Nature, Society, and Thought

NST

a Journal of Dialectical and Historical Materialism

EDITOR: Erwin Marquit (physics, Univ. of Minnesota)
MANUSCRIPT EDITOR: Leo Auerbach (English education, retired, Jersey City State College)
EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerald M. Erickson, April Ane Knutson, Doris Grieser Marquit (BOOK REVIEW EDITOR)
ASSOCIATE EDITORS:
Herbert Aptheker (history)
Jan Carew (African American studies, Northwestern Univ.)
Gerald M. Erickson (classical studies, Univ. of Minnesota)
Morton H. Frank (physiology)
Viktoria Hertling (German exile & Holocaust literature, Univ. of Nevada, Reno)
Gerald Horne (African American studies, Univ. of North Carolina)
Leola A. Johnson (communications, Macalester College)
April Ane Knutson (French literature, Univ. of Minnesota)
Jack Kurzweil (electrical engineering, San Jose State Univ.)
James Lawler (philosophy, State Univ. of New York, Buffalo)
Sara Fletcher Luther (political sociology)
Doris Grieser Marquit (literature, women's studies)
Philip Moran (philosophy, Triton College)
Michael Parenti (political science)
Epifanio San Juan (humanities, Wesleyan Univ.)
José A. Soler (labor education, Univ. of Massachusetts, Dartmouth)
Ethel Tobach (comparative psychology, City Univ. of New York)

VOL. 14, NO. 3 (JULY 2001) Sent to press September 13, 2002
Copyright © Marxist Educational Press
All rights reserved

Cover design by Prockat

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 3 JULY 2001

NST: NATURE, SOCIETY, AND THOUGHT (ISSN 0890-6130). Published quarterly in January, April, July, and October by MEP Publications, University of Minnesota, Physics Building, 116 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0112. Periodicals postage paid at Minneapolis, Minnesota. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *NST: Nature, Society, and Thought*, University of Minnesota, Physics Building, 116 Church St. S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0112.

Subscriptions. U.S.A./Great Britain, one year, individuals $15/£14, institutions $28/£23; two years, individuals $28/£26, institutions $56/£45.50. Other countries, add $5 for postage for each year. Single copies: individuals $5/£3.50, institutions $10/£6.

Subscription and editorial address: *NST*, University of Minnesota, Physics Building, 116 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0112 (tel. 612-922-7993).

Contents are indexed in *Sociological Abstracts* and *Alternative Press Index.* A complete index of all articles ever published in *Nature, Society, and Thought* is given on <www.umn.edu/home/marqu002>.

Information for Contributors

Nature, Society, and Thought welcomes contributions representing the creative application of methods of dialectical and historical materialism to all fields of study. We also welcome contributions not explicitly employing this methodology if the content or subject matter is in an area of special importance to our readers. Submissions will be reviewed in accordance with refereeing procedures established by the Editorial Board. Manuscripts will be acknowledged on receipt, but cannot be returned.

Submissions should be made in triplicate, typed, double-spaced, with at least 1-inch margins. Normal length of articles is between 3,000 and 10,000 words, with an abstract of about 100 words. Manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the MEP Publications Documentation Style Guide (*see* <www.umn.edu/home/marqu002/mepstyle.htm>). Citations should follow the author-date system, with limited use of endnotes for discursive matter, as specified in the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th edition.

Unless otherwise arranged, manuscripts should be submitted with the understanding that upon acceptance for publication the authors will submit the manuscript on a PC- or Macintosh-compatible diskette and transfer the copyright to *NST*, the authors retaining the right to include the submission in books under their authorship. Diskettes cannot be returned.

CONTENTS

Vol. 14, No. 3 (2001)

ARTICLES

Jürgen Rojahn, A *MEGA* Update 249

Pradip Baksi, *MEGA* IV/3: Marx's Notes, 1844–1847 253

Morris Zeitlin, Globalization: Part 1—Its Advocates 269

Victor G. Devinatz, The Antipolitics and Politics of a New Left Union Caucus: The Workers' Voice Committee of UAW Local 6, 1970–1975 285

MARXIST FORUM 323

Tom Meisenhelder, The Contemporary Significance of Karl Korsch's Marxism 325

Robert Steigerwald, The Radical Voluntarism of Karl Korsch 337

BOOKS AND IDEAS by Herbert Aptheker 346

BOOK REVIEWS

Stephan Lieske, *British Marxist Criticism*, edited by Victor N. Paananen 354

Edward D'Angelo, *The Consolation of Ontology*, by Egon Bondy 358

Eric R. Jackson, *Black Workers Remember*, by Michael K. Honey; *The Bridge over the Racial Divide*, by William Julius Wilson 360

Jeffrey R. Kerr-Ritchie, Affirming Action: A Comment on the Work of William Julius Wilson 365

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES (in English and French) 369

A *MEGA* Update

Jürgen Rojahn

The attentive reader of my article, "Publishing Marx and Engels after 1989: The Fate of the *MEGA*," published in volume 13, no. 4 (October 2000) of this journal, may have been surprised to read in its concluding section about "the current state" of the *MEGA*, "This year the first volume edited under the auspices of the IMES . . . vol. IV/3, will be published." *MEGA* IV/3, comprising Marx's 1844–47 excerpt notebooks, was published in 1998. My article was actually written in that year. èFortunately the MEGA project has not stood still since then.

As I said in my article, the *Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung* (IMES), from the outset, has endeavored to ensure that the *MEGA* was continued as a purely academic project–that is, the editorial work should not be constrained by the interests and needs of any political party. It was for this reason that, despite the commendable support offered by the publishing house of the (post-)Communist Dietz Verlag, Berlin, the IMES finally decided to change publishers. So, *MEGA* IV/3 was not only the first volume edited according to the new editorial guidelines, but also the first volume published by Akademie Verlag (Palisadenstrasse 40, D-10243 Berlin, Germany, phone 49-30-42200611, fax 49-30-42200657, e-mail <info@akademie-verlag.de>. This is an experienced publishing house that has acquired a worldwide reputation for this kind of publication.

MEGA IV/3 exemplifies the fruitful cooperation, inaugurated by the IMES, of old and new editors, and of editors from various

countries. In this case, experienced *MEGA* editors from Moscow worked together with me, a "new" editor from Amsterdam (coordinating the work in Moscow on behalf of the International Institute of Social History [IISH], which funded the Russian teams at that time). The major part of the editorial work was done by the Russian scholars, Georgii Bagaturiia, Lev Churbanov, Ol'ga Koroleva, and Liudmila Vasina. My part consisted of a comprehensive revision of the apparatus and in writing the general introduction to the volume. It is true, we had heated discussions on a number of points. However, the undeniable differences in outlook and style did not impair our sincere mutual respect, and close personal relations developed. When the volume came off the press in December 1998, a number of leading European newspapers reported this event. (For a description of the contents of the volume, etc., see the article by Pradip Baksi in the pages following this update).

