic science in its present state can throw little light on the socialist society of the future.

Second, socialism is directed towards a social-ethical end. Science, however, cannot create ends and, even less, instill them in human beings; science, at most, can supply the means by which to attain certain ends. But the ends themselves are conceived by personalities with lofty ethical ideals and—if these ends are not stillborn, but vital and vigorous—are adopted and carried forward by those many human beings who, half unconsciously, determine the slow evolution of society.

For these reasons, we should be on our guard not to overestimate science and scientific methods when it is a question of human problems; and we should not assume that experts are the only ones who have a right to express themselves on questions affecting the organization of society.

Innumerable voices have been asserting for some time now that human society is passing through a crisis, that its stability has been gravely shattered. It is characteristic of such a situation that individuals feel indifferent or even hostile toward the group, small or large, to which they belong. In order to illustrate my meaning, let me record here a personal experience. I recently discussed with an intelligent and well-disposed man the threat of another war, which in my opinion would seriously endanger the existence of mankind, and I remarked that only a supranational organization would offer protection from that danger. Thereupon my visitor, very calmly and coolly, said to me: "Why are you so deeply opposed to the disappearance of the human race?"

I am sure that as little as a century ago no one would have so lightly made a statement of this kind. It is the
statement of a man who has striven in vain to attain an equilibrium within himself and has more or less lost hope of succeeding. It is the expression of a painful solitude and isolation from which so many people are suffering in these days. What is the cause? Is there a way out?

It is easy to raise such questions, but difficult to answer them with any degree of assurance. I must try, however, as best I can, although I am very conscious of the fact that our feelings and strivings are often contradictory and obscure and that they cannot be expressed in easy and simple formulas.

Man is, at one and the same time, a solitary being and a social being. As a solitary being, he attempts to protect his own existence and that of those who are closest to him, to satisfy his personal desires, and to develop his innate abilities. As a social being, he seeks to gain the recognition and affection of his fellow human beings, to share in their pleasures, to comfort them in their sorrows, and to improve their conditions of life. Only the existence of these varied, frequently conflicting, strivings accounts for the special character of a man, and their specific combination determines the extent to which an individual can achieve an inner equilibrium and can contribute to the well-being of society. It is quite possible that the relative strength of these two drives is, in the main, fixed by inheritance. But the personality that finally emerges is largely formed by the environment in which a man happens to find himself during his development, by the structure of the society in which he grows up, by the tradition of that society, and by its appraisal of particular types of behavior. The abstract concept "society" means to the individual human being the sum total of his direct and indirect relations to his contemporaries and to all the people of earlier generations. The individual is able to think, feel, strive, and work by himself; but he depends so much upon society—in his physical, intellectual, and emotional existence—that it is impossible to think of him, or to understand him, outside the framework of society. It is
"society" which provides man with food, clothing, a home, the tools of work, language, the forms of thought, and most of the content of thought; his life is made possible through the labor and the accomplishments of the many millions past and present who are all hidden behind the small word "society."

It is evident, therefore, that the dependence of the individual upon society is a fact of nature which cannot be abolished—just as in the case of ants and bees. However, while the whole life process of ants and bees is fixed down to the smallest detail by rigid, hereditary instincts, the social pattern and interrelationships of human beings are very variable and susceptible to change. Memory, the capacity to make new combinations, the gift of oral communication have made possible developments among human beings which are not dictated by biological necessities. Such developments manifest themselves in traditions, institutions, and organizations; in literature; in scientific and engineering accomplishments; in works of art. This explains how it happens that, in a certain sense, man can influence his life through his own conduct, and that in this process conscious thinking and wanting can play a part.

Man acquires at birth, through heredity, a biological constitution which we must consider fixed and unalterable, including the natural urges which are characteristic of the human species. In addition, during his lifetime, he acquires a cultural constitution which he adopts from society through communication and through many other types of influences. It is this cultural constitution which, with the passage of time, is subject to change and which determines to a very large extent the relationship between the individual and society. Modern anthropology has taught us, through comparative investigation of so-called primitive cultures, that the social behavior of human beings may differ greatly, depending upon prevailing cultural patterns and the types of organization which predominate in society. It is on this that those who are striving to improve the lot of man may ground their hopes: human beings are not condemned, because
of their biological constitution, to annihilate each other or to be at the mercy of a cruel, self-inflicted fate.

If we ask ourselves how the structure of society and the cultural attitude of man should be changed in order to make human life as satisfying as possible, we should constantly be conscious of the fact that there are certain conditions which we are unable to modify. As mentioned before, the biological nature of man is, for all practical purposes, not subject to change. Furthermore, technological and demographic developments of the last few centuries have created conditions which are here to stay. In relatively densely settled populations with the goods which are indispensable to their continued existence, an extreme division of labor and a highly-centralized productive apparatus are absolutely necessary. The time—which, looking back, seems so idyllic—is gone forever when individuals or relatively small groups could be completely self-sufficient. It is only a slight exaggeration to say that mankind constitutes even now a planetary community of production and consumption.

I have now reached the point where I may indicate briefly what to me constitutes the essence of the crisis of our time. It concerns the relationship of the individual to society. The individual has become more conscious than ever of his dependence upon society. But he does not experience this dependence as a positive asset, as an organic tie, as a protective force, but rather as a threat to his natural rights, or even to his economic existence. Moreover, his position in society is such that the egotistical drives of his make-up are constantly being accentuated, while his social drives, which are by nature weaker, progressively deteriorate. All human beings, whatever their position in society, are suffering from this process of deterioration. Unknowingly prisoners of their own egotism, they feel insecure, lonely, and deprived of the naive, simple, and unsophisticated enjoyment of life. Man can find meaning in life, short and perilous as it is, only through devoting himself to society.

The economic anarchy of capitalist society as it exists
today is, in my opinion, the real source of the evil. We see before us a huge community of producers the members of which are unceasingly striving to deprive each other of the fruits of their collective labor—not by force, but on the whole in faithful compliance with legally established rules. In this respect, it is important to realize that the means of production—that is to say, the entire productive capacity that is needed for producing consumer goods as well as additional capital goods—may legally be, and for the most part are, the private property of individuals.

For the sake of simplicity, in the discussion that follows I shall call "workers" all those who do not share in the ownership of the means of production—although this does not quite correspond to the customary use of the term. The owner of the means of production is in a position to purchase the labor power of the worker. By using the means of production, the worker produces new goods which become the property of the capitalist. The essential point about this process is the relation between what the worker produces and what he is paid, both measured in terms of real value. Insofar as the labor contract is "free," what the worker receives is determined not by the real value of the goods he produces, but by his minimum needs and by the capitalists' requirements for labor power in relation to the number of workers competing for jobs. It is important to understand that even in theory the payment of the worker is not determined by the value of his product.

Private capital tends to become concentrated in few hands, partly because of competition among the capitalists, and partly because technological development and the increasing division of labor encourage the formation of larger units of production at the expense of the smaller ones. The result of these developments is an oligarchy of private capital the enormous power of which cannot be effectively checked even by a democratically organized political society. This is true since the members of legislative bodies are selected by political parties, largely financed or otherwise influenced by private capi-
talists who, for all practical purposes, separate the electorate from the legislature. The consequence is that the representatives of the people do not in fact sufficiently protect the interests of the underprivileged sections of the population. Moreover, under existing conditions, private capitalists inevitably control, directly or indirectly, the main sources of information (press, radio, education). It is thus extremely difficult, and indeed in most cases quite impossible, for the individual citizen to come to objective conclusions and to make intelligent use of his political rights.

The situation prevailing in an economy based on the private ownership of capital is thus characterized by two main principles: first, means of production (capital) are privately owned and the owners dispose of them as they see fit; second, the labor contract is free. Of course, there is no such thing as a pure capitalist society in this sense. In particular, it should be noted that the workers, through long and bitter political struggles, have succeeded in securing a somewhat improved form of the “free labor contract” for certain categories of workers. But taken as a whole, the present day economy does not differ much from “pure” capitalism.

Production is carried on for profit, not for use. There is no provision that all those able and willing to work will always be in a position to find employment; an “army of unemployed” almost always exists. The worker is constantly in fear of losing his job. Since unemployed and poorly paid workers do not provide a profitable market, the production of consumers’ goods is restricted, and great hardship is the consequence. Technological progress frequently results in more unemployment rather than in an easing of the burden of work for all. The profit motive, in conjunction with competition among capitalists, is responsible for an instability in the accumulation and utilization of capital which leads to increasingly severe depressions. Unlimited competition leads to a huge waste of labor, and to that crippling of the social consciousness of individuals which I mentioned before.
This crippling of individuals I consider the worst evil of capitalism. Our whole educational system suffers from this evil. An exaggerated competitive attitude is inculcated into the student, who is trained to worship acquisitive success as a preparation for his future career.

