ABSTRACT THIS ISSUE

About half of this issue consists of Loren Goldner’s well-written and basically accurate account of Kamunist Kranti as he saw it in 1997. It appeared originally in Collective Action Notes number 14/15 as did Kamunist Kranti’s response. It has been slightly cut in length—about three and a half pages altogether. Omissions are indicated by (……) and consist largely of additional examples Goldner used to illustrate points he had made. Readers wanting the omitted material can get copies by writing to DB or
e-mailing me at <fgrard@iserv.net>. In several pages of the article Goldner comments critically on KK’s activity. I disagree with his idea that KK is overly focused on workers’ experiences on the job, but I think, as he does, that KK members make unwarranted assumptions about the similarity of working class experience in India and the West.

Next KK responds vigorously to both Goldner’s criticism and other aspects of his article including what they regard as misreadings of their ideas about the conditions of workers in the west and misunderstandings of conditions in India. Unlike Loren Goldner, I met with KK members after publication of their most recent pamphlet, Self Activity of Wage Workers, which provides a more detailed explanation of KK’s theory and practice. Much of my article reflects impressions gained by
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REVOLUTIONARY TERMITES IN FARIDABAD: KAMUNIST KRANTI/COLLECTIVITIES:

PRESENTATION AND CRITICAL DIALOGUE by Loren Goldner

(Abridged from Collective Action Notes, Number 14/15, P.O. Box 22962, Baltimore, MD 21203)

Introduction

The following article grew out of a four-week stay in India in fall 1997. During that time, I had occasion to spend about a week with members of the Kamunist Kranti/Collectivities group, first in Faridabad, an industrial suburb of Delhi and then in Delhi itself. Before meeting them, I knew Kamunist Kranti from their two English language pamphlets, Reflections on Marx's Critique of Political Economy and Ballad Against Work. These pamphlets, while interesting and important as signposts in the evolution of a current, do not in themselves stand out as unique in the international discussion. It was rather conversations with members of KK, in which they elaborated their perspectives, told me the 20-year history of their group, and provided me with running translations of their Hindi press, which convinced me of their (to my knowledge) relative singularity, in spite of my own disagreements with aspects of their outlook. The world has its share of revolutionary P.O. boxes, but Kamunist Kranti, which means "Communist Revolution" in Hindi, stands out as one of the few, if not the only ultra-left current with a genuine, years-long working-class presence, not merely in the Third World, but in the world. They have evolved over twenty years from Maoism to anti-Stalinist vanguardism to anti-vanguardism through an extended experience of factory struggles in one of India's principal industrial centers. The richness of this experience, and the conclusions which KK has drawn from it, deserve to be better known and debated internationally. I do not by any means agree with all of Kamunist Kranti's formulations, but as the following will show, I do think unequivocally that they deserve a hearing and a response in the international movement. More valuable than anything I could write would be an English anthology of selections from KK's Hindi-language press, which documents more than 15 years of struggles from which they have arrived at their current perspectives. Particularly in a country such as India, where the left is still weighed down by an enormous legacy of statism, in its Congress, Stalinist and Maoist "Marxist-Leninist" varieties, the appearance of a working-class current that rejects and combats this statism unequivocally is a phenomenon worthy of international attention. If the following article helps bring about further attention to and debate of KK's perspectives, it will have achieved its purpose. To that end, I invite CAN readers and of course KK itself to respond with comments/criticisms of their own.

Geographic Context

Faridabad, India, is a Third World working-class town of one million inhabitants of which 300,000 are factory workers, one of the "cities of the South" in Jeremy Seabrook's phrase. (2) It is most easily reached by one of those commuter trains one sees in all urban centers of
India, seemingly packed at all hours with people hanging out of windows and open doors, and in which one is well advised to start inching toward the door three or four stations before one's stop. Situated in the southern industrial suburbs of Delhi, Faridabad might strike the casual visitor as a late 20th-century version of Engels' Manchester. A seemingly permanent haze of smog and pollution (provoking a high rate of respiratory ailments, including asthma) hangs over the city. For block upon block of mainly unpaved streets, old and new factories mix helter-skelter with shanties, more permanent houses and small shops, as well as pools and canals of fetid water and industrial waste. All of these intermingle in crazy-quilt fashion, a hybrid of rural and industrial life, with open fields where water buffalo graze and are milked, and whose dung is gathered and dried for fuel. Women wash clothes by hand in the available pools of water, and malaria-infected mosquitoes hover above them. In cities such as Bombay, one finds slums and shanties abutting an ultra-modern corporate office building; in Faridabad shanties and lean-tos are built right outside the (well-guarded) factory gates. Pigs, a kind of alternative municipal sanitation system, roam the streets, eating garbage and the various kinds of excrement, animal and human, which regularly surface from the gutters with the slightest rain. At rush hour, the pigs largely cede the streets to fleets of motorized rickshaws which constitute the main form of public transportation. Small shanties housing six, seven or more people line canals of sludge and industrial waste. Since many are without running water or toilets, (not to mention air-conditioning), in the 100-plus degree heat of the summers the shanties become infernos in which people have to walk blocks to a public well and have to relieve themselves where they can. In these same summers, strong young men fresh from the Himalayas or the countryside work next to open steel foundries where, by the age of 30, they are husks.

(........)

But Faridabad, for all that it visually conjures up of the Dickensonian rawness of the early phases of industrialization in the West, is nonetheless very much a city of the end of the 20th century. On paper, India has enlightened labor legislation and high job security, which in practice are circumvented in many instances by management collaboration with union goon squads. Faridabad's working class has had decades of experience with so-called Communist parties and their unions. Faridabad management practices the latest methods of downsizing and devotes tremendous amounts of energy and resources to controlling the work force, a control in which the left parties and unions play a major role. The factories brim with MBA's with cellular phones, who apply killing speed-up to the assembly lines, and who almost brazenly provoke strikes, with union help, aimed at retrenchment. None of these characteristics particularly distinguish Faridabad from other comparable industrial centers scattered around India (or elsewhere), but it was here that a current with no counterpart in India or, to the best of my knowledge, the rest of Asia, emerged.
Political Context

Around 1972, state repression came down hard on India's Maoist ("Naxalite") movement, a New Left revolt of disaffected middle class students and intellectuals who were against the bureaucratic sloth and sleaze of post-independence, Congress Party-dominated Indian society, and against the accommodation of the (then pro-Soviet) Indian Communist Party to these realities. Echoing the Russian Populists of a century earlier, Naxalite cadre gave up urban middle-class lives and went to the rural peasantry, often in remote villages accessible only on foot, to be "fish among the water" of the people. However skewed their perspectives, ultimately drawn from the bureaucratic-peasant revolution of Mao tsetung (and in this way no different from comparable movements around the world in those years), the Naxalites did have modest initial success among the poorest peasants, until they began exemplary "executions" of somewhat mythical but widely hated "large landowners" (often merely slightly poorer peasants) and made themselves vulnerable to the full weight of state repression. (Nonetheless, repression did not completely annihilate the movement and there are still armed Maoist insurgencies scattered around rural India.)

In 1975, Indira Gandhi's Congress government proclaimed a state of emergency, aligned itself on a generally perceived "pro-Soviet" foreign policy stance, came down hard on strike-prone railway workers and jailed and silenced hundreds of Maoist militants, often presented, in the shrill atmosphere of the day, as "CIA agents" in leftist guise. The earliest origins of Kamunist Kranti are to be found in the fallout and regroupment of the Indian Maoist milieu following the state of emergency, when that milieu had already broken up into various warring factions. But with Mao's death in 1976, the subsequent arrest of the "Four Dogs" (or Gang of Four), the official burial one moonless night of the "Cultural Revolution", and the consolidation in power by 1978 of the "capitalist roader" Teng shao-peng and a full blown reorientation to "market socialism", it was getting harder to be a "Maoist", in India and anywhere else. By 1978-79, after the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, China's U.S.-backed retaliation on Vietnam's border, and the resulting threat of confrontation between the Soviet Union and China, many of the world's front-line "Marxist-Leninist" states seemed about to go to war... with each other. It was in this context that the future nucleus of Kamunist Kranti decided that something was terribly wrong with their earlier perspectives, and embarked on the "long march" out of Maoism to what and where they are today.

(.......)
The Genesis of Kamunist Kranti's Perspective and Faridabad Struggles in the 1980s

In 1982, as the future nucleus of Kamunist Kranti was leaving Maoism behind and beginning to focus their activity on the working class in Faridabad, a strike occurred at the East India Cotton Mills which illustrates in a nutshell the dynamics which they began to generalize into a theory. The mills employed 6,000 workers; management wanted to automate 3,000 jobs out of existence. The Communist Party's union had
been ousted by the workers in 1977, and replaced by a union affiliated with the BJP (Bahartiya Janata Party, the Hindu fundamentalists now the minority ruling party in India). (5) The strike was provoked, as is often the case, over a seemingly small point, in this instance a disagreement over whether the annual bonus should be 19% or 18%. It lasted six months. The strikers were replaced by scabs, and fights and murders broke out among workers; sporadic violence of this kind continued for two further years. Through all of this, the plant continued production with 3,000 workers, exactly the management’s goal.