Similarly, the preparatory publication for *MEGA* IV/32 published in 1999 is the result of joint efforts of German and èRussian scholars. It was edited by Hans-Peter Harstick, Gerald Hubmann, Richard Sperl, and Hanno Strauss of Berlin, cooperating with Larisa Mis'kevich and Ninel' Rumiantseva of Moscow and Karl-Ludwig König of Trier, Germany. The volume contains an annotated catalogue of the 1,450 books (2,100 volumes) once belonging to Marx and Engels that could be traced to date. After the exact bibliographical description of each book, its present location is given. Also, dedications and marks of ownership as well as the pages containing marginalia or other marks by Marx and Engels are noted. Finally there is documentation showing whether Marx and Engels made excerpts from that book, and whether it is mentioned in their writings. In the lengthy introduction to the volume, the turbulent history of this unusual collection of books is laid out in detail.

Besides this volume, *MEGA* IV/31, including Marx and Engels's 1877–83 excerpt notebooks on natural sciences, was published in 1999. It was edited by the former team at Humboldt University in Berlin, which, led by Anneliese Griese, continued

the work on this volume voluntarily. (For further details, see the article by Pradip Baksi [to be published in vol. 14, no. 4 of this journal.) *MEGA* III/10 followed in 2000, edited by Galina Golovina, Tat'iana Gioeva and Jurii Vasin of Moscow and Rolf Dlubek of Berlin. In 2001 appeared *MEGA* I/14, edited by Hans-Jürgen Bochinski, Ute Emmerich, Martin Hundt, and Manfred Neuhaus of Berlin. *MEGA* III/10 contains the letters from and to Marx/Engels from September 1859 to May 1860. In *MEGA* I/14, the works and drafts Marx/Engels wrote in 1855 are published. If everything works out, by the end of 2002, three more volumes, *MEGA* I/31 (Engels's works and drafts from 1886–91), II/14 (Engels's manuscripts for his edition of vol. 3 of *Capital*), and III/9 (the correspondence from January 1858 to August 1859), will be published.

In 1999 we were able to form a new team of scholars from Germany and Italy to work on *MEGA* III/29. The Japanese team was extended by a number of scholars who started the work on MEGA IV/17, IV/18, and IV/19. Further, we were very pleased to hear that the U.S. team (Kevin Anderson et al.), which, together with scholars from Moscow, Berlin, and Amsterdam (among them this author), is working on *MEGA* IV/27, received a grant from the National Endowment of the Humanities.

In conclusion, I would like to mention that, after the reorganization of the project was completed, I indicated my intention to resign from the post of IMES secretary, which I had held since the foundation of the IMES. In 2000, this post was taken over by Manfred Neuhaus (BBAW/MEGA, Jägerstrasse 22/21, D-10117 Berlin, Germany, phone 49–30–20370637, fax 49-30-20370403, e-mail <neuhaus@bbaw.de>).

REFERENCE LIST

MEGA I/14: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. *Gesamtausgabe.* Section I: *Werke, Artikel, Entwürfe.* Volume 14: *Januar bis Dezember 1855,* edited by Hans-Jürgen Bochinski and Martin Hundt, with the collaboration of Ute Emmrich and Manfred Neuhaus. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001, xv, 1693 pp.

MEGA III/10: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. *Gesamtausgabe.* Section III: *Briefwechsel.* Volume 10: *September 1859 bis Mai 1860,* edited by Galina Golovina, Tat'iana Gioeva, Iurii Vasin, and Rolf Dlubek, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000, xvii, 1269 pp.

MEGA IV/3: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. *Gesamtausgabe.* Section IV: *Exzerpte, Notizen, Marginalien.* Volume 3: Karl Marx. *Exzerpte und Notizen Sommer 1844 bis Anfang 1847,* edited by Georgii Bagaturiia, Lev Churbanov, Ol'ga Koroleva, and Liudmila Vasina, with the collaboration of Jürgen Rojahn. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, ix, 866 pp.

MEGA IV/31: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels. *Gesamtausgabe.* Section IV: *Exzerpte, Notizen, Marginalien*. Volume 31: *Naturwissenschaftliche Exzerpte und Notizen Mitte 1877 bis Anfang 1883,* edited by Anneliese Griese, Friederun Fessen, Peter Jäckel, and Gerd Pawelzig. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999, xv, 1055 pp.

Preparatory publication for *MEGA* IV/32. Hans-Peter Harstick, Richard Sperl, and Hanno Strauss, editors, with the collaboration of Gerald Hubmann, Karl-Ludwig König, Larisa Mis'kevich, and Ninel' Rumiantseva: *Die Bibliotheken von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels. Annotiertes Gesamtverzeichnis des ermittelten Bestandes.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999, 738 pp.

MEGA IV/3: Marx's Notes, 1844–1847

Pradip Baksi

Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)*. Edited under the auspices of Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung. Section IV: *Exzerpte. Notizen. Marginalien.* Volume 3: Karl Marx, *Exzerpte und Notizen: Sommer 1844 bis Anfang 1847*. Editorial team: Georgij Bagaturija, Lev Churbanov, Ol'ga Koroleva und Ljudmila Vasina in cooperation with Jürgen Rojahn. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 1998. In two partial volumes. ISBN 3–05–003398–3.

MEGA IV/3 came out in December 1998, as the first section of the *MEGA* edited according to the guidelines of the Internationale Marx-Engels-Stiftung (Amsterdam) and published by the Akademie Verlag (Berlin). The texts contained in this very impressively edited and produced volume are Marx's personal notebook for the years 1844–1847 (5–30), two of his Paris exercise books containing excerpts made during the years 1844/1845 (35–110), and six exercise books containing excerpts made by Marx during his stay at Brussels in 1845, prior to his trip to England in July-August the same year (115–433). The Apparatus contains an introduction (449–82); editorial remarks on the origin and historical trajectory of individual texts; indexes of their variant readings, corrections, deviations in the excerpts from the originals; stress marks in the margins; editorial commentaries, Marx's insertions and comments; a note on a missing exercise book of that period; name index; indexes of the literature used or mentioned in the texts and Apparatus; and subject

Nature, Society, and Thought, vol. 14, no. 3 (2001)

index (483–866). A brief description of these texts and some observations follow.