I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion. A planned economy, which adjusts production to the needs of the community, would distribute the work to be done among all those able to work and would guarantee a livelihood to every man, woman, and child. The education of the individual, in addition to promoting his own innate abilities, would attempt to develop in him a sense of responsibility for his fellow men in place of the glorification of power and success in our present society.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to remember that a planned economy is not yet socialism. A planned economy as such may be accompanied by the complete enslavement of the individual. The achievement of socialism requires the solution of some extremely difficult socio-political problems: how is it possible, in view of the far-reaching centralization of political and economic power, to prevent bureaucracy from becoming all-powerful and overweening? How can the rights of the individual be protected and therewith a democratic counterweight to the power of bureaucracy be assured?
(from p. 3)
Also included is an earlier essay by Einstein published in 1931. The pacifist humanism of his thinking at that time contrasts sharply with his anti-capitalism witnessing the human misery of the depression of the Thirties and the horrors of WWII.

Readers interested in obtaining the essay full size in pamphlet form can send DB a dollar for two copies.

---

(from p. 21)
ago, with its untold human suffering. We are in for a struggle unlike anything any of us have ever seen before, as the Bell-Atlantic employees testify, and we must use any and all means at our disposal. It’s time we came to our collective senses, while there is still time. We must insist that progress without people is not progress. At the very least, as a modest beginning, we pull the public plug on the information highway.
[The following open letter to Dr. Albert Einstein was published in the WEEKLY PEOPLE, December 31, 1949. It was inspired by an article by the great physicist that was favorable to Socialism, but that expressed apprehension of an "overweening" bureaucracy. Stephen Emory, who answers Dr. Einstein, was the Socialist Labor Party's candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1948.]

December 16, 1949
Dr. Albert Einstein
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

Dear Doctor Einstein:

I have read with interest your article, "Why Socialism?" and, in the main, warmly approve the views you express there. It is my conviction, too, that the grave evils disfiguring this age can be eliminated only by the establishment of a Socialist economy.

To my mind, you do not exaggerate when you state that "Clarity about the aims and problems of Socialism is of the greatest significance in our age of transition." For certainly the penalty for failure on the part of at least a substantial number of our contemporaries to achieve this clarity must be a social disaster.

STALINISTS AND CAPITALISTS SOW CONFUSION

Accordingly, it is the solemn duty of every earnest individual to strive for a clear understanding of Socialism himself and to aid others to reach it. The more so because the enemies of Socialism, Stalinist and capitalist alike, are doing their utmost to sow confusion on this crucial subject.

In this spirit, I venture to deal with some questions which you pose at the close of your article.

The questions referred to indicate sincere and penetrating thought. However, they also indicate that you, Dr. Einstein, have not escaped being infected by one of the most vicious of the many fallacies regarding Socialism in circulation today; the erroneous notion that the governing agency of Socialist society will be political in character—i.e., a State; and the corollary notion that control of Socialist industry will be vested in a bureaucracy.

EINSTEIN FEARS "SOCIALIST" BUREAUCRACY

Can one infer other than this when you ask: "How is it possible, in view of the far-reaching centralization of political and economic power, to prevent bureaucracy from becoming all powerful and overweening? How can the rights of the individual be protected and therewith a democratic counterweight to the power of bureaucracy be assured?"

Let me say in immediate reply to these questions that, given the grotesque caricature of Socialism which they imply, there would be not the slightest possibility of avoiding a bureaucratic tyranny.

Such a monstrosity might be a "planned economy," yes. But, as you yourself warn, "it is necessary to remember that a planned economy is not yet Socialism. A planned economy as such may be accompanied by the complete enslavement of the individual."

WHAT KIND OF "PLANNED ECONOMY"?

Now where lies the critical distinction between the type of "planned economy" which totally en-
of Lewis Henry Morgan, a masterwork which laid the basis for modern anthropology and deeply influenced De Leon and other eminent Socialist thinkers. And I close with the fervent hope that "clarity about the aims and problems of Socialism" shall soon become as universal among our fellow mortals that the human family will avert the catastrophe looming before us and enter upon a splendid era of fraternity, tranquility and freedom.

Yours sincerely,

STEPHEN EMERY.

AIMS OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY wants to abolish poverty, insecurity, unemployment and war; we do not want totalitarianism in any form, be it Stalinist, Nazi or a domestic adaptation of either of these European models.

WE WANT A WORLD free of the war-breeding struggle for capitalist markets, a world in which goods are produced for the use of the producers and not for sale with a view to profit. We want a world in which machinery will become a blessing to multiply our output and give to the producers leisure in which to study, travel and enjoy the product of our labor. We want to live full lives relieved forever of want and fear of want.

ORGANIZED POLITICALLY, the workers possess the right to agitate freely for the overthrow of the capitalist system that has brought society to its present pass, and the establishment in its place of the Socialist Cooperative Commonwealth. ORGANIZED ECONOMICALLY into Socialist Industrial Unions, they possess the might to enforce the right that their Socialist platform proclaims.

SOCIALISM MEANS the abolition of the Political State with its horde of politicians and establishing of the ownership and operation by the workers of the means of wealth production—the land, the factories, the railroads, etc. It means the retention by the useful producers of the full social value of their labor. It means an end to exploitation and the inauguration of true democracy, the establishment of industrial democracy through a Socialist Industrial Union Administration over things as opposed to the capitalist State rule over men.

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY, 61 Cliff Street, New York 8, N.Y.
I am interested in Socialism. Without obligation, please send me information and free literature, including sample copy of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party, established in 1881.

Name ..................................................
Address .................................................
(S.E.G.U.S.) .........................................
(May be pasted on back of postcard)
LIVING PHILOSOPHIES

Albert Einstein

Strange is our situation here upon earth. Each of us comes for a short visit, not knowing why, yet sometimes seeming to divine a purpose.

From the standpoint of daily life, however, there is one thing we do know: that man is here for the sake of other men—above all for those upon whose smile and well-being our own happiness depends, and also for the countless unknown souls with whose fate we are connected by a bond of sympathy. Many times a day I realize how much my own outer and inner life is built upon the labors of my fellow-men, both living and dead, and how earnestly I must exert myself in order to give in return as much as I have received. My peace of mind is often troubled by the depressing sense that I have borrowed too heavily from the work of other men.

I do not believe we can have any freedom at all in the philosophical sense, for we act not only under external compulsion but also by inner necessity. Schopenhauer's saying—"A man can surely do what he wills to do, but he cannot determine what he wills"—impressed itself upon me in youth and has always consoled me when I have witnessed or suffered life's hardships. This conviction is a perpetual breeder of tolerance, for it does not allow us to take ourselves or others too seriously; it makes rather for a sense of humor.

To ponder interminably over the reason for one's own existence or the meaning of life in general seems to me, from an objective point of view, to be sheer folly. And yet everyone holds certain ideals by which he guides his aspiration and his judgment. The ideals which have always shone before me and filled me with the joy of living are goodness, beauty, and truth. To make a goal of comfort or happiness has never appealed to me; a system of ethics built on this basis would be sufficient only for a herd of cattle.

Without the sense of collaborating with like-minded beings in the pursuit of the ever unattainable in art and scientific research, my life would have been empty. Ever since childhood I have scorned the commonplace limits so often set upon human ambition. Possessions, outward success, publicity, luxury—"to me these have always been contemptible. I believe that a simple and unassuming manner of life is best for everyone, best both for the body and the mind.

My passionate interest in social justice and social responsibility has always stood in curious contrast to a marked lack of desire for direct association with men and women. I am a horse for single harness, not cut out for tandem or team work. I have never belonged wholeheartedly to country or state, to my circle of friends, or even to my own family. These ties have always been accompanied by a vague aloofness, and the wish to withdraw into myself increases with the years.

Such isolation is sometimes bitter, but I do not regret being cut off from the understanding and sympathy of other men. I lose something by it, to be sure, but I am compensated for it in being rendered independent of the customs, opinions, and prejudices of others, and am not tempted to rest my peace of mind upon such shifting foundations.

My political ideal is democracy. Everyone should be respected as an individual, but no one idolized. It is an irony of fate that I should have been showered with so much uncalled-for and unmerited admiration and esteem. Perhaps this adulation springs from the unfulfilled wish of the multitude to comprehend the few ideas which I, with my weak powers, have advanced.

Full well do I know that in order to attain any definite goal it is imperative that one person should do the thinking and commanding and carry most of the responsibility. But those who are led should not be driven, and they should be allowed to choose their leader. It seems
to me that the distinctions separating the social classes are false; in the last analysis they rest on force. I am convinced that degeneracy follows every autocratic system of violence, for violence inevitably attracts moral inferiors. Time has proved that illustrious tyrants are succeeded by scoundrels.

For this reason I have always been passionately opposed to such regimes as exist in Russia and Italy today. The thing which has discredited the European forms of democracy is not the basic theory of democracy itself, which some say is at fault, but the instability of our political leadership, as well as the impersonal character of party alignments.

I believe that those in the United States have hit upon the right idea. A President is chosen for a reasonable length of time and enough power is given him to acquit himself properly of his responsibilities. In the German Government, on the other hand, I like the state's more extensive care of the individual when he is ill or unemployed. What is truly valuable in our bustle of life is not the nation, I should say, but the creative and impressionable individuality, the personality—he who produces the noble and sublime while the common herd remains dull in thought and insensible in feeling.