In Kamunist Kranti’s conception, the basic paradigm of strikes in India is this: management, as in the case of the cotton mills, wants to achieve wage cuts, layoffs, speedup, automation, whatever. They call in the union and basically say: "we have 2,000 employees; we want to lay off 1,000. We’ll announce a plant closing. You people call a strike and stay out for six months; we’ll re-open with 1,000 workers, and you proclaim a victory. " In what follows, it will be seen how often this scenario is enacted in Faridabad, and in the rest of India. For Kamunist Kranti, the 18-month, 1981-83 Bombay textile strike of 250,000 mill workers, the "strike of the century" led by the (recently assassinated) populist demagogue Datta Samant, which was smashed and led to dozens of mills closing (as mentioned earlier), was just such a management-union provocation from start to finish.

But Kamunist Kranti goes further, and does not mince words. In their stark formulation: in the 19th century strikes were a weapon of the working class; at the end of the 20th century strikes are a weapon of management. Not just in Faridabad, or in India, but everywhere. Before examining this provocative assertion, let us examine further struggles from which KK drew this conclusion.

One of the more paradigmatic episodes illustrating KK’s analysis took place at a Faridabad tool factory in the early 80’s. (A further struggle of a even more extreme kind is taking place at the same (renamed) plant today, now known as Jhalani Tools.)

In 1982, a struggle erupted at the German-owned Gedore Hand Tools works, consisting of three plants and employing 3,500. The dominant union was the CITU, the affiliate of the CPI (M). Gedore management demanded 600 "resignations" (6) and a 25% pay cut or six months of "special terms" for pay. All demands were rejected. Management attempted a "pinprick" strategy, to which the union responded with a "tools down" strike. Management attempted a lockout, and the union struck. As is often the case, the union called the strike just before payday, ensuring that the workers would go into the strike with the least possible financial cushion. A month passed, and two contracts were rejected; with a third offer, the union packed the strike meeting and ordered a return to work. The strike continued nonetheless, as strikers occupied their own union hall and demanded the resignation of the leadership, which took place, after which a new leadership took over the CITU. The strikers returned to work, but nine months later management locked out one of the three
plants. A "Committee of 15" was formed to get a better agreement, but it
was then learned that the new leadership, which had taken over in the
original ouster, had collaborated with management in the lockout. This
brought the "Committee of 15", which had ties to the original
leadership, to power in the union. The "Committee of 15" in turn began
forcing people to resign by force. Armed police and police trucks were
posted inside the plants. On some days as many as 50 workers were forced
to resign and were beaten by union goons. Many workers went back to
their villages to avoid being forced to resign. In these conditions, it
took a year to force 1,500 resignations (7), and in May 1985 the
struggle was over. Later, the German management sold off the company,
which became Jhalani Tools.

The CITU in 1983 was involved in another militant strike in Faridabad,
this time at Lakhani Shoes, which then employed 500 workers and is now
much larger. The CITU carried out physical attacks on managers and
supervisors, but the strike, which lasted for months, ended in defeat.
It later came out that Lakhani had paid 35,000 rupees to the Faridabad
leader of the CITU. (Subsequently, the CITU was ousted and replaced by
unions affiliated with the Congress Party and then with the JD.)

1990's Struggles in Faridabad

Lakhani Shoes, which currently operates 19 plants in Faridabad,
was the scene of mass layoffs in 1983 (described earlier) and 1988. By
the mid-90's, it had become a joint venture with Reebok, using a large
number of casuals in very hard work with low pay, rapid aging on the
job, and loss of fingers. Many workers are Nepali. The work force is
young because of the previous mass layoffs.

In these conditions, in May-June 1996, the workers decided to organize
and went to the Hind Majdoor Sabha (HMS), mentioned earlier as the union
affiliate of the Janata Dal. In July-August 1996, management suspended
the union activists, and in September the union called a strike.
Permanent, casual and contracted workers all struck. The strike
continued into the spring of 1997, when workers began to disperse. The
management resumed work using new hires,
with the ex-leaders from the HMS as the labor contractors. A court order
demanded that strikers stay 100 yards from the gates, and all strikers
were ultimately fired.

In June 1995, a new struggle erupted at the East India Cotton Mills in
Faridabad, where the 1979 strike was one of KK's first experiences in
the working-class milieu. In 1995, the mills employed 3,000 workers in
two factories. While some equipment was dismantled and workers
complained, 6 of them were suspended. 2,500 workers walked out and the 6
were reinstated.

Management, however, wanted 600 layoffs. Without leaders among the
workers, they were unable to control the work force. In the run-up to a
confrontation over the layoffs, hunger strikes took place, and a group
of rank-and-file leaders, demanding a "good contract", took over. In June-July 1996, 295 workers were forced to resign. Management floated a voluntary retirement scheme which found no takers. On July 10, they declared a lockout. 18 days later, the lockout was lifted and an agreement to resume work was signed, with 18 days pay lost.

In August, management simply paid no wages, and on Sept. 12 it declared a lockout in both plants, backed up by the arrival of the police. In an unusual move in a lockout situation, the rank-and-file leaders told the workers to leave the factories. The lockout continued into the fall, with the workers dispersed. The rank-and-file leaders threatened to close down Faridabad if the lockout did not end before Diwali (a Hindu festival). At the same time they avoided demonstrations because they were afraid of losing control. The leaders tried taking the case to the Supreme Court. In January 1997, the smaller plant reopened, but two months later resumed the lockout, with management still demanding 600 layoffs. As of December 1997, the lockout was still ongoing.

The struggle at Jhalani Tools Ltd. is one of the most recent struggles in which Communist Kranti has been involved, one of the most dramatic, and the one about which I have the most documentation so, at the risk of overkill (cf. KK's accompanying report) I will give it more space. Jhalani Tools provides unusually clear illustration of what Faridabad workers (and workers in other parts of India) are up against.

Workers everywhere are familiar with asset-stripping by management. But most workers in Europe and America, when their company goes bankrupt or is absorbed in a leveraged buyout, can at least expect to be laid off with a final paycheck, collect some unemployment compensation, and perhaps eventually some part of a pension. Of course in the fly-by-night sweatshops of Los Angeles and New York, as in similar maquiladora operations on the US-Mexican border, there are constant cases of companies folding up and disappearing while owing workers weeks of pay. But to date there have been few cases of decades-old, well-known "mainstream" companies operating for nearly 2 years without paying any wages.

Not so in Faridabad. Jhalani Tools Ltd. (9), the successor to Gedore Hand Tools (cf. above for the account of the 1982-85 struggle there) has not paid wages to 2183 workers since March 1996. Since there has been no hiring at Jhalani since 1978, (and the forcible "downsizing" of the work force in 1984) these 2183 employees have been at Gedore/Jhalani for a minimum of 20 years. They are the target of an asset-stripping strategy that is not uncommon among Indian firms.

Jhalani Tools is not merely attempting to loot 2 years of back wages; it is also looting money owed workers for 2 annual bonuses, three years of "leave-travel" allowance, 3 years' payments to the group medical plan, and other "contracted" benefits. It is able to blackmail workers in this way because of the difficulty, not to say impossibility for them to find other jobs by walking away from their "legally guaranteed" employment.
After reducing staff almost by half by using goon terror in 1984, as described earlier, Jhalani in 1989 coiled with the union to ram through a contract containing three secret clauses that were withheld from workers (the contract was read aloud, minus these clauses, at a gate meeting). The clauses linked wages to production targets (requiring a minimum of 200 tons before any wages would be paid), absolved the company of the obligation to pay workers when production was impossible because of electricity blackouts or raw materials shortages, and gave the company the right to assign work irrespective of job classification. Even after pay had been docked for electric outages and materials shortages, these clauses remained in a new contract pushed through in 1993. Pleading poverty from various causes, Jhalani Tools in December 1995 got an "ad hoc committee" to agree to a 50% pay cut until further notice. The company began paying wages months in arrears and finally, in March 1996, stopped paying wages altogether, largely blaming work stoppages and indiscipline for the company's problems, using further endless salami tactics and maneuvers, and blithely ignoring the occasional labor board and court decisions in the workers' favor (the latter hardly being news).

Seasoned by decades of these tactics by management and the unions, Jhalani workers refused to be provoked into a set-up strike or other easily targeted actions making it easier to fire them and instead took their case to the Faridabad working class as a whole with roadside informational pickets. (For further details cf. accompanying article). As of this writing (March 1998), the standoff remains unresolved.

Faridabad Struggles and the Evolution of Kamunist Kranti 1979-Present

When Kamunist kranti began its focus on Faridabad in the late 1970's, the group was still recovering from Maoism; it remained within some kind of vanguardist perspective until 1992, at which point it evolved to its current, anti-vanguardist "affinity group" outlook. The preceding sketch of the major struggles which shaped KK's evolution gives some idea of the environment in which the group evolved. In Kamunist Kranti's view, workers in India (and not merely in India) confront a set of interlocking rackets: corporate management, unions, the left political parties, the state at every level from local to national, labor boards and labor courts (where workers pursue legal redress for flagrant violation of the law for up to 15 years, and when they happen to win, find that the company's assets have been looted three times over by management, banks and state officials). None of these phenomena, in themselves or taken as a whole, are unfamiliar to many of us who are far from the Indian context (and KK would deny that there is anything specifically "Indian" about them). In Faridabad, thousands of workers see all unions, including oppositional currents in unions, and left-wing political parties as uniformly on a continuum with all the other interlocking parts of the racket, as merely further forces against which they have to defend themselves by refusing to be provoked into confrontations that are rigged in advance. This is what KK means when it
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says that, in contrast to 100 years ago, strikes are today the weapon of management. KK tells stories of management calling in groups of perceived "troublemakers" and insulting them in the most personal way, calling them wimps and cowards who stand there and take such insults, while the workers refuse to be provoked; in the middle of the management's tirade, the police van, which had been called in anticipation of a row, pulls up at the factory gate. For KK, part of the unions' strategy in working with management on retrenchment schemes is calling of sometimes violent strikes and confrontations in order to set in motion a "struggle scenario", with leaders, fiery speeches and martyrs, in which the result is always defeat for the workers.