I

Marx's personal notebook of the years 1844–1847 (5–30) is the first of twenty such notebooks located and preserved so far.[1] This notebook contains, among other things, lists of authors and books that Marx had read or planned to read or buy; a short note on Hegel's Construction of Phenomenology; the draft plan for a work on the modern state; a plan for producing a "library of the best foreign socialist writers,"[2] and the famous "Theses on Feuerbach" (*MECW* 3:3–5). The Engels-edited version of the latter gained currency at first, and gave rise to certain controversies that are still ongoing.[3]

The lists reflect Marx's plans for many-sided studies in the years to come. Some of the fields and authors indicated are philosophy (Plato, Sextus Empiricus, Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Hume, Hobbes, Helvetius, Herder, Hegel, and Comte), logic (Trendelenburg and Erdmann), political economy (Smith, Bentham, Malthus, Babbage, Ganilh, Rossi, Sismondi, Buret, MacCulloch, J. A. Blanqui), history (Guizot, Gibbon, Tacitus, Mirabeau, Raynal, and Ferguson), law (Hegel, Mackeldey, Eichhorn, Claus, and Comte), *belles-lettres* (Schiller, Goethe, Homer, Pindar, and Shakespeare), population studies (Hale, Franklin, Percival, Short, and Price), socialist thought (Campanella, Owen, and Saint-Simon).

One of the books on the list of books deals with philosophy of mathematics.[4] Another deals with physiology as an empirical science.[5] The book on philosophy of mathematics figured in Roland Daniels's list of Marx's personal collection, but neither of these two titles figure in the catalogue of the partially reconstructed personal libraries of Marx and Engels,[6] nor have any excerpts from them been located so far.[7] Many of the titles mentioned in these lists were subsequently excerpted by Marx. The rest of the present volume contains some of these excerpts. Language of the excerpts is either that of the source (mostly French

or German or a free mixture of both, which was characteristic of Marx).

II

Two Paris exercise books of the years 1844–1845 (35–110):

1. Pages 35–65: Excerpts from *Le détail de la France; Dissertation sur la nature des richesses, de l'argent et des tributs*; and *Traité de la nature, culture, commerce et intérêt des grains*—by an official of the French provincial judiciary and police turned economist, statistician, forerunner of the Physiocrats and founder of classical political economy in France, Pierre [Le Pesant sieur] de Boisguillebert (1646–1714), published in the anthology *Economistes financiers du XVIII*^{e} *siècle*, edited by Eugène Daire (Paris, 1843). The issues here are diminution of national wealth in France; its causes; the nature of wealth, money, and taxes; and the development of agrarian economy and its influence upon the economy as a whole. Boisguillebert, and subsequently the Physiocrats, considered the *laissez-faire* doctrine to be something humane and significant. In Marx's words,

> *Humane* in its opposition to the economy of the old state, which sought to increase its revenue by unnatural means of control and *significant* as the first attempt at emancipating the bourgeois/civil life, which had to be emancipated, for showing *what* it *is*. (*MEGA* IV/3, 53, 30–33)[8]

It is customary to characterize this doctrine as Western and bourgeois.[9] However, some scholars have traced the roots of the *laissez-faire* doctrine back to the ancient Chinese, Taoist concept of *wu-wei*.[10] Investigations into the journey of this concept across (and back and forth between) civilizations, modes of production, and continents, and through texts of various persuasions seem to be pregnant with rich possibilities for the historiography of theories of government and political economy.

2. Pages 66–68. Excerpts from *Considerations sur le numéraire et le commerce*—a French translation of the pamphlet

Money and trade considered, with a proposal for supplying the nation with money (Edinburgh, 1705), by the Scottish expert on finance and *contrôleur général* of finance in France in 1720, John (Jean) Law of Lauriston (1671–1729)–published in the anthology edited by Daire, mentioned in item 1 of section II above. Marx's excerpts from the first two chapters of Law's "Considerations" concern value, merchandise, money, trade, and the dependence of trade upon the quantity of money supply. Law, who often compared the historic significance of the establishment of banks and emergence of credit with the "discovery" of India by the Europeans (Anikin 1982, 115) was a principal spokesman of credit endowed "with the pleasant character mixture of swindler and prophet" (*MECW* 37:439).

3. Pages 69–83. Excerpts from some edition of *The History of Rome* (vol. 1. 2d. ed., [London, 1847]), an English translation of the *Römaische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1811–1812), by the German historian of Danish descent, Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831). He is reported to be the first critical historian of Rome (788). Marx's excerpts cover the period ca. 752–387 B.C. The editors of *MEGA* IV/3 have observed that this historical excerpt does not fit in with the discourse of the preceding excerpts (452). It is to be considered in the context of Marx's interest in world history in general, and ancient European history in particular. Marx read this book once again in 1855 and observed that the history of ancient Rome resolves itself into the conflict of interests between the owners of large and small landed property.[11] For the locations of other excerpts pertaining to ancient Rome in the present volume, see section III, items 2, 11, and 26 below.

4. Pages 84–110. Excerpts from *Recherches sur la nature et l'origine de la richesse publique* (Paris, 1808), a French translation of *An inquiry into the nature and origin of public wealth, and into the means and causes of its increase* (Edinburgh, 1804), by the British politician James Maitland, the Earl of Lauderdale, one of the managers of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, economist and opponent of Adam Smith (1759–1839). Marx's

detailed excerpts from all five chapters of the book are about the essence of value, how private and public wealth counterbalance each other, the sources of wealth, and the means of increasing it.

III

The first two Brussels exercise books have continuous pagination and both bear the inscription "Brussels 1845." The excerpts are as follows:

1. Pages 116–22. From *Principales causes de la richesse ou de la misère des peuples et des particuliers* (Paris, 1818), by the French entrepreneur, economist, and brother of Jean-Baptiste Say of "Say's law" fame, Louis Auguste Say (1774–1832), who was critical of Smith, Ricardo, and his own brother. Marx's short extracts are from all the ten chapters of this book dealing with the production and possession of utilities, wealth of people and nations, and other subjects.

2. Pages 123–36 and 175–209. Excerpts from vols. 1 and 2 of *Etudes sur l'économie politique* (Brussels, 1837–1838), by the Swiss economist and historian, Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773–1842). The issues here are production, consumption, revenue, territorial distribution of wealth, conditions of the Gaelic cultivators, economic organization of human society, manufacture, trade, ready money, circulating capital, banking, credit, colonies, and conditions of the farmers in ancient Roman territories. Sismondi's critique of capitalism and his analysis of its crises influenced Marx's own study of the same. To Sismondi goes the credit of introducing the word *proletariat* into the socioeconomic literature of the modern age, as representing a "totally new being" (124).