This subject brings me to that vilest offspring of the herd mind—the odious militia. The man who enjoys marching in line and file to the strains of music falls below my contempt; he received his great brain by mistake—the spinal cord would have been amply sufficient. This heroism at command, this senseless violence, this accursed bombast of patriotism—how intensely I despise them! War is low and despicable, and I had rather be smitten to shreds than participate in such doings.

Such a stain on humanity should be erased without delay. I think well enough of human nature to believe that it would have been wiped out long ago had not the common sense of nations been systematically corrupted through school and press for business and political reasons.

The most beautiful thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the source of all true art and science. He to whom this emotion is a stranger, who can no longer pause to wonder and stand rapt in awe, is as good as dead: his eyes are closed. This insight into the mystery of life, coupled though it be with fear, has also given rise to religion. To know that what is impenetrable to us really exists, manifesting itself as the highest wisdom and the most radiant beauty which our dull faculties can comprehend only in their most primitive forms—this knowledge, this feeling, is at the center of true religiousness. In this sense, and in this sense only, I belong in the ranks of devoutly religious men.

I cannot imagine a God who rewards and punishes the objects of his creation, whose purposes are modeled after our own—a God, in short, who is but a reflection of human frailty. Neither can I believe that the individual survives the death of his body, although feeble souls harbor such thoughts through fear or ridiculous egotism. It is enough for me to contemplate the mystery of conscious life perpetuating itself through all eternity, to reflect upon the marvelous structure of the universe which we can dimly perceive, and to try humbly to comprehend even an infinitesimal part of the intelligence manifested in nature.

Published in Living Philosophies, A Series of Intimate Credos. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1931
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Dear Frank,

I'd like to add a point to your excellent criticism of the ICC (DB 74).

In the article reproduced from Internationalism in DB73 De Leon is criticised for his stance that a socialist party should not advocate reforms of capitalism. According to the ICC, socialists before 1914 should have advocated reforms:

"Whereas other revolutionaries in the late 19th and early 20th century correctly supported the struggle for reforms, De Leon did not support that struggle. Instead he denounced the struggle for reforms as synonymous with the counter-revolutionary practice of reformism" (DB73, page 6).

In other words, the ICC support mainstream pre-WWI Social Democracy which made a distinction between a maximum programme (socialism) and a minimum programme (reforms of capitalism). In practice all they concentrated on was the latter, with the result that they ended up as purely reformist organisations. And the ICC say they were right and the revolutionaries who identified the mistake that mainstream Social Democracy made were wrong!

This support for mainstream Social Democracy and its "counter-revolutionary practice of reformism" is made even more explicit in a criticism of the SPGB and Subversion in the latest issue of the ICC's UK publication World Revolution (No 189):

"There are few tiny libertarian groups which denounce the Labour Party as anti-working class. But for them the Labour Party, like Social Democracy as a whole, was never proletarian, even when before 1914 it could be a vehicle for workers interests".

The pre-WWI Labour Party "a vehicle for workers' interests"! It didn't even claim to be socialist, let alone Marxist or an advocate of class struggle and its MPs were elected in shady electoral deals with the Liberal Party. What next? That workers should have voted Liberal in the 19th century because this party offered them some reforms which capitalism could afford?

Yours for Socialism

Adam Buick

Adam Buick, 40 Granville Gardens, London W5 3PA. GBW
It's True: We Can't Live On Consciousness Alone, But We Can't Live Without It."

[SDR: 207]


The history of men who steal the ideas of women is long and discouraging. The history of white Europeans who have plundered the ideas of the colonized “Other” is long and discouraging. [Yearning: 123-134] It is at this context that I am writing a review of a book by a North American woman about Nicaragua. It is my hope not to colonize Sandino’s Daughters Revisited or the women who speak in it.

Margaret Randall refuses to take the attention and rewards of questioning, recording, transcribing and photographing the various FSLN Nicaraguan women of the post-Sandinista Sandino’s Daughters Revisited [SDR]. As a North American she writes, “For example: people (especially women) have written to me, or come to me, and told me how [the oral histories] Cuban Women Now and Sandino’s Daughters [SDR’s 1981 antecedent, from here on referred to as SDR] opened to them a whole new way of seeing the world […] I do not want to take the credit. It is Cuban and Nicaraguan women’s voices they are hearing” [Albuquerque: 185]. Randall is a former U.S. expatriate who has lived in Mexico, Cuba, Nicaragua, and for a short time in nineteen-seventy five, the former North Vietnam. She is an oral historian, poet, photographer and passionate Marxist-feminist. Randall refuses to emphasize either “Marxist” or “feminist” at the expense of the other [Gathering Rage: 1-23].

While in Mexico, in the nineteen-sixties, she edited the literary journal El Corno Emplumado. The Plumed Horn. After the student riots of the late nineteen-sixties and the subsequent government crackdown, she fled to Cuba with Robert Cohen [Portrait of a Revolutionary: 1-46]. Living in Mexico, she mistakenly renounced her American citizenship, assuming her life in Mexico obligated her to do so. Because of this, when she attempted to emigrate back to the United States in nineteen-eighty four, she endured seven years of court battles with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. She currently teaches at Trinity College in Connecticut.

In Sandino’s Daughters Revisited Randall interviews thirteen women. These thirteen women have, in their own ways, struggled with the male dominated FSLN [Sandinista National Liberation Front]. The dialogues are what Karl Marx referred to as a “revolution in permanence.” [Rosa Luxemburg: viii] They take place after the defeat of the FSLN in the nineteen nineties national elections. These women worked extremely hard and sacrificed their lives for the FSLN. How do these women engage themselves dialectically, with the defeat of a heart felt, populist revolution?* It takes women coming together to develop a language outside patriarchal profession and its canon for there to be real understanding of what has been perpetuated and how to best deal with it.” [NOW: 22]

The FSLN broke the United States backed, ruling Somozas family. They refused to allow the Somozas to perpetuate their greed and corruption. The unemployment rate before the FSLN victory in nineteen seventy nine was twenty-two percent. Before the literacy campaign by the FSLN, the illiteracy rate was sixty percent of all adults. The Somozas family boarded nearly all of Nicaragua’s resources [SD 7].

“This poverty and backwardness is the upside of the development […] of a capitalist economy. […] This translates into benefits for multinational corporations […] at the expense of Nicaraguans.” [SD: viii].

The United States has hegemonic power with Nicaragua. As Randall shows in SDR and SDR, hegemony has been present since the nineteenth century. The United States has constantly tried to colonize the people of Central America. “Beginning in the 1950’s, much U.S. aid and in Third World countries was linked to policies limiting the reproduction of the working class and poor, including programs that ranged from laboratories-like experimentation with birth control pills and intrauterine devices to forced sterilization. By the 1960’s, one third of all Puerto Rican women of child bearing age were sterilized. […] President Eisenhower remarked that the best was to avert the threat of popular movement was to prevent revolutionaries from being born.” Along with colonizing Latin America, the U.S. colonized women’s bodies.

The thirteen Nicaraguan women’s voices of SDR engage themselves in dialectical struggle with other women, their various theories and beliefs and their nation. The women engage themselves with their families and the histories behind them. Some families have a history of collaboration with the Somozas family. Sofía Montenegro, a FSLN member, comes from a petit bourgeois family. “Back in the 1950’s my father [was] a soldier against Sandino’s hell of a legacy […] And my oldest brother was also a military man […] He, too, fought against the Sandinistas.” [287]. Montenegro describes how she comes to terms with her love for her brother and, her hatred for a government so corrupt, it tortures its citizens. “[My] brother already knew that some of his siblings - myself and some of the others - had joined the Front […] and we tried to get him to desert or leave. […] He said, ‘Look, kid: in this room we are brothers and sisters. But if we come upon each other in the street you have a gun and so do I. You’d better shoot. ‘Because you can be sure I will.’” [295]. Later, Montenegro describes in harrowing detail her brother’s burial and her relationship with her brother’s family. [284-298]

Daisy Zamora, another woman revolutionary, presented, is one of Nicaragua’s most esteemed poets. Bill Moyers presented her on his PBS series The Language of Life, in the summer of 1995: Zamora describes with disillusionment how the new FSLN government relegated artists and writers to the bottom of a vertical hierarchy. In the early to mid nineteen eighties, the FSLN organized poetry workshops for the citizens of Nicaragua: “The poetry workshops […] were an attempt to get people to read poetry, too, and to understand that creativity belongs to us all: we have only to tap it.” [107]. Unfortunately, the workshops were lost to an intraparty struggle for dominance. “No one person, just because he or she liked you or didn’t like you or wanted your job or had some personal motive for attack, should ever have been able to destroy a revolutionary project like that.” [107]. Daisy Zamora also relates the stories of sexual harassment that were allowed to flourish in this “people’s revolution.”

1 "I, Augusto Cesar Sandino, a nationalist leader who fought against the U.S. Marines from 1927 to 1934. [The Sandino led army] succeeded in rooting the invaders from their homeland, but Sandino himself was betrayed and murdered by Somozas.” [SDR: 10]
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recent being this description, published in this issue, of the nature of the class struggle in the industrial city between New Delhi and Agra. David Noble's article about the information highway is also taken from *Monthly Review*, this time a more recent issue, April 1995. It provides a welcome respite from the sort of nonsense we are getting in the major media implying that computers will provide workers with universal prosperity—a la Newt Gingrich's idea of furnishing the children with lap top computers to lift them from poverty.