As I said at the onset of this article, neither KK's published (English-language) theoretical writings nor even its assessment "on the ground" of the official left and the unions in their main arena of intervention particularly distinguish them from a number of other groups in the international ultra-left milieu; what does seem to me to be unusual, if not unique, is the depth of KK's presence in a big working-class center, and their evolution of a strategy to combat their enemies. This strategy is what gives meaning to their self-description as "termites", quietly eating away at the foundations of the left spectacle of opposition, and the whole hoopla of the high-visibility, losing struggles the latter promotes.

KK refers to their pre-1992 vanguardism (even when it became anti-Stalinist vanguardism) as their "preach-teach" phase, when they still conceived of themselves as essentially addressing workers from a revolutionary tribunal. In that earlier phase, they confronted "bad vanguards" and "bad leaders" with the idea of becoming a good vanguard and good leaders. By December 1997, they had published the first issue of their (monthly) newspaper entirely written by factory workers.

In 1984-85 Kamunist Kranti withdrew from intervention and threw its energies into a fundamental theoretical reconsideration of perspectives. In their 1984-85 study group phase, they read through the three volumes of Capital and discovered Rosa Luxemburg's Accumulation of Capital, which they embraced, with some qualifications, as an alternative to the Leninist theory of imperialism and monopoly capitalism which still dominates the Indian left. In 1990, they published an abridged edition of Luxemburg's book, intended to begin a debate with the Indian left; they found no takers, and ran up against the common "I've only read Vol. 1, and that was a long time ago" and evasion and illiteracy which is hardly limited to India. The study of Capital and of Luxemburg showed KK the utter poverty of the Lenin-Hilferding-Bukharin "monopoly capital" - "anti-imperialist" economics (in contrast to the critique of political economy) in which they, and most of the international left, had been immersed.

In their pre-1992 "preach-teach" phase, KK sold a monthly newspaper at the factory gates in Faridabad which by 1990 had reached a circulation of 1,000. The paper was made up of accounts of struggles like those related above. Their 1990 publication of Luxemburg's Accumulation of
Capital and their maintenance of the Majdoor Library in the heart of a Faridabad slum were further parts of what they see today as their "educational" outreach. But almost no one was interested in debating Luxemburg with them, and few workers made use of the written material available in the library.

The turning point came in 1992 when they published an anthology (in Hindi only) of the best articles in their newspaper from the previous decade. The idea was to provide a tool for struggle to combative workers and they expected an enthusiastic response. Instead, workers thumbed through it, put it down, and said "This stuff is for leaders", i.e. specialists. This response to their whole previous "preach-teach" phase that led KK to an even more radical questioning of any kind of vanguardism. The struggles in which they had been involved since 1982 were a litany of management and/or union provocations of workers to achieve management goals. They had again and again seen new leaders thrown up by the rank-and-file and pulled into the same mode of behaviour. On the other hand, KK's very real ties to affinity groups on the shop floor (in which their members were active) made them acutely aware of how workers acted to counter these provocations and noisy scenarios of defeat.

What KK saw, and further evolved as the alternative to any kind of vanguardism, was a strategy of "small steps". From Faridabad workers, they learned that "bees united in a hive can easily be put off by smoke and their honey taken away. But if affinity groups of bees swarm about, no one dares touch their honey". KK's critique of their earlier methods, and of those of all would-be vanguards, is aimed at what they call "unifocal struggles", i.e. big confrontations where the whole spectrum of repression from state, army, police and management to "Marxist-leninist" parties and unions zero in on a big target. They point to most of the struggles recounted above as examples of such unifocal struggles. They counterpose the actions of small "affinity groups" that paralyze management attacks without becoming vulnerable to discipline and dismissal, workers assigned to work dangerous machinery for which they are not trained, work the machinery, let it break down, paralyze the factory, and force management to establish guidelines for training. Workers denied bathroom breaks from the assembly line start pissed on the shop floor and win bathroom breaks. They confront management over in-plant complaints in groups and refuse to delegate leaders who could be singled out or co-opted. When management started locking a factory gate at 8:00 AM sharp, workers, knowing that many busses arrived nearby only at 8:15, gathered at both sides of the gate during the shift change, preventing anyone from going in or out, until management abandoned the policy. At Jhalani Tools, (cf. KK's accompanying article on that struggle) when workers saw that management was preparing to loot the enterprise in classic fashion, they went in small groups to the local labor department, flooding it with complaints about non-payment of wages and publicized the situation to the whole Faridabad working class with roadside placards, generalizing an awareness through the whole city of these looting tactics.
In Kamunist Kranti's post-1992 break with "preach-teach" practice, they aim at a completely different kind of multilateral communication with workers. They stopped selling their newspaper and (as part of a critique of commodity relations), began giving it away at factory gates, but only to those who asked for it, and accepting contributions for further publication. In this way their circulation stabilized at 5,000. They are often approached by workers who write stories for the KK paper on developments in a specific plant. Individual workers in trouble with management come by the Majdoor Library for suggestions and help. KK and their newspaper are widely known in Faridabad, even by people who do not agree with them or work openly with them, as an alternative network of information and "small steps" strategy and tactics to deal with a situation where the official left and the trade unions are part of the problem. KK's "termite" strategy has succeeded in opening a space for genuine worker discussion in an industrial city of 300,000. KK articulates the hostility the workers already feel toward" their" parties and unions. KK members have been beaten up many times by goons of the left parties and the unions, but more recently they are left alone.

Once again, many if not all of Kamunist Kranti's most recent ideas have been articulated before, and elsewhere. (The issue here is of course not originality; it is substance.) The critique of work in KK's Ballad echoes similar ideas articulated by Zero Work and Midnight Notes over the past 25 years. Stan Weir and his collaborators in the U.S. have for several decades argued that workplace affinity groups and horizontal communication among plants are the natural and real self-organization of workers and as an alternative to vertical unionism and vanguards, even if they do not reject unionism per se, as Kamunist Kranti does. (10) Back in the 1950's, the Facing Reality group in Detroit around C.L.R. James attempted to publish a factory based newspaper written by and for workers, although they never (to my knowledge) achieved the shop floor presence, quantitative or qualitative, which Kamunist Kranti has in Faridabad. I am sure there are further examples of which I am unaware. On the other hand, I have never encountered another tendency which states so unequivocally that today "strikes are the weapon of management", nor have I ever encountered such a systematic rejection of what KK calls "unifocal struggles" as guaranteed defeats, however many defeats, in India and just about everywhere else, can be pointed to in recent decades. It is around this problematic, having laid out their ideas as judiciously as I can, that I begin my "comradely criticism" (as opposed to a full-blown critique) of Kamunist Kranti.

Criticism of Kamunist Kranti

Kamunist Kranti's two English-language pamphlets, A Ballad Against Work and Reflections on Marx's Critique of Political Economy, are the two main theoretical statements by which the current is known internationally. As stated earlier, I think that for all their interest, they do not reveal clearly the uniqueness of what KK is about in its real presence in Faridabad, and space prevents me from taking them up in detail here. What follows flows rather from a reflection on the material
already presented and from further conversations with members of KK.

To state my principal criticism as bluntly as possible: Kamunist Kranti, as a current, is overly focused on worker struggles at the point of production. The lessons of their Faridabad experience, however rich, are not as generalizable as KK thinks. They offer only so much, and not enough, to revolutionaries in countries where a large part of the proletariat has never made it to the shop floor, or has more recently particularly in the West been downsized out of it. In breaking totally (and mainly rightly) with "unifocal struggles" in the context of one city, Kamunist Kranti has also broken with the CLASS-OF-IT-SELF, which is a totality, not a sum, and which therefore cannot be a linear addition of affinity groups in a linear addition of factories, but becomes something qualitatively different in direct proletarian dual power political form, presaging actual working-class power over society as a whole, such as the soviets of 1905 (Russia), 1917-1921 (Russia-Germany), or 1936 (Spain). (Kamunist Kranti might of course rightly point out that all the latter examples also ended in defeats, but that would be a fatuous conflation. All struggles short of the final overthrow of capitalism will sooner or later be defeats in some way.)

KK evolved against the incredible inertia of the official left in India (of which the above narrative presumably gives at least a whiff), which is almost hopelessly dominated by the legacy of the Indian Communist Party's accommodation to the Congress state, and by more radicalized versions of the same which began breaking away from the ICP with the Maoist revolt of the 1960's. These, in turn, are part of a larger context of statism which besets the left internationally, and particularly in Third World countries. Kamunist Kranti had to polemicize with an environment deeply influenced by statist nationalism, justifying the kind of "anti-imperialist" alliances with the "progressive bourgeoisie" against "comprador elements" and "feudal remnants" at home, and "monopoly capital" abroad, the old tired refrain which has so badly declined in recent decades. Kamunist Kranti evolved in this context to a resolute internationalism, taking care to substitute the term "wage workers in India" for "Indian workers". All these elements are, in India and anywhere else, a breath of fresh air.