3. Page 137. This very brief excerpt from *Du paupérisme, ce qu'il était dans l'antiquité, ce qu'il est de nos jours* (Paris, 1842), by the French lawyer and journalist, C. G. Comte de Chamborant (1807–1887), deals with the question of poverty among the French people.

4. Page 138. A similarly very brief excerpt from the *Economie politique chrétienne, ou recherches sur la nature et les causes du paupérisme en France et en Europe* (Brussels, 1837), by the social-Catholic French politician and economist Jean Paul Alban, Vicomte de Villeneuve-Bargemont (1784–1850), is also about poverty among the European people. Marx noted that this book contained materials on theory of population.

5. Pages 142–56. Excerpts from a part of *De la misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France,* by the French economist, follower of Sismondi, and socialist, Antoine Eugène Buret (1811–1842), published in the *Cours d'économie politique* (Brussels, 1843), continued with the theme of poverty.[12] He posed questions such as "Should property and pauperism exist? Should marriage and prostitution, family and familylessness exist?" (142). Such posing of the questions gave rise to the ideas: "Without the sublation of private property, no removal of pauperism. Without the sublation of the bourgeois family, no removal of prostitution" (editors' introduction, 471). These are related to Marx's idea in his "Draft Plan for a Work on the Modern State": "*Suffrage*, the struggle for the *sublation* of the state and of bourgeois society" (11). The consequences of the attempts at one-dimensionally interpreting sublation as barren or formal abolition, disregards the dimensions of preservation and promotion, in the aforementioned domains of private property, family, state, and civil society are written large in the annals of the twentieth century.[13] What are we going to do in the twenty-first century?

6. Pages 157–74. Marx's excerpts from *Principes fondamentaux de l'économie politique*, edited by Jean Arrivabene (Paris, 1836), deal with lectures by Nassau William Senior (1790–1864), the English economist and adviser to the Whig party, about wealth, value, money, population, production, consumption, thrift/abstinence, division of labor, etc.

The third and fourth Brussels exercise books can also be considered in tandem. The excerpts from Henri Storch (see item 12

below) begin in the third book and conclude in the fourth. The excerpts here are as follows:

7. Pages 210–18. From *Du gouvernement considéré dans ses rapports avec le commerce* (Paris, 1805), by the mercantilist and protectionist French economist François Louis Auguste Ferrier (1777–1861). The issues here are the usefulness of money as a means of exchange, role of commerce in increasing the wealth of people, and institutionalized management of possible commercial losses.

8. Pages 219–28. Excerpts from *De l'esprit d'association dans tous les intérêts de la communauté* (Paris, 1818), by the French politician, civil servant, archaeologist, and author Alexandre Louis Joseph, Comte de Laborde (1774–1842). These deal with the various industrial, municipal, military, financial, scientific, literary, political, and other associations. Marx was of the view that the Comte de Laborde's view of the antagonistic character of the well-developed forms of capitalist production was an unwarranted abstraction, since these forms involved cooperation in and through confrontation, and linguistically "transformed" them into some form of free association (*MECW* 35:533 n. 2).

9. Pages 229–31. A brief extract from *De l'industrie cotonnière et des ouvriers en Catalogne*, by Don Ramòn de la Sagra (1798–1871), on the Catalonian cotton industry and the mutual assistance societies of its workers. published in vol. 2 of *Journal des Economistes* (Paris, 1842). Don Ramón de la Sagra was a Spanish economist, historian, once a director of the Havana botanical garden–a convinced liberal, according to the editors of the present volume (*MEGA* IV/3:673), and according to the *New Encyclopaedia Britannica* (15th ed., s.v. "anarchism"), the first known Spanish anarchist.

10. Page 231. A very brief excerpt from *De l'esprit progressif et de l'esprit de conservation en économie politique*, also from vol. 2 of *Journal des Economistes*, by the Swiss economist and journalist Théodore Fix (1800–1846). It is possible that from this

article of Fix came one of the earliest seeds that sprouted into the idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat." Fix advocated the use of permanent constraint and force for changing the conditions of the have-nots in the empire of liberty and for offsetting the domination of laws of supply and demand (231).

11. Pages 231–32. A very short extract on the ancient Roman domestic economy from *Aperçus statistiques sur la vie civile et l'économie domestique des Romains au commencement du quatrième siècle de notre ère,* in vol. 3 of *Journal des Economistes,* by the French statistician, Alexandre Moreau de Jonnès (1778–1870).

12. Pages 233–71, 273–88. Detailed excerpts from the first and second volumes, first part of the third volume, and the fourth and fifth volumes of the *Cours d'économie politique* (Paris, 1823–1824) by the Russian [Baltic-German] economist, statistician, and historian Andrei Karlovich [Heinrich (Henri) Friedrich von] Shtorkh [Storch] (1766–1835). The topics here include, among others, production, accumulation, and distribution of national wealth; money; credit; consumption; the nature of national revenue; and expansion of economics into a general theory of civilization.

13. Page 272. Barely a couple of lines from the *Essais sur les abus de l'agiotage* (Brussels, 1834), by the Belgian lawyer and economist Louis François Trioen (1801–1846), wherein an article of the penal code on the fraudulent dealings of illegal speculation is noted.

14. Pages 281–82. A short extract from the *Essais sur les monnoies, ou réflexiones sur le rapport entre l'argent et les denrées* (Paris, 1746), by the French civil servant, statistician, and economist Nicolas François Dupré de Saint-Maur (presumably 1695–1774), containing repeated references to John Locke's essays, *Some considerations of the consequences of the lowering of interest, and raising the value of money* (London, 1692) and *Further considerations concerning raising the value of money* (London, 1695). At issue here is the relationship between the supply of money and commodities.

15. Page 283–96. Excerpts from all the chapters of the *Traité de la circulation et du crédit* (Amsterdam, 1771), by Isaac de Pinto (1715–1787), Dutch economist of Portuguese descent, wholesaler, stock jobber, and "Pindar of the Amsterdam Stock Exchange" (*MECW* 35:161) on money circulation and credit, as well as from his *Letter on the Envy of Commerce* and *Essay on Luxury*, included therein. The excerpts on share trading in Holland are especially detailed.

16. Pages 297–314. Excerpts from the *Traités sur le commerce* (Amsterdam, Berlin, 1754), by the English merchant, economist, and mercantilist, and, for some time, governor of the East India Company, Sir Josiah (Josias) Child (1630–1699), on alleviation of poverty through employment, merchant companies, navigation, naturalization of foreigners, manufacture of wool, balance of trade, and colonies.