The SLP's ideas about the role of the party strike me as a useful contribution to the ongoing debate among non-market socialists and anarchists. Written by Nathan Karp, then the SLP's National Secretary, it appeared originally in the *Weekly People* in the latter part of the 1970s, as I recall. It was included when the SLP began publishing articles from the WP as small inexpensive pamphlets in a series called Socialist Studies around 1980.

Larry Gambone's article on Joseph Dietzgen was published originally as a sort of advertising flyer for a pamphlet edition of an excerpt of around a hundred pages from Dietzgen's major book, *The Positive Outcome of Philosophy*, published in 1906 by Charles H. Kerr and Company. Larry tells me that the pamphlet is now out of print. Although the review doesn't say it in so many words, Ken Smith's *The Survival of the Weakest* is the nearest extant thing to an encyclopedia for non-market socialist. As usual we finish with a few "Notes, Announcements, and Short Reviews."

**BULLETIN MATTERS**

**Finances**

DB's finances seem to be following the stock market. During the past two months receipts have fallen off sharply from a low figure for the preceding two months. The fat we accumulated during those heady days last spring and summer when I was talking about declaring a dividend has disappeared and we now have a deficit. If things continue like this we will have to downsize and restructure, laying off help here in Grand Rapids and outsourcing some work offshore. Part of the problem was the $85 annual bulk mailing fee, but the DB is simply not getting the volume of business it has grown accustomed to. Actually, though, the earlier prosperity was an unusual thing. Over the thirteen years of DB's experience it has spent as much time in the red as in the black.

(to p. 21)
Collective Struggles of Wage-Workers in Faridabad

It is necessary that attempts be made to differentiate between formal, phoney, real struggles and their admixtures. By and large, the mass media highlights formal struggles. From amongst real struggles only exceptional mass upsurges are reported/post-mortemized. A major problem is that not only individual struggles, even the very large number of collective struggles taking place daily are not known. They do not form the memory of wage-workers. One of the necessities for the emancipatory project is to be able to learn from experiences across time and space. Detailed reports of the mundane/daily [real] struggles and their mass circulation amongst wage-workers is essential for this.

Faridabad is a major industrial complex in the suburbs of Delhi. Below are some translations from our monthly Hindi language publication, Faridabad Majdoor Samachar's June '94 and July '94 issues. These reports, in comparison to the numerous daily struggles going on, are only the tip of the iceberg even for Faridabad alone.

In the month of May '94 [ reported in June issue of FMS ]

* There was an agreement in Escorts Railway Division that workers coming to the factory by means of their own or public transport could enter the factory without any problem till the arrival of factory buses from Delhi. After the recent agreement the management started recording the names of those workers who reached the factory after eight O'clock although factory buses after detour to Escorts First Plant etc. continued to reach the Railway division around 8.15 a.m. Reacting to this, on the 10th of May, workers reaching the factory before 8 a.m. stopped at the factory gate and soon a crowd of workers on foot, on bicycles, scooters and motorcycles was formed at the factory gate. Only after the factory buses arrived at 8.15 a.m., workers started entering the factory. The management locked the main gate. Workers had to face difficulty in entering along with cycles-scooters-motorcycles from the small side-gate. Thereupon, workers who had entered the factory also returned to the factory gate and demanded that the main gate be opened. Assessing the situation, the management quietly opened the main gate of the factory. Since then, the management has stopped the practice of taking down names in the Escorts Railway Division.

* A thousand workers from Palwal side came to work in Escorts plants everyday. Five to seven kilometers on bicycles from villages early in the morning to catch train from Palwal, 45 minutes train journey, hurry from the railway station to the factories is the daily life of these daily up and down workers. The duty covers not eight but 12-14 hours. Because of this the aspiration for a few minutes leisure and the desire to pass on work-load to others besides rough, obstinate behaviour develop to quite some extent. Due to these reasons other workers often start disliking these workers.

To save money Escorts management has not arranged factory buses for Palwal side workers. But on the condition that they give full production, the management used to allow these workers to reach their plants till 8.30 instead of 8. In the recent agreement besides increasing work load, the management has done away with this small concession as well. Palwal side workers reaching factory gates after eight were turned back from the gates. On May 10 after
getting down from trains Escorts workers instead of rushing towards their plants got together and reached the union office.

Leaders were panic stricken by this collective outburst. They locked the union office and ran away. Workers began a sit down at the union office. Leaders declared workers' step gangsterism. Leaders published handbills against the sit-down. To create dissension between different groups of workers skeleton were unearthed from their coffins and seeds for further divisions were sown. According to 'Majdoor Morcha' this lockout of the union office was similar to managements lockouts.

On the 11th of May, also Palwal side Escorts workers after alighting the trains joined the sit-down in front of the locked union office instead of going to the factories. Seeing the sit-down continue, management-union said that they would consider the issue and announced the restoration of the old situation till then. Thereafter, the workers agreed to end this sit-down at the union office. Lock-out of the union office was lifted.

* Dirt, dust and smoke in Jhalani Tools are of such an order, that workers are always desperate to get out of the plants. At lunch time most of the workers are out of the factory gates. One day when some workers were entering the 1st plant, a few minutes after lunch time was over, the management noted their names. The next day, all 1st plant workers in that shift went out of the factory at lunch time. After the lunch time was over all the workers stayed out for longer than the previous day and then together entered the factory. The management did not note down names and stopped doing so thereafter.

* Goodyear management has started suspending workers on minor issues. On the 9th of May, it suspended some workers. After this, workers on duty decided on their own that no one will do overtime in the place of suspended workers. This collective step of the workers posed problems for the Goodyear management.

* 'Power' shoe department workers in the Bata factory on the 25th of May brought to the notice of the department incharge the bad quality of the shoe material and told him that the shape of shoes was getting spoiled due to this. As a result the workers would be paid less. The department incharge brought the workers and told them to do their job properly. Work, deduction in wages and threats agitated the worker. Resentment spread not only among the 'Power' workers but also among the workers of the other departments. Within minutes workers stopped production in the whole factory. Eventually, Bata management had to apologise for the behaviour of its officer.

* In Escorts 1st Plant also management has started harassing the workers after the last agreement. The management is trying to appropriate every second of the workers' time. The workers sought to counter the management's tactics by taking a collective step. One day after the shift ending at 4.30 p.m., none of the workers took out their bicycles or scooters from the stand and all the workers gathered at the gate. The gate was jammed. Workers for the next shift could not enter the factory gate and a crowd was formed on both the sides of the gate. Some people tried to convince the workers to clear the jam but did not succeed. The gate was jammed for an hour and the machines lay idle. From the next day, the management specified different gates for those coming for
duty and those leaving after finishing theirs.

In the Month of June '94 (reported in the July issue of F.M.S.)

* There is hardly a factory in Faridabad in which the canteen workers are employees of the company. Everywhere managements have taken the cover of contractors and have imposed 12-14 hours duty but wages one-third of the legal minimum. In some factories, under pressure from workers, the canteen workers are permanent contract workers. They get the minimum legal wages for 8 hours work. Even in these factories open discrimination is practiced against the canteen workers.

Jhalani Tools management paid the wages for the month of April on the 18th of May, but the canteen workers were still not paid. When the canteen workers struck work on the 19th of May, the management started paying the permanent canteen workers. But it refused to pay the casual workers even then. The permanent workers refused to take their wages. The management was forced to pay the casual and permanent canteen workers at the same time. It also had to promise that the wages for the month of May would be paid to the canteen workers alongwith the other workers.

The wages for the month of May were paid on June 11. Among the canteen workers only those of the IIIrd Plant were paid. 12th was Sunday. On the 13th, canteen workers of 1st and IIInd Plants struck work. By 8.30 a.m. the news of canteen workers' strike had created disquiet amongst other workers. Thereupon, the welfare officer in the 1st plant reached the canteen. The canteen workers reminded him of the earlier promise and demanded their wages. Meanwhile, the other workers of the plant threatened to stop the production if they did not get the 9 o'clock tea. The welfare officer rushed to the personnel officer, who in turn went to plant manager. After the assurance that the canteen workers would be paid by the evening, work commenced in the 1st and IIInd plant canteens. The workers were paid their wages in the evening.

* On the 15th of June, during a tea break in Hitkari Potteries, a worker in the canteen showed the tea to a leader and told her, "See, there is neither milk, nor tea leaves and nor is it boiled properly. But you leaders have tea which is prepared with tea leaves boiled in milk. What does it matter as to what quality of tea workers get? It would be better if you get poison, put in this tea so that all workers would die and then the leaders could enjoy themselves." The leader became angry and she complained to the chief personnel manager about the worker. The next day was that worker's rest day. When he reported for duty on the 15th, he was stopped at the factory gate. In the suspension cum charge-sheet letter given to him, the management on behalf of another leader charged him with misbehaving with that leader's wife! The news spread and during the lunch at 12.30 p.m. workers started gathering at the cycle stand. The management dispersed the workers with the help of the security staff.