Kamunist Kranti thinks that conditions of wage workers are, today, pretty much the same everywhere, and radically question the distinction between the "developed" and "underdeveloped" world. One does not have to accept blindly productivist- technocratic ideas of development to wonder about this. KK will point to the downsizing, increase of electronic surveillance at the workplace and in society generally, the lengthening of the work week, speedup, loss of purchasing power and all the elements of the attack on wage workers in the West since the 1960's, and show their more or less exact counterpart in India. Even Bombay has been seriously de-industrialized by out-sourcing and decentralized cottage production which helped shut down its century (or more) old textile industry. Hong Kong has been de-industrialized by Shenzhen, where wages are 10% of Hong Kong wages, and Shenzhen is losing jobs to cities further into China, where wages are about 10% of Shenzhen wages. KK's
Ballad Against Work, using examples from India and all over the world, documents this intensification of work by cordless phones, pagers, computer networks, "karooshi" (Japanese for "death from overwork"), "quality control", "agricultural revolutions", on-line work in the home, airline commutes, freeway commutes, mass transit commutes, and domestic piece-work out-sourcing of manufacture, all over the world.

There is doubtless a large element of truth in this. But it is at the same time somewhat breathtaking to hear a current in a city like Faridabad, where a skilled industrial worker earns the rupee equivalent of $50-200 per month, in a country where 16% of the world's population produces 1.5% of the total world product, say that conditions are essentially the same as in the Western countries where a skilled industrial worker earns $15 per hour and 16% of the world's population produces over half the world's product. I know that every one of these figures (except for population) is subject to the most withering critical scrutiny, but I still note massive labor emigration to the West from the "Third World", and not in the other direction. It is certainly true that wage workers are one international class and that there is no revolution in one country, but this has been true for a long, long time. It is also true that the conditions of the post-1973 world crisis have significantly blurred the distinctions between "developed" and "underdeveloped" countries, in particular in the accelerating creation of one world labor market (e.g. Lufthansa accountants in Hyderabad).

The point, however, is not to quibble about "developed" and "underdeveloped" countries. What is most striking about Kaminist Kranti, as a review of the history of Faridabad struggles recounted above will show, is that for the past 20 years they have been dealing with the kinds of struggles which revolutionaries in the West used to deal with in Detroit, Manchester, Alsace, the Ruhr, and Turin, i.e. struggles primarily centered on the point of production, that is the factory. The capitalists in Europe and America for 25 years also have a critique of "unifocal struggles" and big confrontations, because in the 1965-1973 period, throughout the West, contrary to what KK might think, the capitalists were LOSING them, and those "unifocal struggles" (such as may 1968 in France or Italy's 1969 'hot autumn') were also interacting intensely with "small steps" struggles on the shop floor, which the capitalists were also losing. Their strategy since 1973 has been to pulverize, wherever possible, the big units of production which created large-scale concentrations of proletarians (such as one finds in Faridabad today) and replace them with decentralized, "flexible" cottage-type production, a strategy largely realized in the demise of the old "worker fortresses" like Renault-Billancourt and Turin-FIAT which caused them such headaches, as they lost control of the work force and the shop floor.

The (to date largely successful) capitalist strategy in Europe and America for 25 years has been to fragment the old working class, and along comes Kaminist Kranti saying that the problem is "unifocal struggles"! They are rather, from the other end, theoreticians of the same fragmentation, as a strategy for workers, and they have no idea how
to combat it because it has not yet hit them as it has hit workers in the West. However astute they may be about how workers in Faridabad have fought back against the snare of their arrayed political, managerial and trade-union enemies, they have no grasp of the way these problems present themselves in Europe and America, where growing numbers of (ex) wage workers have been thrown onto the scrap heap, and even more are being already in the scrap heap, (as they are in India).

It may seem somewhere bizarre to criticize a working-class current in India for what it says about Europe and America. But since KK claims that its perspectives are without borders, and that the problems of wage-workers are everywhere the same, if KK is wrong somewhere they are wrong everywhere. Their error, once again, comes from a fallacy of linear composition of certain local trends with which they are familiar. (But, to paraphrase Hegel, the familiar is not always the known) To make Faridabad the "known" in this sense, Communist Kranti would have to locate it in the global context of this "race to the bottom".

Ex-auto workers in inner-city Detroit can piss on the shop floor all they want, because GM and Ford long ago packed the assembly line off to Puebla and Chihuahua; steel workers who used to hold cake-bakes on the job in Gary, Indiana, are now scattered through the Chicago suburbs, delivering pizzas; the ex-longshoremen of the containerized San Francisco waterfront today can barely find each other in the phone book. Not to mention the children of these auto, steel and longshore workers, ground up in the casualized inferno of temp agencies and dead-end Macjobs. Not to mention the black ex-auto workers who participated in the 1972 Lordstown, Ohio wildcat, and who are now doing slave labor in Ohio state prison.

While it is difficult to find in their writings (particularly in those available in English), KK has a rather bizarre sense of what this has meant for the workers in the West in the past 25 years. When, in discussion with them, I pointed to the accelerating disappearance of the working-class revolt of 1965-1973 (extended by a few years in countries such as Spain, Portugal, and Italy), and said that this had constituted (particularly in the U.S.) a very successful capitalist counter-offensive and effective response to the earlier revolt, KK insisted that I was focusing only on well-known "unifocal struggles" and that workers since 1973 had shifted to a "small steps" strategy, blacked out in the media. As evidence for this they point to the greatly increased amount of electronic surveillance on the job, evidence that management has still not regained control of the shop floor. While this may be true, a lot of workers after the 1973-75 downturn were happy to have a job, period. KK sees management today as literally trembling at the depth of worker autonomoy, (a panic for which I certainly find no evidence in the exultant American financial and business press, where the mood for the past two decades is rather that labor has been KO'd for good, as profits soar.) (11) Whatever truth there is to this (and I doubt there is much; rather electronic surveillance is first of all one of the tools of worker rollback), all these "small steps" have not prevented a 20% fall in workers' living standards since 1973, and 40% for American (black and Hispanic) minorities. But since KK rejects the
idea that there was any increase in workers' living standards during the
1945-1973 boom in the West (pointing to longer hours, more travel time,
more women obliged to enter the work force), they reject the idea that
there was any rollback of struggle after 1965-1973 or that increased
living standards and a more favorable labor market had anything to do
with the relative ebb phase prior to 1965-1973 (12)

Again, I have no desire to lapse into productivist-technocratic notions
of living standards. But I can't help agreement with the Communist
Workers Organization (CWO) Internet reply to KK, on the same
constellation of issues: "In the 1960's we could tell the boss to stuff
his job and walk into another one the next week. Or...we could work for
six months and then live on state benefit for six months." Tell a UPS
temp about that today.

In fact, Kamunist Kranti's point-of-production problem is already
contained in their favorite (and, in fact, syndicalist) metaphor about
"swarms of bees protecting their honey". The "honey" of the working
class is not in any individual factory, or in the additive sum of all
factories; that is in fact a Ricardoan, productivist, vols. 1+2 "simple
reproduction" view of capitalist production. The "honey" of the working
class is in the total social wage in a "vol. 3" (and vol. 4: Theories of
Surplus Value) expanded reproduction of labor power, which includes
education, medical care, and social infrastructure (e.g. sanitation,
transportation, housing) however different any and all of these things
will look in a society freed from commodity exchange. (It is significant
that in their discussions with me about the critique of political
economy, KK was skeptical in the extreme about including education and
medical care in the total social wage; for them, education and medicine
only exist to make it possible for the working class to work, as if a
completely different kind of education and medicine will not exist in a
communist society.) Kamunist Kranti's almost exclusive factory focus,
for all its richness, and its "small step" eschewal of "unifocal
struggles" is the radicalization of a consciousness and practice
circumscribed by the capitalist fiction par excellence, the individual
enterprise.

When workers attempt to paralyze production at one factory, or even all
factories, whether through "unifocal struggles" or "small steps", no
matter how radical, they are still merely "negating" the dominant,
alienated organization of production; they break with this (very
necessary) day-to-day "negation" by posing themselves, as a class, as an
alternate basis for the reproduction of society as a whole, not merely
in one or all factories, but in all aspects of life, just as capital
currently dominates all of life. Kamunist Kranti's exclusive focus on
radicalized forms of "negation" (disruption of capitalist production),
however interesting and important, is not enough.

I am no more interested than Kamunist Kranti in name-calling or
citation wars from Marx's Capital. The point is this. For 25 years,
world capital has whipsawed workers, and particularly workers in the
West, with a global "rationalization" of production, featuring high-tech
innovation, eliminating jobs, and the farming out of manufacture to the Third World, also eliminating jobs, all aimed at lowering the total wage bill. Hong Kong textiles replacing Manchester, Shenzhen replacing Hong Kong, and Wuhan replacing Shenzhen. Japanese capital outsourced to Korea, and when Korea became too expensive, to Indonesia, and they all live in fear of China. The process, in the West, is most advanced in the U.S. where real incomes have fallen 20%, the work week has increased 20%, housing now takes 40-50% of household income, nearly 1% of the population is in prison or on parole, and something like one-third of the work force is made up of part-timers and temps. Prison construction is the leading growth industry, and prisons are being built with factories in them, to recycle the newly-criminalized downsized work force into 30-cents-an-hour full time semi-skilled and skilled jobs, including computer programming.

This "American model" is now crashing down on what is left of the "welfare states" of western Europe. The long-term disappearance, since 1973, of what Kamunist Kranti calls "unifocal struggles" is the result of this global restructuring. Again and again, this process has crushed worker resistance, no matter how militant, in a single factory or industry or town (most recently, again, in the Decatur, Illinois "war zone"). Capital understands that the game is being played at the level of the total capital: no effective worker strategy has been developed to counter it, and no strategy focused exclusively on the point of production will. "Small steps" tactics, no matter how effective in one locale that still is more like the old "worker fortresses" of the West than like the new killing fields of highly mobile capital, provide no answer. I don't have the right answer, either, but I think I have the right questions, and Kamunist Kranti has no answer to them.