17. Pages 317–21. Excerpts from *De la disette* (Geneva, 1804), by the Scottish physician Benjamin Bell (1749–1806)–a French translation of part four (on scarcity) of his *Essays on Agriculture* (Edinburgh, 1802).

The fourth Brussels exercise book also contains some calculations related to surplus value and rate of profit.

The fifth exercise book contains the following:

18. Page 322. A short excerpt from the *Considérations sur les machines* (Paris, 1835), by the French agronomist and politician Auguste de Gasparin (1787–1857), on the importance of science and technology for agriculture.

19. Pages 325–41. Excerpts from the *Traité sur l'économie des machines et des manufactures* (Paris, 1833), a French translation of *On the economy of machinery and manufacture* (London, 1832), by the English mathematician, philosopher, management expert, and economist credited with conceptualizing the first digital computer, Charles Babbage (1792–1871). The topics covered here include, among others, cost reduction, division of labor, excess production, use of machinery, and trade unions. Marx borrowed the definition of machinery from Babbage.

20. Pages 342–51. From vols. 1 and 2 of the *Philosophie des manufactures* (Paris and Brussels, 1836), a French translation of *The Philosophy of Manufactures* (London: 1835), by the English professor of chemistry and physics, "Pindar of the automatic factory" (*MECW* 35:421), Andrew Ure (1778–1857). The issues touched upon here are conditions of the workers in various factories of England, the related legislations and the transition of the English textile industry from its manufactory stage to the stage of mechanization.

21. Pages 352–53. A short extract from the *Leçons sur l'industrie et les finances* (Paris, 1832), by the French banker, economist, initially Saint-Simonist but later on Bonapartist politician, Isaac Péreire (1806–1880), dealing with the administration of property by the bankers and how this was allegedly creating conditions for removing the antagonism between the propertyless workers and idle proprietors.

22. Pages 354–88. From the *Cours d'économie politique* (Brussels, 1843), by the Italian economist, lawyer, and politician, long-time resident in France, Pellegrino Luigi Edoardo Comte Rossi (1787–1848). Among the topics dealt with in these excerpts are objects and limits of economics, value, price, agriculture, measurement of value, production, productive and "unproductive" labor, the Malthusian theory of population, large and small property, laws of succession, capital, freedom of trade, and the colonial system.

The sixth Brussels exercise book bears the title "History of National Economy." Here are the excerpts.

23. Pages 389–406. From *Histoire de l'économie politique en Italie* (Paris, 1830), by the Italian economist and author Giuseppe (Joseph) Comte Pecchio (1785–1835). It contains an account of the history of the political economy of Italy from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, short sketches of some thirty economists, a comparison of Italian and English political economy, and attempts to trace the influence of the Italian economists on the reforms there in the eighteenth century.

24. Pages 407–12. Excerpts from the *Discours sur l'origine, les progrès, les objets particuliers, et l'importance de l'économie politique* (Geneva and Paris, 1825), a French translation of *A discourse on the rise, progress, peculiar objects and importance of political economy* (Edinburgh, 1824), by the Scottish statistician and economist John Ramsay MacCulloch (1789–1864), wherein the monetary and mercantile systems, Physiocrats, some of the works of Thomas Mun, Josiah Child, William Petty, Dudley North, Adam Smith, Malthus, Jean-Baptiste Say, Edward West, and David Ricardo are briefly discussed.

25. Pages 413–23. Excerpts from vols. 1 amd 2 of *Des systèmes d'économie politique* (Paris, 1809), by the French mecantilist economist and politician Charles Ganilh (1758–1836). It is reportedly the earliest history of economic ideas (741). Among the subjects discussed here are wealth, labor, capital, value, colonies, trade balance, and private and national economies.

26. Pages 424–25. Excerpts from the *Histoire de l'economie politique en Europe depuis les anciens jusqu'à nos jours*, in *Cours d'économie politique* (Brussels, 1843), by Jérôme Adolphe Blanqui (1798–1854), French economist and historian and brother of the Paris Communard Louis Auguste Blanqui. The excerpts are about ancient Greek and Roman economy.

27. Pages 426–29. From the *Histoire des idées sociales avant la révolution française, ou les socialistes modernes* (Paris, 1846), by Filippo Buonarroti (1810–1856), French journalist, follower of Charles Fourier and François Villegardelle, and a communist since 1840. This is a survey of the pre-1789 social ideas, substantiated with selected texts. Marx's excerpts are from three of these texts: *Sur la législation et le commerce des grains* (Paris, 1775), by the Swiss banker turned French statesman and economist–many times finance minister–Jacques Necker (1732–1804); *Observations d'un républicain sur les différents systèmes d'administrations provinciales*, in *Oeuvres posthumes de Turgot* (Lausanne, 1787), by Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville

(1754–1793), French politician, participant in the French revolution, member of the Jacobin club, subsequently leader and theoretician of the Girondists; and *Théorie des loix civiles* (London, 1767), by Simon Nicolas Henri Linguet (1736–1794), French lawyer, journalist, historian, economist, critic of the Physiocrats.

In the excerpts from Brissot de Warville (427), one encounters the idea that the overwhelming majority of the people, being propertyless, have *no fatherland*; that it is impossible for them to belong to the civil society—indeed, they stand in hostile opposition to it; hence, to restore to the people their rights, the *entire machine* of existing administration *must be smashed*. These ideas subsequently entered into the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*,[14] and grew into the thesis about the need to break up the bourgeois state machine in the course of the proletarian revolution—formulated in the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (*MECW* 11:185, 193, 337) and in *The Civil War in France* (*MECW* 22:328, 333–34, 486–88, 493, 533, 536, 549.

28. Pages 430–33. Excerpts from *The Facts and Fictions of Political Economists* (Manchester and London, 1842), by the one-time follower of Robert Owen, and subsequently liberal English journalist, John Watts (1818–1887). The topics here are labor as the only source of wealth; appropriation being the greatest curse; relationships among population, want, and accumulation; wages and prices; knowledge and happiness; wages and rent.