On June 22nd there was a heated exchange between a worker and a supervisor. The supervisor alleged that the worker was drunk. Other members of the management enquired and finding the supervisor's allegations hollow, they let
the matter pass. When that worker reached the factory for duty on June 23rd, he was stopped at the gate and handed a suspension letter. The letter said that the charge against him was so serious that he would be given charge-sheet on July 1st. Following this, the workers of the maintenance department got together and went to the plant manager.

On June 24th, a supervisor misbehaved with a woman worker in the glazing department of Hitkari Potteries. Thereupon, all the workers of the glazing department informed the management of the happening in writing. On 25th June, all the workers of the glazing department, together went to meet the management and enquired about the action against the supervisor. The management said that it is examining the matter.

* The plating department of the Jhalani Tools was again filled with smoke on May 30th during the second shift. The plating workers got together and went to the works manager. A guard was stationed outside the works manager room. In view of the increasing incidents of workers collectively presenting their problems to the manager, the management had recently posted a guard outside the manager's office and ordered him not to allow entry to workers in groups. The guard told the plating workers: "You can not meet the sahib together. Get your leader. One of you can go along with the leader to meet the manager." The guard did not relent even after workers' efforts to convince him. While this was going on an assistant came out of the room with the manager's belongings. The manager followed him - ready to go home. Workers surrounded the works manager and ordered him to go with them to the plating department. The manager insisted on taking there instead. But the workers were adamant and he had to go to the plating department. Smoke from the harding department had filled the plating department. The smoke was irritating to the eyes. With water flowing down his eyes the manager went to the harding department. There the workers told him that if they did not do that work, the material would become soft. Also, the exhaust fans were either not working or had been removed. The workers of the plating and the harding department told the manager that they had repeatedly informed the management about the exhaust fans. Surrounded by the workers, the works manager then ordered work to be stopped in the harding department for 6 days to improve the conditions there.

* The workers of Escorts Railway Division had acquired a right when there division was shifted from the 1st plant to Sector 24. To maintain that right, the workers had been struggling for more than a month till 14th of June. Every day workers who reached the factory before 8 a.m. would stop at the gate. A crowd of workers with bicycles, scooters, motorcycles and those on foot would gather at the factory gate. Only after workers, who came by the factory buses which reached the factory at 8.15 a.m., had arrived did the workers en masse enter the factory.

* For some background information, see the workers' struggles reported in the June '94 issue of F.M.S.
THE TRUTH ABOUT THE INFORMATION HIGHWAY

by DAVID NOBLE

At the end of November 1994, the truth about the information highway finally got out. Protesting the announcement of another 5,600 layoffs, 1,200 Bell-Atlantic employees in Pennsylvania wore T-shirts to work which graphically depicted themselves as Information Highway Roadkill. The layoffs were just the latest round of cutbacks at Bell-Atlantic, which have been matched by the elimination of jobs at the other giants of the telecommunications industry—ATT, Nynex, Northern Telecom—supposedly the very places where new jobs are to be created with the information highway. In reality, the technology is enabling companies to extend their operations and enlargement their profits while reducing their workforce and the pay and security of those who remain by contracting out work to cheaper labor around the globe and by replacing people with machines. The very workers who are constructing the new information infrastructure are among the first to go, but not the only ones. The same fate is facing countless workers in manufacturing and service industries.

David Noble is a professor at York University and a historian of technology. He taught for nearly a decade at M.I.T. and was curator of automation at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. His most recent book is People Without People.
tries in the wake of the introduction of these new information technologies.

What is most striking about the Bell-Atlantic episode is not just the provocative fashion statement of the workers, members of Communication Workers of America District 19. Rather, it was the company’s exaggerated response. Bell-Atlantic demanded that the workers remove the T-shirts and, when they refused, it suspended them without pay. According to Vince Maison, president of the union, the employer suspended the employees out of expressed fear that their message would be seen by the public. Significantly, management was concerned about adverse publicity not just for Bell-Atlantic but, more importantly, for the information highway itself. This was the first time the information highway was unambiguously linked with unemployment, by a union and workforce presumably best situated to reap its promised benefits. Apparently the company believed there was too much riding on the information highway bandwagon to allow this sober message to get around. But it did anyway. The (probably illegal) management action backfired. Rather than a few hundred customers catching a glimpse of the T-shirts during the course of the day’s work, millions throughout North America saw them through the media coverage of the suspensions; within hours, the union was inundated with phone calls of support and orders for the T-shirts. The truth was out.

By now probably everyone has heard of the information highway, as a result of the massive propaganda blitzkrieg of the last year. Announcements heralding the dawn of a new age emanate incessantly and insistently from every quarter. The media gush with the latest info highway reports (but not the fatalities), all levels of government are daily pressured into diverting public monies into yet another private trough, every hi-tech firm, not to mention every hustler and con artist in the business world and academic world is rushing to cash in on the manufactured hysteria. The aggressive assault on our senses is aimed at securing public support and subsidy for the construction of the new commercial infrastructure. Its mes-
The Truth About the Information Highway

sage, which has become the mind-numbing multinational mantra, is simple and direct: We have no other choice. Our very survival, it is alleged, as individuals, a nation, a society depend upon this urgent development. Those without it will be left behind in the global competition. And those with it? A recent "Futurescape" advertisement supplement to the Globe and Mail by Rogers Cantel and Bell Canada warned that the information highway "raises the ante in competition. If we don't act, Canada and Canadian companies will be left behind. . . . the information highway is not a luxury technology for the rich. It is the way of the future. And those who do not get on the highway will not have any way of reaching their ultimate destination."

And what exactly is the destiny advanced by the information highway? Ask the Bell-Atlantic employees. The propaganda never mentions the roadkill, of course, but that is the future for many. Most people in Canada instinctively seem to know this already. According to a 1993 Gallup poll, 41 percent of those currently employed believe they will lose their jobs. But, despite this intuition, people have been terrorized into a hapless fatalism. It's inevitable. Or else they have been seduced by the exciting array of new tools and diversions: home-shopping, home-videos, home-learning, home-entertainment, home-communication. The operative word is home, home is where people without jobs are—if they still have a home. The focus is on leisure, because there will be a lot more of it, in the form of mass unemployment. (Some lucky few will get home-work, as their job takes over their home in the sweatshops of the future.) This is where we are headed on the information highway.

To see where we are headed requires no voodoo forecasting, much less federally funded research. We just need to take a look at where we've been, and where we are. The returns are already in on the Information Age, and the information highway promises merely more of the same, at an accelerated pace.
In the wake of the information revolution (now four decades old—the term cybernetics and automation were coined in 1947). People are now working harder and longer (with compulsory overtime), under worsening working conditions with greater anxiety, stress, and accidents, with less skills, less security, less autonomy, less power (individually and collectively), less benefits, and less pay. Without question the technology has been developed and used to deskil”and discipline the workforce in a global speed-up of unprecedented proportions. And those still working are the lucky ones. For the technology has been designed above all to displace.

Structural (that is, permanent and systemic as opposed to cyclical) unemployment in Canada has increased with each decade of the Information Age. With the increasing deployment of so-called “labor-saving” technology (actually labor-cost saving), official average unemployment has jumped from 4 percent in the 1950s, 5.1 percent in the 1960s, 6.7 percent in the 1970s, and 9.3 percent in the 1980s, to 11 percent so far in the 1990s.

These, of course, are the most conservative estimates (actual unemployment is closer to double these figures). Today we are in the midst of what is called a jobless recovery, symptomatic and symbolic of the new age. Output and profits rise without the jobs which used to go with them. Moreover, one fifth of those employed are only part-time or temporary employees, with little or no benefits beyond bare subsistence wages, and no security whatever.

In 1993, an economist with the Canadian Manufacturers Association estimated that between 1989 and 1993, 200,000 manufacturing jobs were eliminated through the use of new technology—another conservative estimate. And that was only in manufacturing, and before the latest wave of information highway technology, which will make past developments seem quaint in comparison.

None of this has happened by accident. The technology was developed, typically at public expense, with precisely these ends in mind, by government (notably military), finance, and
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BUSINESS — TO SHORTEN THE CHAIN OF COMMAND AND EXTEND COMMUNICATIONS (THE MILITARY ORGANIZED THE INTERNAL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT, TO ALLOW INSTANCES OF MONETARY MARKETS, AND TO ENABLE MANUFACTURERS TO EXTEND THE RANGE OF THEIR OPERATIONS IN PURSUIT OF CHEAPER AND MORE COMPLIANT ADJUSTS.)
The Role of a Socialist Party

The world is not exactly the same today as it was when the Socialist Labor Party was organized toward the end of the 19th century. There were no jet planes, computers, atomic power plants, thermonuclear weapons, or spacecraft. Nor was there the widespread concern with the pollution of our air, land and water. But there was widespread poverty, recurring unemployment crises, spreading urban chaos, racial prejudice and discrimination, brazen violations of democratic rights, international conflicts that threatened to erupt or periodically did erupt into open warfare and a host of other economic and social problems.