1. Kamunist Kranti/Collectivities publications, in both English and Hindu, are available upon request from Majdoor Library, Autopin Jhuggi, N.I.T., Faridabad 121001, India. Also available from the CAN Web site: http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/2379 or by mail from CAN in the US.

2. See his In the Cities of the South, (Verso), London/New York, 1996


4. India of course has not yet been fully integrated into the East Asian capitalist boom of the post-1960's (currently on hold until further notice), as the world financial press somewhat ruefully admitted in fall 1997 when India was, as a result, relatively unaffected by the collapse
of the Thai, Malaysian, Indonesian and South Korean currencies, the Hong Kong real estate and stock markets, and the ensuing (and continuing) regional debacle. The global capitalists who are plying open East Asian economies to buy up their assets at bargain basement prices still have the effrontery to tell capitalists in India that they should make haste down the same road, to "take advantage" of globalization. India as a result is, according to the 1991 census (and the following categories, which can describe a child selling Chiclets on a street corner as a "service" worker, should be taken at less than face value) still nearly three-fourths rural, with 73.9% of the population living in villages and hamlets of 5,000 or less, and the remaining 26.1% in towns and cities. The breakdown of the work force shows the same rural preponderance, with 39% peasants and 26% agricultural laborers; in addition to the latter agricultural proletariat, the non-agricultural working class (some of it also rural) shows 7% in manufacture (with an additional 2% in household production), 3% in extractive industries (fishing, forestry, mining), 2% in construction, 8% in trade and commerce, 3% in transportation, and 10% in "other services". The census also mentions 28.2 million "marginal workers" and 55 million children (not including those working directly for their parents) working in agriculture (25 million), "services" (20 million), and 5 million in handloom, carpet-making, gem-cutting and match-making. 29% of the total work force, by these official categories, is made up of women. (These figures are from J. Heitzman et al. eds. India: A Country Study (1996), p. 325, a U.S. government handbook.) The annual per capita income is ₹324 per year.

In this context, Faridabad, for all its osmosis of urban and rural (for much of its factory work force is, as indicated earlier) drawn from all over India and Nepal), is, for India, a high concentration of industrial workers, who earn between 800 and 8000 rupees per month ($20-$200 at December 1997 exchange rates).

5. Just about every political party in India has a trade union affiliate. The Bharatiya Majdoor Sangh is the BJP union, and the largest; the INTUC (Indian National Trade Union Congress) is affiliated to the Congress Party; the AITUC (All-India Trade Union Congress) is linked to the Communist Party India (CPI); the CITU (Center of Indian Trade Unions) is linked to the Communist Party of India (Marxist); the CPI (M-L) and further breakaways have their unions.

6. "Resignations" are a classic management method of side-stepping India's tough job security legislation; these "resignations" are often extracted, by force, with the help of the unions' goon squads.

7. According to another human rights pamphlet, Gedoré management claimed that the 1,500 resigning workers had opted for a "Voluntary Retirement Scheme"; workers claim that the union participated in drawing up lists of workers to be "resigned" and then worked with police to terrorize them into doing so. (cf. The Company They Keep. A Report on Workers of Jhalani Tools Ltd., Faridabad. Available from Dr. Sudesh Vaid, D-2, Staff Quarters, I.P. College, Shamnath Marg, Delhi 11054. 3 rupees plus postage.) Even today, in legal arbitration by Gedoré's successor Jhalani Tools, management refers to the 1984 events as the year of "Voluntary Retirement".
8. Copies of the excellent Negation pamphlet, LIT, or the Self-Managed Counter-Revolution, are available from Black and Red, PO Box 02374, Detroit, MI 48202, USA.

9. Most of the following information is from the human rights pamphlet, The Company They Keep, cited earlier. While providing useful background information, this pamphlet is marred by excessive legalism and an attempt to show Jhalani Tools as a "human rights" case instead of a more visible instance of a systemic practice.

10. Stan Weir's views, and those of others like him, can be gleaned from Staughton Lynd, ed. "We Are All Leaders": The Alternative Unionism of the Early 1930's, (University of Illinois Pr.), 1996. The strength of this book is its demonstration, in different contexts, that the CIO was top-down and bureaucratic from the beginning.

11. After the August 1997 UPS strike in the U.S., which if not exactly the victory which most of the left and far-left made it out to be, certainly showed something more than the abject prostration of the previous 20 years of labor routs (UAW 1978, PATCO, 1981; Greyhound 1983; Phelps-Dodge, 1984; Hormel P-9, 1986; Jay, Maine 1989, Yale 1995, Detroit News 1996, etc. etc. etc.), and above all showed a depth of anger over temp work and support for the strike far beyond the UPS workers themselves, papers such as the Wall Street Journal went wild with invective aimed at Sweeney and Carey for having broken with such a nice consensus! Such invective over a strike that resulted in a 10 cents per year raise over a 5-year contract for temps (who had not had a raise in 14 years) is not exactly the tone one would expect from the cowed management, losing sleep over a post-1973 worker rebellion, portrayed by KK.

12. To put things into perspective (again using the American example, although a similar story could be told for any European country): after the 1945-46 postwar strike wave and the 1948-1953 McCarthyite purge of the labor movement, there were indeed important struggles that escaped management and union control, and were harbingers of the 1965-1973 revolt: the 1955 auto strike, the 1959 steel strike, and the perpetual struggle for control of the shop floor in auto. But management and the unions had not nearly lost control of rank-and-file workers as they did in the latter part of the postwar boom, when e.g. members of the UAW had a de facto 4-day work week through massive absenteeism. Whether "unifocal" or "small step", these are struggles of another era in the days of "lean and mean" management and "just in time" production, which is not to deny the existence of "small steps" struggle in the latter.
A Response to Loren Goldner's Presentation & Criticism

I. We all 'frame' our own experiences or others' experiences in some form (theoretical, ideational & practical) or the other. This framing, which dominates all our symbolically mediated communication(s), is almost impossible to get away from. The process of framing is a fairly tricky affair because it caoles us, urges us (at times thrusts us), sensitizes or de-sensitizes us to the nature of our (and others') experiences in only a specific dimension(s). To be conscious (and reflective) of this process and to be able to destabilize (de-legitimize) dominant & conventional modes of framing can be a significant oppositional practice, if we care to engage in it.

II. Capital*(footnote at end of article) * finds it very annoying to see its relation to labour in its nudity. Thus, it continuously makes numerous assaults of varying amplification to dress us all in different collared costumes. This effectively cushions the sight's.

We are quite dismayed at Loren Goldner's mode of framing his visit to Faridabad and his conversations with us (i.e. KK/Collectivities). The confidence with which Loren uses the term 'Third World', 'Asian Capitalism', 'Japanese capital' makes one squirm. It seems that he does not have any problem with the dominant definitional division of the world that is created, circulated and perpetuated by the ruling configurations of different factions of capital. How this definitional fancy dress so preferred by missionaries of capital goes totally unchallenged by Loren, who otherwise claims to be against the 'imperialist theses', is baffling.

Again and again the reference to the 'Indian left', it's 'inertia', it's this or that completely escapes us. The article makes it appear as if we are constantly fighting some entity called the 'Indian left', 'left parties' etc. What we are up against are managements, state and the politics of representation. These can have many hues and shades and we do not privilege one hue or shade as our main adversary. We are therefore unable to comprehend Loren's insistence on this 'left' angle.

"Particularly in a country such as India, where the left is still weighed down by an enormous legacy of statism, in its Congress, Stalinist and Maoist/"Marxist-Leninist" varieties, the appearance of a working-class current that rejects and combats this statism unequivocally is a phenomenon worthy of international attention" - is this 'enormous legacy of statism' specific to a 'country such as India'? Or is it a legacy and a reality that has got a much deeper root in the dynamics of capital and can be seen in all places?

KK was formed in 1986. KK emerged from a group around a monthly newspaper intervening in industrial conflicts in Faridabad, with a Leninist framework (1982-84). Both practical experiences and an acquaintance with German-Dutch and Italian Lefts through International Communist Current (ICC) led to a critical revaluation of the Leninist framework. Since there had always been a stress that intervention in industrial conflict needed an anchorage in a critique of political economy, these new experiences led to an examination of Rosa Luxemburg's 'The Accumulation of Capital' and re-readings of Marx's three volumes of Capital. Debates with ICC and IBRP(CWO), along with reading of their texts as well as the examination of texts such as Bukharin's critique of Rosa's Accumulation and Paul Mattick's work led to certain conclusions. These conclusions were presented for wider debate with the publication of KK1 (July 1986). Correspondences and debates with groups (such as the EFICC (Belgium), Cuc (France), ICP (England), Echanges (France), PCI Programima (Switzerland), Lal Pataka (India), Samajjati Sangha (India), Wildcat (Britain), Emancipacion Obrero (Argentina), Militancia Clacista
Revolucionario (Uruguay), LRP (USA), Interrogations pour la communite humaine (France) etc.] led to the recognition that a huge barrage of uninformed debates and quotation flinging polemics were camouflaging inabilities to grapple with the reality through categories of the critique of political economy. In an attempt to overcome this, in 1980 we published an abridged version of Rosa’s ‘Accumulation’ along with an introduction and appendices wherein we critically examined certain basic formulations of Marx, Rosa and Lenin. The book was circulated in the above milieu but no one took up the issues, even though the very premises of the groups were put to question.