In his subsequent writings, Marx made use of most (though not all) of these excerpts, especially those pertaining to political economy.[15] References to the authors mentioned and/or excerpts are also to be found in his other completed writings of the period 1844–1847.[16]

Another exercise book of the period under consideration is still missing (770). It contained excerpts from the following: 1) vols. 1 and 2 of *Nouveaux principes d'économie politique*, 2d. ed. (Paris, 1827), by Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de Sismondi, which, among others, provided a survey of the various

legally sanctioned forms of distribution of property and vigorously attacked the doctrine of *laissez-faire, laissez-passer*; 2) *Economie politique ou principes de la science des richesses* (Paris, 1829), by the French philosopher, historian, and economist Joseph François Xavier Droz (1773–1850), a clear, elegant, and methodical popular treatise on political economy; 3) *Richesse ou Pauvreté* (Paris, 1841), by the Swiss lawyer and economist, Antoine Elisée Cherbuliez (1797–186), which traced the course followed by the law of appropriation controlling the distribution of wealth in the lands "governed" by the theory of representative government. These missing excerpts have been reflected elsewhere.[17]

All the materials contained in *MEGA* IV/3 have been published here for the first time in their original context. These contexts have been extensively documented and substantiated in the editorial apparatus. The introduction (449–82) contains extensive references to the contemporary studies of the authors excerpted by Marx. Like the other volumes of *MEGA* IV, this one too is going to be of great help to interested students. So far, owing to the privileged position of the finished writings of Marx, among other things, Marx studies has remained largely oriented to the question of the specificity of Marx's intellectual and practical break from the earlier contributions to science and socialism. Now, with the publication of the volumes of *MEGA* IV, we are getting materials that represent the continuity that links him with the earlier thinkers and activists. Thus, grounds are being created for appreciating both the lines of continuity and the points of departure in Marx, for understanding Marx's intervention as what it is, namely, as a sublation involving many sublations. It is hoped that these are the first lights of a new dawn ushering in, first, a Renaissance, and then a corresponding Enlightenment, of socialist theory and practice oriented on the sciences and their critique.

Kolkata, India

NOTES

1. See *MEGA* IV/3, 828–29, and not 824–25, as has been inadvertently printed on pages 450 and 483 of this *MEGA* volume.

2. For the note on Hegel's Construction of Phenomenology, draft-plan for a work on the modern state, and the plan for the "Library of the best foreign socialist writers," see *MECW* 4:665–67.

3. See, for instance, Hubmann et al., 2001, 307 n. 2.

4. Constantin Frantz (1817–1891), *Die Philosophie der Mathematik: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Logik und Naturphilosophie* (Leipzig: Hermann Hartung, 1842), reportedly the first Hegelian treatment of mathematics (see Szigeti 1999, 342–43).

5. Karl Friedrich Burdach (1776–1847), *Die Physiologie als Erfahrungswissenschaft*. 6 vols. (Leipzig: 1826–1840).

6. See *Vorauspublikation zu* MEGA *IV/32. Die Bibliotheken von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels. Annotiertes Verzeichnis des ermittelten Bestandes* (Berlin: Akademic Verlag, 1999).

7. Personal communications from Jürgen Rojahn, 31 May and 5 June 2001.

8. All translations from the originals, here and henceforth, are mine—P.B.

9. See, for instance, *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1968), s.v. "*laissé-faire*."

10. See Guy 1963, 341–59 (referred to in Clarke 1997, 50, n. 18).

11. *MECW* 39:527.

12. For Marx's excerpts from the earlier part of this work, see *MEGA IV/2*: 551–79.

13. For example, in the translation of this Draft Plan of Marx in *MECW* 4, 666, the term *Aufhebung* is rendered as "abolition" instead of "sublation"—Ed.

14. "The working men have no country" (*MECW* 6:502).

15. See especially the volumes of *MEGA* II and the corresponding volumes, *MEGA* IV and *MECW*, vols. 28–37.

16. See the corresponding volumes: *MEGA I* and *MECW*. vols. 3–6.

17. See *MEGA* II/1.1, 1.2; IV/7, 8; and International Institute voor Sociale Geschiedenis (Amsterdam), Marx-Engels-Nachlaß, shelf-mark A52—an exercise book containing quotations.

REFERENCE LIST

MECW refers to *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works* (New York: International Publishers, 1975–).

MEGA refers to *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels: Gesamtausgabe* (Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1975–, and Berlin: Akademie Verlag [since 1998]}.

Anikin, Andrei. 1982. *Arthashastrer Bikasher Dhara*. Moscow: Pragati Prakashan. Bengali translation of the Russian original *Yunost' Nauki*, Moscow, 1975.

Clarke, John J. 1997. *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought*. London: Routledge.

Guy, Basil. 1963. *The French Image of China before and after Voltaire.* Geneva: Institut Musée Voltaire.

Hubmann, Gerald, Herfried Münkler, and Manfred Neuhaus. 2001. " . . . es kömmt drauf an sie zu verändern": Zur Wiederaufnahme der *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe (MEGA)*. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, no. 2:299–311.

Szigeti, József. 1999. The Principle of the Identity of Identity and Non-Identity, *Nature, Society, and Thought* 12, no. 3:261–375. This is a slightly modified English translation of the Hungarian original: Azonosság és nem-azonosság azonossága, *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* (Budapest), nos. 4–6 (1988): 435–507.

Globalization: Part 1–Its Advocates

Morris Zeitlin

What globalization signifies and what it bodes for the future are often debated with more heat than light. Globalization is a rewarding and punishing economic and political development celebrated by winners and decried by losers in our class-divided society.

Mainstream advocates of globalization–capitalism's apologists–call for special scrutiny, for in the seeming innocence of their learned writings lurk the hidden and ominous aims of capitalist global expansion. Mainstream theorists fall into two camps: (1) those who attempt to examine and explain globalization, and (2) those who simply accept and acclaim it. All view it as a normal, positive development within an unquestioned capitalist order of society.

(1) Critical advocates of the "new order"

Mainstream advocates trace the origins of globalization to the world economic crisis of the 1970s, the competitive reentry of the economies of Europe and Japan into the world market, and the end of the postwar dominance of the United States over the capitalist world. That decade saw the destabilized dollar, defaults on debt in the developing countries, the rise in OPEC oil prices, and breakthroughs in communications technology. As a result, finance capital in the rich countries devised transnational corporations (TNCs) that could manipulate debt, investment, and government policies to maximize profits in their home countries

Nature, Society, and Thought, vol. 14, no. 3 (2001)

and fund high-profit investment abroad (Sassen 1991, 80; Sassen 1994, 27–28; Budd 1995, 346–47, 352). The TNCs became the primary movers of globalization.

A TNC may be defined as a corporation "that has significant foreign ownership of stock and/or foreign representation on the board of directors" (Budd 1995, 350), or as one "operating in at least two countries . . . coordinating production from one center of strategic decision making . . . across national borders" (Spybey 1996, 86).