Most of these problems still plague us. They have, in fact, grown worse. The prevailing social turmoil and conflict all attest to that. Bluntly stated, the vaunted capitalist system in America is perpetually on the verge of complete collapse these days.

Unfortunately, its collapse would not necessarily result in the automatic establishment of a better social system. In the absence of the human forces required to accomplish that end, the collapse of capitalism could lead to stark reaction and the establishment of brutal fascism. The consequences would be greater deprivation and suffering for the vast working-class majority.

That possibility is real. Nevertheless, it does not justify pessimism and dismay, for it is not the only possibility. There are social forces in motion that could lead to other results—including the establishment of a free and affluent society.

There are some encouraging signs. There are stirrings among the workers. Increasing numbers of them are questioning the values and standards of our present society. More and more of them are openly criticizing the system—questioning its inequalities and demonstrating a growing contempt for its politics and its politicians.

Among the millions of workers belonging to the unions there also is rising dissatisfaction, much of it directed at the bureaucrats who run the unions. In increasing numbers, rank-and-file workers are demanding a more effective voice in the operation and affairs of their unions.

In short, there is a climate of social unrest, an atmosphere of questioning and challenge, and a spreading demand for change in many areas of our society. These developments could serve the forces of progress and lead toward the establishment of a new, viable social system.

For that to happen, however, an important development must take place. There must be a growth of class-consciousness among the workers. There must be a realization of the need for a reconstruction of society on democratic and equitable social and economic principles—a socialist reconstruction of society.

A revolutionary transformation of the social and economic basis of society is not a simple task. Nor is it one to be accomplished by some select, self-appointed group or party on behalf of the vast majority. On the contrary, the revolution to socialism can be assured only if it is the collective effort of the working class of the nation. That class must be involved consciously and actively. The revolutionary effort must be under its direct influence and control. In the words of Rosa Luxemburg, the revolution "must arise out of the growing political training of the mass of the people."

Daniel De Leon was emphatic in his warning that "the proletarian army of emancipation cannot consist of a dumb, driven herd. Rather it must be organized on the basis of a comprehensive understanding of its class interests and a clear comprehension of the socialist goal.

Vanguardism Rejected

These are not idle rhetorical points and few, if any, of the organizations on the left would contest them. Yet by their daily actions and in their day-to-day propaganda work many left organizations in large measure violate or ignore them. They conduct themselves in ways that demonstrate that they consider the proletariat a mass that can be led to revolutionary action only if it is manipulated by a party—a party that provides the "right leadership."

Moreover, these organizations envision the party as the dominant body—the vanguard of the class—with a permanent role to play in the new society. They consider that role to be not merely political and educational but also governmental and administrative. In short, they see the party as an institution of proletarian rule in the new society.

The Socialist Labor Party does not accept this Leninist concept of the party. It considers it a fundamental departure from the sound Marxist premise that the emancipation of the working class from wage slavery must be its
own conscious act. The SLP holds that the dominant factor in the socialist revolution must be the class-conscious proletariat, not a small, close-knit, vanguard party that leads the revolutionary effort and then remains in existence to conduct the affairs of the new society.

This is not to say that the party has no role to play. It has a very important role. It must actively assist the development of class-conscience among workers through its agitational and educational work, offer a program of organization that will consolidate the power of the workers, do all within its means to urge the revolutionary organization into existence, and keep the socialist goal in sight at all times. The party, then, must be what Rosa Luxemburg described as "the most resolute part of the proletariat that at every step points out to the whole broad mass of workers its historical tasks."

In short, the party's important role is to assist and give impetus to the social forces that are welding the proletariat into the revolutionary force. But in doing so it must not substitute itself for the proletariat as the revolutionary force, nor as the future instrument of workers' rule. If that happens, the party becomes a threat - the threat of a dictatorship over the proletariat. There is eloquent testimony to that in the world today.

It must be remembered that there is a vast difference between the "regulated docility of an oppressed class" by a party claiming to represent half of that class, and the self-discipline and class-conscious activity of a "class struggling for its emancipation." Socialist democracy, Luxemburg correctly declared, must be the asset of the organized, class-conscious workers not a decree "from behind a few official desks." Vanguardism inevitably contains the danger of a proletarian dictatorship "transformed into a system of class rule based on unthinking obedience to the commands of leaders."

A militant party of socialism must also be capable of responding to the "pace" and events of the class struggle and of becoming involved in that struggle in fact as well as in words. It must avoid reducing Marxism-De Leonism to a set of abstract principles and formulas. Toward that end it needs to acknowledge its obligation to support, to the extent that capacities and resources permit, the legitimate efforts of workers to improve their lives, relieve their miseries and ease their burdens. As Marx observed in a letter to F. Bolte (Nov. 23, 1871):

"Where the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organization to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power, i.e., the political power of the ruling classes, it must at any rate be trained for this by a continual agitation against and by a hostile attitude toward the policy of the ruling classes. Otherwise it will remain a plaything in their hands..."

But in meeting this obligation the party must not become a purveyor of reformist promises. It must not dilute the scientific content of Marxism-De Leonism. Rather, it is imperative that it promote a clear, class-conscious understanding of the nature of capitalism.

Granted, that is not an easy task. Nor is it a new one. We are not the first to be confronted with it. As Rosa Luxemburg observed: "The basic question of the socialist movement has always been how to bring its immediate practical activity into agreement with its ultimate goal."

Whether we get the workers' attention during these critical days of capitalist disintegration will depend on a number of factors. Among the most important of those factors are 1) the zeal and alertness with which we approach the task, follow developments and events and seek out opportunities; 2) the Marxist-De Leonist insight and socialist analysis we bring to bear in connection with such opportunities; and 3) the tact and intelligence with which we conduct our work. Needless to say, at all times we must reject reformist opportunism in every aspect. We must never compromise or subordinate our socialist principles and goal for any temporary advantage. As Luxemburg correctly warned:

"Opportunism is a political game which can be lost in two ways: not only basic principles but also practical success may be forfeited... If we begin to chase after what is 'possible' according to the principles of opportunism, unconcerned with our own principles, and by means of statesmanlike barter, then we will soon find ourselves in the same situation as the hunter who has not only failed to slay the deer, but has also lost his gun in the process."

De Leonist Program

Safeguards against such errors must be built into the basic program of a socialist party. And they are built into the De Leonist program of the Socialist Labor Party. For that program is based upon the recognition and acceptance of the fact that the revolutionary change to socialism must be the class-conscious act of the workers themselves.
Accordingly, the SLP calls upon workers to organize politically for the purpose of advocating this revolutionary change. Such a political organization would not only promote class consciousness, but also project a program of organization that workers could implement toward this end. It would seek to build a party capable of capturing the political state with a view to dismantling the state when the workers assume power.

Simultaneously, the De Leonist program calls for the organization of revolutionary socialist unions. These are essential to mobilize the economic power of the proletariat, not only to resist the ever-increasing encroachments of capitalism more effectively, but ultimately to provide the essential power to enforce the revolutionary demand.

In the revolutionary equation the economic organization is the decisive one. Capable of assuming control and continuing to administer and operate the essential industries and social services, it can exercise the power to provide the decisive leverage to "swing" the revolution. Moreover, it has the structure that provides the necessary foundation for socialist society.

This is the De Leonist socialist industrial union program. It is unique and essential to the revolutionary movement in the United States. It provides the basic organizational structure for consolidating the massive power of our class. It clearly defines the socialist goal. It provides the means for defending working-class interests and pursuing working-class objectives as long as capitalism exists. It provides the societal framework on which to build the new social structure as soon as capitalism is abolished.

Moreover, the SIU program makes clear that it is the workers who must construct the new societal framework and own, control and administer the new social structure. It thereby provides the basic concept for workers' control of the entire economy and all other essential elements of society. And it is a concept that enables the workers to exercise that control directly rather than through any surrogate party that would contain the germs for new forms of economic and political enslavement. It provides for an industrial government composed of councils of workers democratically elected from the industries and social services.

Once the workers' mass organizations are in control of the entire economy and social structure—and without them proletarian control is an illusion—there is no need or justification for any separate governmental structure. There is no need for a political state apart from the SIU. Certainly there will be problems of all kinds. But whether such problems are minor or serious, anticipated or unanticipated, all of them will be within the capacity of the SIU government to deal with.

The essence of the SLP's De Leonist concept of SIU government is that it puts the workers in complete control and provides for the most democratic form of social administration. It is a concept capable of assuring the success not only of the revolutionary act but of the revolution itself. It is, therefore, a solid, indispensable revolutionary program.
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Joseph Dietzgen, known as 'the Tanner', was born near Cologne in 1828 and as a youth apprenticed to the leather industry. During the Revolution of 1848 he became a supporter of Karl Marx, who years later mentioned him in the Introduction to Capital as one of the few people to understand the work. Marx also introduced him to the 1872 congress of the International as "our philosopher". He was self-taught and has an honorable place with other 'proletarian' philosophers such as Blake the engraver, Boehme the cobbler, Spinoza the lens-grinder and Paine the printer. He contributed many articles to the working class press and his first book, Nature of Human Brain Work, was published in 1869.