In 1997, in ‘Reflections on Marx’s Critique of Political Economy’ we again elaborated on the following: a questioning of the very premise of Marx’s formulation of capital (M-C-M); the preponderance of loan dependent production enterprises and the implications of this; the meaninglessness of the concept ‘the rate of profit’ and of ‘the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall’ today; the anti-wage-worker nature of theories of monopoly capital/ imperialism; etc. All these issues have a bearing on wage-workers’ resistances and steps of change. For twelve years now, we have been in touch with various groups and individuals in different parts of the world but we are yet to come across those who are debating these questions. However, Loren Goloner says that these questions have been routinely debated in ‘the international left’. We would certainly like to know of such debates. Moreover, his flagrant usage of the term ‘capitalists’ shows that he is trapped in terminology of the 19th century, and is unaware of the problematic of its usage today. This has also been dealt with in ‘Reflections’.

In Loren’s article, when describing conditions after WWII in North America and Europe, a nostalgic reverie of workers’ power emerges (even when the text is a quote from another quarter) - “In the 1960’s we could tell the boss to stuff his job and walk into another one the next week. Or we could work for six months and then live on state benefit for six months.” The question is where did this bargaining capacity come from? This thesis is very strange and contradictory - that workers controlled the shopfloor but capital ran the show with massive leaps in intensification of work. By the way, describing conditions in North America and Europe, G.Munis writing in 1960 says, “In the strictly economic domain the situation of the working class was never worse than it is today. Everything said to the contrary is so much bullshit.” (‘Unions Against Revolution’, available from Black & Red)

Let us get out of constructing ‘bizarre’ mythologies and try to describe conditions on the basis of still valid categories of the critique of political economy such as the intensity of labour, the working day and the rate of exploitation.

That capital time and again intensifies its offensive on wage-workers we all agree. Loren seems to agree that in the last 25 years there has been an intensification of attacks on wage-workers, gives very many examples to show this, but strangely refuses to talk about the process by which these attacks were actualized. The critical question is how capital implements the policies of downsizing, intensification and wage cuts? How did it break the old workers’ fortresses? What were its strategies? It would be helpful for us to debate these issues substantively, especially when we do get to know of the actual unfolding of events. A mere assertion about events does not make the events ‘known’. We can exchange notes on methods of resistance(s) only when we are dealing with the HOWs of the attacks.

Capital, the social relation, has long been global in nature, and operating at a global level. Giving it a nation-ality or continent-ality, a la ‘Japanese capital’, ‘Asian capitalism’ only nurtures identity politics. Our activity is to participate in resistances and steps of change by wage-workers. The debates which are meaningful are those which evaluate the efficacy of steps of resistances and change through a continuous evaluation of experiences. 1905 Soviets, 1917-18 Russia-Germany, 1936 Spain can be evaluated and practical lessons drawn only when the impact of routine resistances and steps of change is scrutinized. All information
that we have been able to access shows that representation & delegation were not challenged during these events. This lack contributed to the enhancement of proto-state tendencies.

There is some serious confusion regarding what we have to say about conditions of wage-work all over the world. We are not saying that wage rates are the same all over the world - we would have gone nuts to make such idiotic claims. What we are saying is that the same processes are acting all over the world, with the scales of intensification, rate of exploitation, and working day varying from place to place, location to location. It is an undeniable fact that all these have increased exponentially, no matter what the location, in this century.

We are categorically saying that the levels of supervision, policing and surveillance show the range & degree of resistance to the regimes of work, productivity & discipline. The exponential increase in these control & coercion apparatuses shows also the weakness of state apparatuses & management. Whether one finds reflection of this weakening in the financial & business press that Loren refers to, we do not know. But we do find reflection of this 'process of weakening' in the phenomenal growth of security services and the expenditure over the mushrooming technologies of control. The expenditure on the other 'cloudy mushroom' can be left aside. Slave labor in state prison shows a besieged, decaying system - not a confident system.

Let us also try and define 'small steps'. These are steps of self-activity that wage-workers in small groups or individually take routinely. These are steps taken after a lot of discussion and deliberation, and do not follow any specific procedure. These are steps that everyone participates in, and acts without leaders & representatives. These are steps that managements are very weary (and wary) of and are sources of constant tension for them. Supervisors, foremen and leaders are in constant fear of these steps. These are steps that are very low on visibility, almost wordless but extremely effective. The unregulated, diffuse, endless and rule-less nature of these steps are their strength. This strength, however, has also its major weakness because these are rarely discussed amongst wage-workers as significant and pregnant with possibilities. Probably the routine, everyday, non-heroic nature of these steps stop them from being taken seriously in a political milieu immersed in the worship of extraordinary, grand, heroic resistances, with more and more martyrs and less and less gain.

What are we at present grappling with is to find a practice that is based on the self-activity of wage-workers, which is anti representatives & leaders. A self-activity that everyone can participate in their own terms, and create modes of resistances that are within their own control. A self-activity that is routine and non-heroic (because heroism implies events, not processes). A self-activity that refuses to get abducted by the politics of representation and to become a target of already laid down assault paths. A self-activity that constantly expands its linkages through conversations amongst wage-workers on ever larger scales.

The workers of Jhalani Tools are not carrying 'informational pickets'. One of the activities that some workers of Jhalani Tools do before and after their shift hours is to stand along a road, during morning or evening shift-change hours, in groups of six or eight, with hand written placards. They have been doing this daily since August 1997. On the placards is written: "We are from the 2000 workers who have not been paid their wages for (so many) months"; "What is to be done when managements do not pay wages?"; "We have changed leaders four times and union flags three times, but each time it has been from the frying pan into the fire"; "We have made many complaints to govt. officials and ministers but conditions have gone from bad to worse"; "Metal Box, Delta Tools, Electronics Ltd. and now Jhalani Tools workers. Whose turn tomorrow?"; etc. Everyday they space themselves along a different road. Along each route that they stand on, workers from hundreds of factories pass by. Over this
period of nine months, more than 200,000 workers have read their placards and thousands of workers have stopped to have extensive conversations with them. In almost all factories of Faridabad questions posed by these workers are being debated. What is being discussed by an ever-increasing number of wage-workers is how to act on their own strength against the triumvirate of state, management and representatives. It is a constant process of conversation, argument and counter-argument as to the whats and hows of resistance. There is awareness that the charted out paths and networks of representatives, leaders and their organisations are all geared to subvert this process.

Loren's criticism that we are trapped in the logic of the 'individual enterprise' is simply untrue. For the last twelve years all our theoretical and practical activity has been geared to locating the discussion in terms of a global reality of capital, to show the global linkages of the social formation of wage-labour based production for the market. And to show the emergence of loan based production enterprises and the immense flexibility and mobility of capital. 'a ballad against work' & 'Reflection on Marx's Critique of Political Economy' were written to forefront this in debate and to facilitate conceptualizations for a global practice. When we say 'wage-workers in India' and not 'Indian workers', it is to articulate this reality. Our critiques of dominant modes of struggles have stressed the fact that the politics of territorially (i.e. marking, control & defence of a territory), be it of a factory, or a region or a nation, is dangerous for wage-workers and is sure to lay the grounds for its defeat. Our critique of representation & delegation emerges from this realization. Representatives armed with delegated power need the language of territoriality to make the workers return to productive labour in that hellhole of discipline and punishment called the factory. Defence of territoriality unleashes nothing but this punishment. Making a fetish out of defeat does not in any way help us. Only when we can learn from a defeat can we know what NOT to repeat.

The metaphor 'bees united in a hive can easily be put off by smoke and their honey taken away, but if affinity groups of bees swarm about, no one dares touch their honey' was articulated by a worker in a spontaneous mass meeting outside the district administration office to counter the ageless rhetoric of unity and delegation (for negotiations with management & administration) put forward by leaders. It did very well to thwart leaders, management & administration's attempts to control the workers at that very critical juncture. We do not extrapolate more from this metaphor, and in fact anticipate thousands of more creative articulations from wage-workers in their struggle against the politics of representation and for newer and sharper methods of resistance.

To make wage-workers more productive, managements & state apparatuses make a lot of investment in living & working conditions and for the training of workers. These investments range from installation of an exhaust fan in a foundry to air-conditioning of factory premises, uniforms, shoes, gloves, canteen, roads and railroads, sanitation, accidents & injury care, disciplining and training institutes like school. Investments in these branches wax and wane in a specific location as per the requirements of capital at that point of time. 'Welfare state' is a term circulated by state apparatuses to enhance their legitimacy.

In a Goodyear Tyre factory, the management has installed state of the art technologies to see to it that not a fly, not an insect can pollute the factory canteen and become a health hazard for workers. The slogan is 'A Healthy worker is a Productive worker'.

As per critique of political economy, in the total capital, V (total wage) is the summation of wages of all the workers. We see no reason to change this formulation by bringing in the concept of social wage. Ensuring the terminologies of 'welfare state' in concepts like 'social wage' is playing into the hands of the managements. 'Democratisation', 'totalitarianisation', 'welfarisation', 'dismembering the welfarisation', seeking the 'proper mix', etc. are all steps at grabbing the maximum.
possible portion of global produce by different state-apparatuses.

An elaboration on strikes (unifocal struggles) can be seen in our text 'Towards a Critique of Representation & Delegation'.