Major national corporations faced fierce international competition in the world market. TNCs seek to escape high production costs and tariffs in their home countries by moving production to locations where weak states and low costs of labor, materials, and overhead could be matched with market outlets to cut prices and raise profits. In brief, TNCs sought "the assembly of a network of production sites, labor sources and market outlets to make the best use of economic opportunities across the nation-state system" (Spybey 1996, 85–86).

Grown powerful enough to buy out and take over weaker competitors, and commanding amassed capital quickly deployable worldwide, the TNCs have become dominant in the world economy. Their freedom to range over the world to exploit profitable places did not, however, free them to operate from any place they might choose. They needed an operating home base; they were in practice dependent on their base cities, without whose physical and social infrastructures they could not exist.

The new communications technology and efficiency-seeking specializations simplified and speeded the financing, production, and marketing of goods and services. They made it possible to move capital instantly as needed around the globe, to set up, manage, or cease production as profitability dictated. They freed corporations from having to mass produce goods, warehouse them, and ship them to various remote markets. Instead, parts could be made in scattered, specialized small factories, assembled in others, and then shipped to market outlets without paying national tariffs. The whole flexible process could be managed efficiently in volumes the market could consume.

To control financing, scattered production and marketing, and complicated planning and management, TNCs were forced to concentrate in big cities to make use of their complex and versatile infrastructure–above all, their hosts of specialized consulting firms (Sassen 1991, 11–13, 19, 124, 326–27; 1994, 76).

These information-producing consulting firms develop in the big cities where TNCs and many world bodies concentrate. They huddle mostly in central business districts to feed off each other and produce the complementary data their clients need, and to have access to high-skill and professional workers living near the central cultural amenities they need to sharpen their skills (Sassen 1991, 11–12; 1994, 3, 47–48; Solar and Hook 1993, 50–53).

This clustering of consulting firms, research and engineering companies, and universities in metropolitan centers is essential to TNCs, since wide up-to-date knowledge of finance, production, technology, marketing, administration, management, insurance, geography, climatology, national cultures, transportation, world politics, the sciences, and the arts means success in their global competition. For when competition advances technology, rationalizes industry, diversifies markets, and complicates politics, corporate command and control centers must continually upgrade and modify their global operations (Knight 1989b, 229). The function of these firms may be likened to that of remoras. Like the keen-eyed remoras guiding sharks to their prey and feeding on the scraps of the feast, the consulting firms guide TNCs to their profit opportunities and receive fat fees in return.

Mainstream advocates contend that in the new global economy, the collection, analysis, and use of information should be regarded as production–the production of knowledge and innovation. The knowledge-producing firms of a big city, they argue, are collectively its main industry, replacing its lost goods-producing industries and reversing its economic decline (Sassen 1991, 5, 325).

Those challenging this premise argue that manufacturing is critical to the health of a national, regional, or local economy because services cannot long survive without a manufacturing

base (Cohen and Zysman 1987, 261). To which mainstream advocates reply that although the manufacture of goods is indeed the basis of an economy, today the location of the manufacturing industries is irrelevant, as long as they are a part of the multinational corporations. In the age of globalization, "the functional specialization within factories finds its counterpart in . . . fragmentation of work process spatially and organizationally . . . [in a] global assembly line" (Sassen 1991, 10–11; 1994, 64–85).

Mainstream advocates have also looked at the negative effects of globalization on cities, such as a "greater inequality in earnings distribution and household income, a greater prevalence of poverty, and a massive increase in luxury commercial and residential construction." They acknowledge gentrification on a much larger scale then in earlier times, and the growth of high-style, high-price consumption alongside a poverty "new in its severity, leading in the extreme to homelessness on a scale not seen in a long time." They have observed a deepening racism, in that "blacks and Asians in professional occupations tend to hold the lower paying jobs . . . , and the emergence of persistent and concentrated poverty among these populations and [among] a growing share of young adults who have never held a regular job." They note a tendency "toward a growing isolation and economic irrelevance of a growing share of these workers and households on the one hand, and on the other hand, the full incorporation of others in the form of a casual, flexible, low cost labor force" (Sassen 1991, 317–19).

Some who examined the nature of the new information-service jobs generated by globalization in cities report what enthusiasts are inclined to belittle. "The overwhelming preponderance of service jobs . . . are not especially knowledge based, 'advanced,' high-paid. . . . Instead, in every way except the best ways they are traditional: wholesale and retail sales, routine office work, restaurant work, hospital work, janitorial work, and so on. Overwhelmingly, they are simple, low-skill, hands-on, part-time, low wage, dead-end jobs" (Cohen and Zysman 1987, 10).

By 1994, analysts were reporting "sharp increases in socio-economic and spatial inequalities within major cities in the developed world, . . . extended conversions of urban space to high-rent office and high-income shopping and apartment uses along with a sharp rise in homelessness." They found a widening gap between rich and poor, between powerful and powerless, as well as weakened unions and "a growing share of unsheltered jobs in lower-paying echelons, along with a growing share of high-income jobs. Thus the major cities of the globalizing economy create contradictions and breed potentially explosive class and group conflicts" (Sassen 1994, 99–100, 116, 123–24).

These negative developments, in fact, stem from contradictions in the globalization process itself. One such contradiction –the irrational behavior of finance capitalists–has caused cities to slide downward in a chain of related events. TNCs have channeled finance capital–the lubricant of industry–away from production of goods and services to more profitable global speculative trade in bonds, currencies, and the like. The subsequent downsizing and closing of factories weakened the economic base of cities, shrinking revenues and cutting public services. Unemployment went up and wages down, labor unions were undermined, poverty and crime increased. Increased city operating costs contributed to the breakdown of infrastructures and general urban decline (Sassen 1993, 64–66).

Another contradiction has created "economic and social differences of immense proportions" between the developed and developing nations. Advanced technologies controlled by TNCs of the rich countries lessen demand for the poor countries' main exports–their raw materials and cheap labor. Modern production has replaced traditional raw materials with synthetics; computer-run plants diminish the demand for cheap labor. The TNCs have therefore reduced investment in the poor countries, undercutting the touted global economic integration and expectations by the developing countries that they would take part in it (Holm and Sorensen 1995, 16).

(2) Uncritical enthusiasts

None of these difficulties worry the extreme advocates taken by a vision of globalization ushering in a new global society. They say that a new world order is already here. It arrived on the verge of the political trends in the twentieth century unifying the planet into one integrated "global system of all nations and regions . . . mostly achieved through the formation of extended connections and interweaving relationships between many cities all around the globe" (Gottman 1989, 60–61). To the globalization visionaries, the world's cities are the chief links of the emergent global society (Knight 1989b, 324; 1989a, 326).