The Tanner immigrated to the USA in 1884 and became editor of Der Sozialist, a position retained until moving from New York to Chicago in 1886 - the year of the Haymarket Tragedy. When the anarchist editors of the paper, Chicagoor Arbeiterzeitung were imprisoned, he freely offered his assistance as an editor and ran the journal in their absence. This action created much tension between Dietzgen and the leaders of the Socialist Labor Party, who
were trying to distance themselves as much as possible from the persecuted anarchists. He responded by claiming, "that while the anarchists have some middleheads in their ranks, the socialists in turn have a lot of cowards." Dietzgen then announced that "he too was an anarchist". But the proletarian philosopher did not have long to live, felled by a heart attack in the middle of a discussion. Exactly 100 years ago, he was buried in Waldheim Cemetery, Chicago, beside his friends the Haymarket Martyrs.

Dietzgen's Philosophy

For Dietzgen, philosophy played an important role in the struggle for freedom. Many activists feel that political awareness has little to do with something as apparently rarefied as philosophy. But, we do unquestioningly accept the given form of logic and underlying theory of knowledge of this society and upon these views, base our assumptions about the world. Hence philosophy cannot be avoided, for example, if to you reality seems to consist of fixed and unconnected fragments and all choices are reduced to either/or decisions, your political/social views are going to be somewhat different from someone who sees reality as highly complex, interrelated processes.

His philosophy was rooted in the question, "what happens when we think"? Thought occurs in the form of concepts, which is a process involving a person who experiences a phenomenon and the phenomenon experienced. Hence, thought requires an object, and this object can be physical or non-physical. Knowledge is not the direct result of input from a phenomenon, like with a reflection in a mirror, for the mind structures and patterns how we interpret reality. Such concepts as 'truth' or 'causality' are assumptions that we make and impose upon the world.

If we could acquire knowledge by simply 'copying' the object experienced in our mind, there would be few difficulties involved in understanding the world. There is the problem that we can never know an object in its entirety - hence never fully knowing something. Consider attempting to have complete knowledge of a tree down to the sub-atomic level. Consequently, all knowledge is theoretical and everyone is a theoretician. As a result, Dietzgen did not over-emphasize the role of academics and 'professional revolutionaries' and instead looked to the creativity of the working people.

"Our thought" he said, "involves an interaction of the general and the specific". The meaning of this statement is best given by an example. Suppose you are on a mountain and see a green area in the distance. By looking through binoculars you discover that the patch is made up of trees - it is a forest. In this example you went from the general (green patch) to the specific (tree) and out of the relationship between the two created a more developed concept. (forest) This process is usually unconscious. One more example. If you saw a large elongated object covered with leaves, you would say it was a tree. Now in actuality, this tree is a unique and individual object as are all things in the universe, but since phenomena cannot be understood in an ultimate or total manner, we form a concept or generalization about the object. In this example, the concept is given the name 'tree' in the English language. Thought can be considered as a process which unites the seemingly opposite qualities of the general and the specific, resulting in the formation of a new more encompassing generalization. This is dialectics and we are all engaged in it - by the simple act of thinking. A conclusion which may be drawn from considering thought as conceptual/dialectical is that no truths are absolute. In daily life 'to err is human' and dogmatic and sectarian practices - which always claim to be founded upon some absolute principle are ultimately hollow.
The fact that thought must have an object has direct bearing upon Dietzgen's concept of materialism - a concept quite different from the usual Marxist dogma. For him, the object of thought encompassed the totality of everything that exists. To exist means to have impact on other things - existence means to have relationship. The totality of everything is the universe and this cannot be reduced to some essence such as 'spirit', 'matter' or any other construct. Most materialists reduce the whole of reality to a reflection of 'matter', i.e., physical forces and objects. They simply write thought off as a secondary phenomenon - a mirror image of the 'material' world and hence not quite genuine. Idealism reduces everything to a reflection of 'ideas' or 'spirit' and degrades the physical aspects of existence. When Dietzgen refers to 'materialism' in terms of his own philosophy, he is referring to the totality or universe, a view which unites the conventional 'materialism' and 'idealism' in a more developed concept.

The split between idealism and materialism is an example of dualism (fragmentation of reality) and Dietzgen's philosophy was an attempt to overcome this division by explaining that the apparently opposing sides were merely different aspects of a unified world. Everything that has impact is 'real' and hence 'material' - thoughts, dreams and ideologies are as existent as stones, rats or capitalists. The materialism/idealism pseudo-conflict contributes to political divisiveness. 'Materialism' overemphasizes economic forces to the detriment of the cultural or psychological. 'Idealists' regard politics as a matter of imposing the will and reject historical or economic conditions as vulgar. A Dietzgenian approach considers all the factors in maintaining or changing society.

The classical philosophical problems such as 'mind vs. matter' or 'form vs. content' are also false dualities, since both aspects exist in the real world and are inseparable. Nothing is truly separate from anything else and all things are interrelated, with the differences and similarities being a matter of degree. In a world without absolute separation, all truths are relative, but this relativity must not be taken as an absolute. With an absolute relativity no one could make a single decision. Truth then, must be seen as an on-going process of discovery. It is necessary to be able to distinguish between essential (qualitative) differences and secondary ones. For example, some people wish to abolish exploitation and oppression, while others wish merely to lighten the burden. There is an essential difference
between these two positions. Those in the former group may have many divergent opinions on other issues, yet a genuine unity may be built around the common goals.

Dietzgen denied that absolute truth exists - in the sense that one individual aspect, quality or thing was the complete and total truth. Unfortunately there is a strong tendency to absolutize an aspect of the world - a process where a single factor is abstracted and the whole of reality reduced to it - creating a false absolute. This process is ideology, the partial reality taken as the whole and hence we have the sorry spectacle of anarchists quarrelling with each other - social ecologists who sneer at working people, syndicalists contemptuous of 'marginals' and a mass of hair-splitting dogmatists, each clinging to their small portion of the truth and proclaiming this meagre fragment as the word of God.

According to the Tanner, an absolute existed only in one sense - the totality of the Universe. Now this absolute has many characteristics that the religious apply to their deity. It is eternal, infinite, mysterious and since all contradictions are resolved within it, the universe is also the One and the Good. The interrelatedness of all suggests Reason and Karma. He stripped the god concept of its superstitious exterior and exposed the materialist (in the Dietzenian sense) core of the belief.

Dietzgen was critical of the basic logic of everyday life - (also the logic of most so-called philosophers) which is Formal or Aristotelian logic. (also known as Patriarchal logic) This is a system in which things are ... or they are not. Contradiction is excluded. According to such thinking if a contradiction is present in a proposition, the proposition can only be faulty. - i.e., there can only be one answer. This reasoning is fine for crossing the street or adding up a bill, but in more complex situations difficulties arise. But how can something be and yet not be and therefore exist in contradiction? I am not the same person I was when I started to type this essay - cells in my body have died and been replaced... yet I am the same person. Dietzgen’s logic, dialectical logic, sees reality as a process, like a movie, whereas Formal logic fixes the world as though in a snapshot. Formal logic limits us to either/or choices and ignores the web of interactions which constitute the universe. Formal logic is at the root of all the false choices which people forever want us to make - i.e., should we organize employed or unemployed workers? Should we do propaganda in the workplace or the community? Should we support social ecology or workers' movements? Etc. The view that always tries to reduce reality should be rejected and people should work wherever they are, realizing that all struggles are part of the one struggle.

This pamphlet has been a bare outline of Joseph Dietzgen’s thinking. For those interested in studying his works, read, Nature of Human Brain Work (see below) and try to find a copy of his Philosophical Essays (university libraries) These works still need to be read; as history, since the Tanner was the precursor of many ideas popularized by later thinkers, as an introduction to Hegelian philosophy (he was a follower of Hegel) and, most relevant of all, to be adapted by the contemporary libertarian socialist current found among many Greens, feminists and anarchists. There is a great need to overcome the fragmentation, sectarianism and ideological thinking which pervades this tendency. The application of Dietzgen’s libertarian dialectics would certainly aid this endeavor.

L. Gambone

Nature of Human Brain Work is available from Red Lion Press or the Vancouver IWW, Box 56635, Station F, Vancouver B.C. V5N5K5 for $7.00

Smith's book is a sort of compendium of information gathered—I assume—over a good many years by an inveterate reader who also happens to be a non-market socialist. I gained a better idea of the book's value when a friend gave me a copy of Chomsky's five-page essay, "On Post Modernism, Theory, Fads, etc.," published on "ZNet: a mini-web from Z Magazine" as an answer to a questioner who demanded that he explain his hostility to postmodernism and contempt for the writings of postmodernists. Skimming through Smith's book, I found out what post modernism is when I happened to find a definition of it on page 207 in Chapter 9, "Art and Revolution." So that no DB reader need ever puzzle over the meaning of this nineties political term, I reproduce below Smith's—and one David Harvey's—explanation:

Plus ça change. In the disillusion that followed the events of 1968 – that well meant but ill-fated response to the failure of governments in meeting the aspirations of workers, students, women, minorities, – there was a similar relapse into irrationality. The codeword that eventually appeared to express the jumble of reactions was postmodernism. In that nobody could agree what modernism meant—the usage spread across several disciplines: architecture, art, literature, philosophy, politics, etc. – the confusion was more confounded than ever.