A clarification regarding a statement in the write-up "KK members have been beaten up many times by goons of the left parties and the unions, but more recently they are left alone", which we think can give rise to some erroneous ideas. What we discussed was that when we were staking claims for alternate leadership (in 1982-84, when KK did not exist) we were then in the direct line of fire and thus got ourselves thrashed by entrenched union goons. But when our practice shifted to self-activity by workers themselves and we would not provide targets, it then became very difficult for goons to indulge in direct assault. It is very difficult to arbitrarily start hitting any and everybody! But threats, suspensions and dismissals do not disappear. Actually many of us are at present under dismissals. This is not to quibble over accuracy but to say that 'left alone' should be used and read very judiciously.

We are sure that wage-workers everywhere, in all branches, whether in manufacturing, banking, agriculture, transport, marketing, research or even media, routinely resist the regimes of work & discipline. We are attempting to share experiences and evolve multi-nodal modes of linkups with wage-workers in all branches. These are not 'linear additions' but non-linear connectivities. Mathematically it can be characterized as deterministic chaos as in the Mandelbrot set.

Most of the reports in Loren's write-up about Faridabad and other parts of India are concerned with downsizing. It is therefore strange that when he writes his criticism, he asserts that Faridabad has not been hit by downsizing as yet. Also, considering the fact that Loren holds to the axiom that 'emancipation of wage-workers is the task of wage-workers themselves', it is odder still to find him labeling our attempts at extension and expansion of wage-workers' self-activities as supplementing capital's acts at fragmenting wage-workers.

The wage-worker is rarely seen as a 'resisting self'. This not-seeing gives rise to narratives that need mass-forms and spectacular forms in order to see resistance. This search for mass-form makes one oblivious to resistances all around oneself, further hindering recognition of resistances all over. It is our firm conviction, arising out of the experience of so many, that it is possible to deeply connect with one another through recognition and appreciation of each others 'resisting selves', selves that routinely resist the regimes of work, productivity & discipline. It is only on this grounding that we imagine a dismantling of the existing global system.

(Footnote on page 1 reads : * What is meant by the term 'capital' is wage-labour based production for the market. Refer to our publication 'Reflections on Marx's Critique of Political Economy' for details.)

KK/Collectivities
12 April, 1998.
Re Kamunist Kranti and Self Activity

A friend and I were in India from January 12 to March 9 as tourists. A couple of days after our arrival in Delhi I got in touch with a member of Kamunist Kranti’s Delhi group who took me on the train to visit the group in Faridabad. The group’s headquarters is the Majdoor Library. It is one of a hundred or more small adobe buildings housing workers in a narrow unpaved alley on a strip of land running for about three quarters of a mile along a open stagnant drain on one side and factories shoulder to shoulder on the other. The original library is a plaster and brick building about ten feet square squeezed in an alley with the back abutting a factory making leaf springs for trucks. Recently the group obtained additional space so they could expand, and the present library includes a small open courtyard and a roofed meeting hall, altogether about the size of a double garage, perhaps twenty-five feet square.

We spent the day discussing KK, the condition of workers in Faridabad, and the revolutionary strategy KK has worked out there. A major difficulty was the combination of my deafness and unfamiliarity with the pronunciation and cadence of the English spoken in India. As a result much that was said had to be repeated, most frustrating for them, I’m sure.

During this and another visit to Faridabad in March when we returned to Delhi as well as other meetings with KK members in Delhi, I think I got a fairly good picture of the group’s activities and practice. For one thing, they are a part of the Faridabad working class and are employed in the factories there. Also, they have succeeded in gaining the respect of many Faridabad industrial workers. Their primary activity is the distribution of 5000 copies of their four-page paper Majdoor Samachar, (Wage Workers’ News). They don’t sell it; rather, eight or ten members gather on successive days at one of the eleven locations along the roads where workers pass on their way to work and distribute it free. They don’t press it on workers as we did with SLP leaflets in the old days when we could distribute at factory gates; rather they hold up the paper, and workers come up to get a copy. The five thousand copies are distributed within eleven days after publication. This method of distribution provides countless opportunities for impromptu discussions about workplace conditions and other things that are on workers’ minds.

A major component of the paper’s content is the information provided by workers during these impromptu discussions as well as by KK members who work in the various shops. Articles can deal with the specifics of things that concern workers most directly like management activities at different plants, how workers are resisting, the role of the unions in various plants. They showed me a copy book in which workers who came into the Majdoor Library had written about their shop floor experiences with the unions and management. Many of these are published, and members distill articles on factory conditions from the comments they get as they distribute the paper. This activity has made the Majdoor Library a meeting place for workers who have lost confidence in the unions as a defender of their interests. In fact, the Majdoor Library’s expansion was made necessary by the growth and frequency of the impromptu meetings of workers who see the library as a center where they can gather and discuss the latest in management outrages.

KK’s critique of unions has its roots in Indian laws that limit a company’s right to downsize and close plants. Management has found the unions to be willing partners in efforts to circumvent such laws, their favorite device being to get union leaders to call a strike enabling the company to lock out workers and either close down permanently or downsize later by opening with fewer workers. Examples of this are
described in the pamphlet and Goldner’s article above. (I might add that anyone who has witnessed events in the U.S. like the Detroit newspaper strike will agree that Indian unions are not alone in playing this Judas sheep role.)

The genesis of KK’s new “critique of representation and delegation” was clearly the recognition of the sell-out role of the leaders of the unions and radical parties in Faridabad. Convinced after several years of what they call their “teach and preach” phase that the best they could hope to accomplish was to replace the existing unions with new ones or to create an alternative leadership subject to the temptation to sell out as the existing leaders, the KK concluded that the solution lay in opposing all organization of workers larger than the six to eight members of the naturally occurring small informal “affinity groups” whose friendship and trust develops from their being thrown together on the job. Such groups don’t need leaders (representatives and delegates).

* * * * *

How do we explain KK’s impact on workers in Faridabad and ability to become a part—indeed a trusted part—of the working class there. Clearly they are doing something right. I think there are several factors that explain there success. One possibility is that they have been willing to engage in self-criticism and to allow their program and tactics to evolve. That evolution led them to political stance that promotes trust. It may be that a group that eschews leadership or would-be leadership and the arrogance that goes with it and advocates a program of “self activity” of workers has a built-in advantage over most of us preachers and teachers.

Another factor in KK’s success may relate to a happy conjunction of circumstances:
1. They are located in an overwhelmingly industrial center, not too large – one million, of whom 300,000 are industrial workers according to Loren Goldner, and we can assume that their experiences with management on the job are roughly similar.
2. KK has easy access to workers as they go to and from the factory each day.
3. They have the financial wherewithal to publish a monthly four-page tabloid size newspaper.
4. They can also afford a permanent meeting place.

As an old-time leaflet distributor number 2 strikes me as being very important. In Faridabad most workers walk at least part of the way to work on public roads. They see the KK members holding up the newspaper for them to take and they can see the signs telling of new outrages visited on workers in a plant they know about. And workers, on the way home, at least, have time to talk to distributors.

Even a half century or more ago when I began distributing SLP leaflets, things were not that good in the U.S. Workers generally had cars which insulated them from us malcontents. But in the older factories built without attached parking lots, we could distribute as they walked between the car and the factory gate. Nowadays nearly everyone drives to work and parking lots are built on company property inside the gate. Workers go directly into the shop without being exposed to our literature.

The “happy conjunction of circumstances” restrained my enthusiasm for the Faridabad solution at first. Another objection was that KK’s experience was limited to industrial workers, only a small part of the working class in India as elsewhere. (The most recent figure I’ve seen for the U.S. is 17 percent.) But
on a little reflection I realized that whether we work in food production or health or education or construction we are exposed to the same profit system that industrial workers must contend with. It creates the day to day authoritarian harassment of workers on the job, the insecurity of employment, and the ongoing efforts to raise profits by cheapening labor.

Affinity Groups

In discussion with KK members my objections to the affinity group as the logical form of worker organization disappeared. These had included on the difficulty temporary workers would encounter in being accepted into affinity groups, the members of which would see temps as possible replacements. In fact, I would have guessed that management would see this as a side benefit of using temps. KK members argued that temps brought in during busy times are bringing new ideas of resistance with them from other shops where they have worked. They serve a sort of cross pollination purpose. For that matter affinity groups can arise among temps as well as other types of labor situations that capitalist unions have found difficult to organize. As wage slaves we all stand in the same relationship to capital.

What is more natural than to discuss our situation as workers when the opportunity arises and to resist in covert ways. Informal groups of workers have always resisted the speedup and other oppressive acts of management. We can trace such resistance back to plantation slaves in the South and—I suppose—to the conditions that brought recruits to Spartacus in Italy 2000 years ago.

I think most readers believe as I do that the labor movement must be more than defensive—that its object should be emancipation from wage slavery. Can “self activity” lead to revolutionary class consciousness? KK members claim that it does, that workers in affinity groups see their specific problems as originating in the capitalist system itself. If this is indeed the case—that the desire to depose the boss leads to the desire to abolish the boss’s system, then KK is indeed onto something.

As a DeLeonist I can’t dismiss the revolutionary potential of workplace affinity groups. For me the real revolutionary act, the abolition of capitalism, happens when the workers take possession of the workplace and produce goods and services to satisfy human needs. Off hand I can see no reason why assembled affinity groups as well as socialist industrial union members in a factory or other workplace can’t conclude that they must take over the workplace and begin producing to satisfy human needs.