David Harvey, more lucid than many of the commentators, attempted to clear the ground:

Modernism was very much about the pursuit of better futures, even if perpetual frustration of aim was conducive to paranoia. But postmodernism typically strips away that possibility by concentrating upon the schizophrenic circumstances induced by fragmentation and all those instabilities (including those of language) that prevent us even picturing coherently, let alone devising strategies to produce some radically different future. 13

The bias— it will not bear the weight of harder definition—of postmodernity is toward pluralism, relativism; to reject any attempt to predict or plan for the future upon any other than an ad hoc basis. Of course, there is an echo of Karl Popper's attack on Marxist "historicism" in The Open Society and its Enemies and the rejection of "metanarratives" by Lyotard, Foucault and Co. in France. The anguish was not just about the failure of the events of 1968, but also the earlier horror of many Communist sympathisers at the true nature of the Russian regime as the news filtered through.

The conclusion they had reached was not that their beliefs were false and should be corrected, but that one should not have any generalised beliefs at all.

A major weakness of the book is the lack of a subject index—you won’t find out what postmodernism is by looking it up. The index of proper names, though, leaves little to be desired—nearly 900 entries. Consider these: Saint Ambrose 1 reference, King Arthur 1, A.J. Ayer 7, Bakunin 4, Francis Bacon 4, Jean Beaudrillard 7, Daniel Bell 8, Bookchin 6, Bob Black 2, Castoriadis, Steve Coleman 3, J.K. Galbraith 6, Ronald Reagan 2, Anton Pannekoek 1, Upton Sinclair 1, B.F. Skinner 1, Joseph Stalin 8, Mother Theresa 2, Zinoviev 1, Zola 3.

The last two chapters are especially impressive. For one thing Smith tackles most of the hard questions we run into in our discussions with the unsaved. Questions about the actual mechanism by which humans will gain control of their lives and about the nature of a non-market society in the light of what the great majority have come regard as the sinful, evil nature of our species. As to the former he rejects political reformism as utterly futile—and spells out the reasons with examples. To my sorrow, though, he accepts the role of experiments in cooperation both in production—as in Mondragon—and in community living as useful to demonstrate the possibilities of alternative societies and to prepare people for the idea of a world of cooperation rather than competition. He examines several schemes for setting up such a society and concludes that attempts to intervene in the operation of the system at either the political or economic level are doomed because they will not end the primary villain—the market, whose control over economic decisions dooms the planet to increased growth, increased pollution, and increased human misery in the form of poverty.

While Smith believes that the numerically negligible non-market, libertarian socialist groups and individuals possess the only rational solution to the problem of capitalism, he is highly critical of their [our] tactics, which he sees as sectarian and more concerned with defeating the infidels in verbal battle than in converting them.

According to Smith, we are presently in the transition period Marx spoke of in *The Gotha Program*. Capitalism itself is evolving as its internal problems multiply. Reform—*interventionism*, as he calls it—can show us only the limits of the system. Post-revolutionary society will be characterized by the antithesis of capitalism: social ownership of the means of production, free access to the necessities of life, voluntary work, and the absence of a coercive state. Why will it come about instead of one of the authoritarian nightmares waiting in history’s wings? The answer is human nature: “It is this culturally directed, conditioned behavior [loving one another] which has welded human groups into organic wholes and seen us through the vicissitudes of evolution. Not the Survival of the Fittest but the survival of the Weakest. This is not only the distinguishing mark of civilization but is also the secret of our evolutionary success.”

--Frank Girard
NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

We Only Want...the Earth! is the latest addition to the list of non-market socialist journals. Number 1. November 1995 invites us to send in our “ideas on creating a new world of freedom, beauty, and abundance” in any of the following languages: English, German, French, Swedish, Afrikaans, Dutch, Spanish, Norwegian, Portuguese, or Danish. WOW-TE is a side benefit of Boeing’s all-out effort to inflict austerity on its workers. Mark Manning, who edits, writes, and prints it is on strike—or was. I hear conflicting reports on the status of the strike. The Grand Rapids Press has less than complete labor coverage. (Mark has also been publishing his own personal weekly strike bulletin, Schronz’s Nightmare, which contains enough good material, both graphic and poetic, to fill an issue of the DB.) WOW-TE is also strong artistically with poetry by Shelley and some classical illustrations. This first issue reflects Mark’s political positions and current interests with an article on the Boeing strike, and an introductory statement that defines his politics and asserts his view that we live in a class society, that reform has failed, that our goal should be free access, and that our tactic should be direct action. He also lists the people he sees as having “moved our struggle forward: Among them are Tom Paine, Tom Brown, Peter Kropotkin, T-Bone Slim, Karl Marx, Daniel De Leon, Steve Coleman, Samuel Leight, and Adam Buick. Published monthly (if possible), format: 1/2 standard, 22 pages, $2 per issue, $20 for ten issues from Mark Manning, 1709 South Holgate Street, Seattle, WA 98144.

The Macedonian Question -- And the Recent War in Yugoslavia in Historical Perspective. Global capitalism needs law and order. And so do the capitalists of each nation. But true to their instincts the capitalists of each nation compete for the best deal possible, and the law and order necessary for global capitalism takes a backseat to immediate needs. The former Yugoslavia illustrates this beautifully. The Macedonian Question by a TPG, a Greek libertarian communist group, discusses the implications for Macedonia and the southern Balkans of the present struggle among the ruling classes of the Yugoslav successor states. Most of the pamphlet seeks the roots of the present crisis in terms of the history of the area and the needs of its ruling class. Written in 1993 it doesn’t mention the recent peace efforts, but the authors see the conflict between the national and international needs of the rulers: “The bureaucrats [and capitalists - sg] on the one hand look forward to a supranational European capitalism, and on the other they need nationalism to regiment working class reactions to austerity measures.” Sixteen standard pages stapled. $1 or four IRCs from TPG, PO Box 76149 Nea Smirni 17110, Athens, Greece or from Collective Action Notes, PO Box 23962, Baltimore, MD 21203.

Communist Headache: Notes for Working and Living, Volumes 1, 2, and 3. CH explains its purpose as follows: “Our notes for working and living represent our efforts to develop a radical methodology for examining society, and our observations and recommendations when we apply this methodology to various aspects of the capitalist system. We are only a small group, and have put out these first three volumes in a hope to engage in critical debate and to further the revolutionary cause. Communist Headache does not exist as some formal organization. If we manage to see some revolutionaries from their various slumber and join us we will consider this initial stage as successful. Needless to say we offer no blueprints and our analyses are far from flawless.” These three volumes contain some rather heavy theoretical articles: “Some Questions for the Anarchist Movement,” “Workplace Struggle vs Community Struggle,” “Post Modernism vs Class Struggle,” “Librarians and Journalists on Strike,” and “Crime, Community, and Capitalism.” Volume 3 has an interesting six-page critique of LETS (Local Exchange Trading Schemes), the effort by
anti-capitalists to carry on their lives outside capitalism's economic system through barter, moneyless exchange, etc. with the improbable title, "How the Other Half Lives, How the Other Half Suffers, How the Other Half Struggles..." CH has not put a price on the three volumes (28, 25, and 29 stapled eurostandard pages respectively), but we can contact them at C.H., c/o Black Star, P.O. Box 446, Sheffield, S1 INY England.

The Industrial Worker: the Voice of Revolutionary Unionism is the monthly newspaper of the IWW (Industrial Workers of the World). Like The People, reviewed below, it has been around a while. It began volume 93 with the January issue. Besides major articles on the fishing industry ("Bosses Kill Fishing Industry" by Arthur J. Miller) and the Boeing strike ("Boeing Workers: 'It's Our Turn Now' " by Mark Manning), this issue has Mike Ballard's review of two books on the Spanish Revolution, one by Murray Bookchin, and numerous shorter articles on both U.S. and foreign labor struggles. 12 tabloid pages, $1 per copy, $15 per year from Industrial Worker, 103 W. Michigan Ave., Ypsilanti, MI 48197.

The People is the 22 times yearly newspaper of the Socialist Labor Party. Like the Industrial Worker it has seniority. In fact, at age 104 it is certainly the oldest English language socialist paper in existence. and unless I am mistaken, the oldest continuously published socialist paper in any language. Also, like the IW it is a "voice of revolutionary unionism," and like the IW advocates the socialist industrial unionism of the original IWW as it has done since 1905. Its tone is a bit more ponderous than that of the IW, probably because of its historic burden as the voice of the SLP. But it ideas and critique of capitalism and capitalist unionism are identical, if a bit more explicit. The current issue, December 23, has a lead article by Nathan Karp, former national secretary of the SLP, "Year Ending on Economic Sour Note for U.S. Workers," chronicalling the decline in the condition of U.S. workers. Like the IW, it has articles on the Boeing strike, the French strike movement against government cutbacks, and other labor coverage. Eight tabloid pages, $1 for a four-month trial sub; $4 per year (22 issues) from 111 W. Evelyn, #209, Sunnyvale, CA 94086.