I think, though, that the “teach and preach” element among us DeLeonists and World Socialists will have trouble coming to terms with the implicitly anti-political nature of KK’s new revolutionary paradigm as well as its anti-organizational stance. The same is true of the direct actionists—the IWW and anarcho-syndicalists—both of which have programs and structure which employs representation and delegation. Not even the council communists, probably KK’s closest ideological relatives in the ultra left because KK’s thinking includes the councilist idea of worker spontaneity, will feel comfortable, given the representation and delegation implicit in workers’ councils.

And this doesn’t even touch on the real problem for affinity group theoreticians: How do we create a functioning post-capitalist society that avoids representation and delegation? When I raised the question with KK members, they said simply that workers in different parts of the world will build the kinds of social organs that seem most appropriate to them and their circumstances. I find this a less than
satisfactory answer. For one thing it suggests an unwillingness to consider the problems of carrying on production in even one factory without workers delegating their affinity group's authority to a representative. I can see the advantages of the affinity group in the pre-revolutionary stages of the social upheaval that will precede the revolution. I am much less convinced of its possibilities after the revolution.

I can't end this without mentioning the kindness with which KK members received me. They took time out to talk to me, they took me places, they invited me into their homes, they fed me, they were patient with my hearing problem, and they left me with a host of pleasant memories of them individually and of KK as a group.

---Frank Girard

---

Dear Frank & DB Readers:

I would like to address some of Larry Gambone's statements he made in DB94 in which he attempts to whitewash the fascist nature of the American right.

First, American capitalism, contrary to the right-wing myth, was not the small child in the wilderness that singlehandedly beat the odds and grew to adulthood. The federal government has always been the central promoter of, and benefactor to, the elite capitalist class.

Larry is of the mistaken impression that in order for central government control of business to be fascist in nature, that governmental control must be exercised in the form of ownership. A clever argument put forth by American rightests in an attempt to cover-up their fascist nature.

Under fascism, the means of production are under private ownership with centralized governmental control. In America, the use of various business-friendly incentives backed by the military power of the U.S. is a core component of capitalism, centralized in nature, and very much a controlling factor in the global advancement of capitalism. The right-wing has always been highly supportive of fascist aspect of big government.

It's a stretch of reality to even remotely insinuate that corporate America rose up to its present global hegemony based upon "Rugged Individualism." That's pure fantasy manufactured by Propaganda Americana.

Larry attempts to use this same illusion by painting rightest groups as "extreme individualists." Many of these groups, such as militias and patriot groups, exhibit almost all the characteristics of fascism. Among them:

* Forcible suppression of leftists, unions, minorities, and other groups opposing capitalism.
* Belligerent nationalism, racism, and immigrant-bashing.
* Glorification of war and support of militarism.

The American right is a two-headed beast. One face says
it wants less government involvement (i.e., unregulated gun ownership, no taxes, no welfare for poor people, no abortion on demand, etc.), but the second face says we have to pass restrictive constitutional amendments and federal laws (i.e., protect the flag from flame, promote religious fanaticism, increased militarization of society, etc.).

Righteots generally oppose abortion rights but are in favor of life sentences and the death penalty for young wayward children. The right doesn’t want government meddling in its affairs but actively promotes intrusions of big government when the target is programs and rights generally associated with the left.

Larry states in his letter:

"Everywhere that fascism prevailed, ... the Church long prior, had imposed a corporatist and collectivist world view upon the population. The individual was of secondary importance to Church and State. This was not the case in the USA ... where the tendency was more the primacy of the individual."

Contrary to what Larry states, the church has been the helping hand of capitalism in America, along with the State. Talk to any right-wing Christian fundamentalist for five minutes and you will find that they align their "gospel" almost 100 percent with American capitalism and nationalism. And the ideology of Americanism preached by the right, and taught in our schools, is, in fact, a collectivist world view imposed upon the population.

"The primacy of the individual" Larry writes of, is some more of that Americana hog-selling. The "individual" that is so important to the American State is the corporation. It’s no coincidence that the corporation is considered an individual under U.S. law. That’s what holds "primacy" in America.

The flesh-and-blood individual, such as the lowly worker, has, in fact, been treated as "secondary" in importance compared to the corporate individual; having been gassed, beaten and shot for his or her effort at advancement.

To sum up. Yes, the American right-wing is very much a neo-fascist movement.

In The Struggle,

Ronald A. Young
Dear Frank/DB,

Despite your promise to reveal to me the IWW’s anti-statist credentials (DB 94, p. 17), nothing materialised. You can quote as many phrases about “Industrial Government” as you like; this sheds little light on the process of social transformation.

Then and now, the IWW does NOT seek to capture, abolish, or smash the state.

Most of my five points are generally accepted features of a definition of syndicalism. They can be found in contemporary, internal education documents for new members of SAC. Would you like a copy?

I didn’t mention Spain or the debacle of the Spanish Revolution. I don’t think those features are passed down from on high either. However, I think if people are going to have a discussion, that it helps if they know something about the subject matter. Hell, look at what many people mean by the term socialism!

Those five features of syndicalism did not apply to the IWW in its heyday, and they still don’t.

Fraternally,

Derek Devine

Dear Readers,

The problem with the sort of debate Derek and I are involved in is that it depends so much on the definition of abstract ideas, terms like “socialism” and “syndicalism.” I can’t really prove that Derek’s five characteristics of syndicalism are wrong. For me, though, the defining aspect of syndicalism was the stateless industrial form of government which I associated with it. For evidence that such a similarity exists between the industrial unionism of the IWW at its founding and syndicalism, I refer him to what has become the definitive history of the IWW, We Shall Be All, by Melvyn Dubofsky, whose hostility to De Leon and the SLP makes him one of my least favorite labor historians. See page 167 of the book:

"There will be no such things as states," Haywood said. "The industries will take the place of what are now existing States." Dubofsky continues with a quotation from Ben Williams on the role of brain workers in the post-revolutionary society and says, "It was this aspect of the IWW combined with its abiding distrust of political parties and the state, which made the American Industrial Workers so much like the continental European syndicalists of the same era."

But all this is essentially the point I made in DB92.

--Frank Girard
discussion with KK members of the thinking in the pamphlet.

Ronald Young's letter raises questions about Larry Gambone's take on fascism. I think, though, that the "Church" Larry was referring to was the Catholic church as it existed—and probably still exists—in Italy. Derek Devine has written a short note attempting to set me right on syndicalism as it relates to the IWW. Part of the trouble is that I am no more willing to accept "generally accepted" definitions of syndicalism than either Derek or I are to accept such definitions of socialism. But my understanding of the term always related to its ideas of a new society, one based on the workplace. As usual we end this issue with some notes, announcements, and short reviews.

Finances

As usual the financial statement in DB94 was all screwed up, but not because of my arithmetic. This time I decided to actually check the whole thing out, something I usually avoid because I don't want to take the time and because, since I believe Old Kent Bank knows more about counting money than I, the balances they have is more likely to be correct than mine. As a result of my research I found that I had managed to include among the disbursements the $40 for PO box rent and $14 for bank charges both of which had been included in the disbursements in DB93. Consequently we have a more encouraging beginning bank balance. And considering the drop in income, our final balance isn't so bad either.

Contributions: Glenn Morrison $7, Monroe Prussack $2, Eugene Rodriguez $10, Ken Ellis $1.
Total $20. Thank you, comrades.

BALANCE  March 25, 1999  $364.13

RECEIPTS
Contributions $ 20.00
Subs and sales 104.00
Total $ 124.00

DISBURSEMENTS
Postage $ 85.00
Printing 36.29
Bank charges 7.00
Postage due 3.50
Total $131.79

BALANCE  May 1, 1999  $356.34

Fraternally submitted,
Frank Girard for the DB
NOTES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND SHORT REVIEWS

Kamunist Kraati/Collectivities' three recently published English language pamphlets: *A Ballad Against Work, Reflections on Marx's Critique of Political Economy,* and *Self Activity of Wage Workers,* are all available at no cost postpaid from the DB. Just drop us a card or e-mail <fgirard@iserv.net>.

*Kick It Over* is back in print after a hiatus of three years. Describing itself as a "social anarchist anti-authoritarian Quarterly," the winter 1999 issue contains articles on the millennium and civilization, "Seven Deadly Assumptions;" the range of anarchist ideas, "Broadening the Anarchist Gene Pool;" and the anarchist future society, "The City in Anarchy," along with what promises to be a lively letters column in future issues, some foreign anarchist material, and articles on the arts. $3.75, $14.75 for a four-issue sub from PO Box 1836, Guelph, On. N1H 7A1, Canada.

Workers Solidarity is the newsletter of the Workers Solidarity Alliance. This Spring 1999 issue may be the first. It contains articles on the international resistance to sweatshops, the origin of May Day and its connection with the Haymarket martyrs, and a two page section of short articles that includes this remark by labor hero John Sweeney in a speech to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; "Your success is our success." Eight 7 by 8 1/2 inch pages, it is free and available from WSA, 339 Lafayette St., #202, New York, NY 10012.

The Black-Clad Messenger Nos. 1 and 2 "Actualizing Industrial Collapse" come to us from Eugene, Oregon, that hotbed of what I think of as Zerzanism (actually neo-primitivism). Both issues lead off with a mission statement that begins: "Open to everyone who wants to hasten the disappearance of this whole stinking order..." The contents include an article by Bob Black on the Eugene Police Department, a letter from Ted Kuczynski on the Nike protest, and an article suggesting measures anarchists can take to prepare for revolution at midnight on January 1, 2000. No price given, from AAA, PO Box 11331, Eugene, OR 97440.

–fg