How did "extended connections and interweaving relationships" work that magic? "The expansion of communication, knowledge, and trade helped standards of living to rise. Consumption by increasing populations swelled and diversified, . . . developing worldwide exchanges of goods, services, and people and therefore, the linkage and movement between cities" (Gottman 1989, 61–62).

Globalization visionaries start from the premise that globalization is the acme of capitalism bestowing its ultimate boon upon humanity. Competitively pursuing private profit, global capitalism extends progress over the whole world, uniting it politically by means of transnational corporate agreements and institutions created to ease and regulate global transactions. In this integrated world, nation-states will remain sovereign within their borders, but only to govern and administer within their domains much like local governments (Knight 1989c, 33–36).

The "global society" enthusiasts see globalization changing the world's economic and political geography, rearranging what goods are produced where, and how communities and their places are governed in the *world* and *global* economies. They distinguish between the two, conceiving the *world economy* as the world's production within nations marketed nationally or between nations, and the *global economy* as the sum of the world's economic activities produced and marketed globally (Knight 1989c, 30). The idea of *global* subsumes the world's

economic and political relations into a cosmopolitan whole, free of national restraints and restrictions, integrating all of humanity into a global society. Accordingly, global cities are not just great cities that have achieved world status, but only those that have become centers of world trade, exporting know-how in finance and industry (Gilb 1989, 97).

Accordingly, these enthusiasts hold that globalization has been shifting political weight from national states to "global cities," which have become "de-localized," having linked more to a global network of specialized cities than to their own regions. The more each of these cities specializes in what it can sell competitively on the global market, the more it can prosper. Hence the "deconstruction and reconstruction" in cities aspiring to global-city status–that is, the "creative destruction" of production that is cheaper elsewhere in the world, and the expansion of production and services more globally profitable. But the specialization of "global cities" must be varied within a range of complementary functions. A "global city" must also be an industrial city, a financial and managerial center, a hub of mass media, a place of diverse educational and research activities and expertise in a variety of fields. Then it will be a sought-after market for information and knowledge–the basic commodities of the modern global economy (Gottman 1989, 61–63).

To the globalization enthusiasts, all this is positive progress toward a higher order in a global society. Taking a partisan, subjective view of the process, they rationalize what it does and idealize what they think it portends for humanity and its global habitats.

They conceive the new global order to be a developing network of interdependent knowledge-based information-producing cities–centers of banking, insurance, brokerage, mass media, expertise, and research in fields vital to TNCs competing on the global market. For that global order to develop fully, cities must abandon their industrial heritage and renew themselves in two basic ways. They must, first, modernize their physical infrastructure to provide the most advanced technical facilities for communication and ample floor space for office and research use

to produce and apply the knowledge and data essential to competitive global production and trade. They must, second, become attractive to the work force producing and applying that knowledge. They must offer a high quality of city life with high incomes and pleasant living environments, good housing, education, health care, and social and recreational facilities (Knight 1989b, 237–38; Gottman 1989, 63).

Big cities that are home to both industries and corporations, they argue, must above all transform themselves into the most effective producers of information or risk losing any advantage in the global intercity competition. Bound to continue losing manufacturing to lower-cost production places around the globe, they must increase production of information and improve essential infrastructure to attract more corporate and ancillary activities, lest they also lose information resources, global links, and skilled professionals to rival cities (Knight 1989b, 227; 1989a, 326).

What will make these necessary changes in the cities happen? The cities themselves; the new global order will confront their leaders with an either-or choice: either change and survive or fail to change and decline. Necessity will compel vision and initiative to create the infrastructure and social climate to attract and retain TNCs and thus benefit from their global operations. Cities will be forced to condition their people to accept dislocation of industries and loss of jobs. They must drop class politics and yield to demands by corporations for physical and social environments that suit them, their personnel, and their global governing institutions best. Cities will, however, have to assert greater control over their own affairs and over surrounding metropolitan areas. They will have to buck the power of their higher governments to gain sovereignty over the fragmented suburbs around them, because "it requires taking a metropolitan approach [to build] a cosmopolitan city that will be viable in a global society" (Knight 1989b, 236; 1989a, 326–30).

The true believers do not hesitate to offer a model of their ideal cosmopolitan city–Singapore! Singapore, wrote one admirer, transformed itself from a sleepy port of crumbling

buildings on open-sewer streets into a global center. By 1960, its per capita gross domestic product was second only to that of Japan. It made major improvements in transportation, set up a new satellite communication system and a fiber optic cable network for hook-up to twenty-four world centers, installed a modern stock exchange linked to the financial centers of London, New York, and the Pacific Basin, and built 24,000 hotel rooms for the tourist trade. Singapore's striking physical transformation into a modern landscaped city of well-designed high-rise buildings has been the talk of the architectural, planning, and business world.

What else do global advocates see in Singapore that excites them? The island city-state in the South China Sea has a population of three million, ruled by a militarized government, thought-controlled by censored mass media, and disciplined by a severe penal system with the death penalty for drug-trading, stiff punishment for littering and smoke emission, and birth-control taxes. "Singapore became one of the world's great cities," the writer concludes, "because it had skilled leadership, capable people, and was hospitable to multinational corporations" (Gilb 1989, 102–4).

The world's great cities, however, are not islands unto themselves but local units of nation-states. American cities, for example, have grown historically as wards of their states with limited governing powers of their own. Global-society advocates call state limitation of the power of cities an anachronism in the age of globalization. The sovereign right of states over cities is not an absolute right. In pre-nation history, cities were autonomous city-states serving as political, cultural, and market centers for their surrounding regions. Nation-states arrogated their powers in order to rule over the riches of bigger regions (Gottman 1989, 60; Knight 1989b, 223). Now, as national economies integrate into the global economy, the role of cities increases and that of nation-states decreases. Not states but cities–where profit opportunities arise, technology advances, and financial flows spring to feed global markets–are its strategic links. The inevitable expansion of free trade, deregulation, lowering of tariffs,

world tourism, and cultural exchanges are opening nations to each other and shrinking the role of nation-states. In the developing global economy, cities, not states, carry the burdens of competition (Knight 1989a, 327–28).

Cities must therefore assert their independence and change their subservience to the states. States must redefine their relations with cities and grant them greater autonomy to organize their metropolitan areas to grow more competitive in the global society (Knight 1989b, 223–24).

The great American cities have become huge metropolises, which globalization enthusiasts argue are unable to deal with the complexity of problems generated by their growth. Metropolitan cities should not be restrained by state laws and bureaucracies from making their own policy decisions, nor be fragmented into a host of parochial suburban minigovernments. They should be governed according to the demands of the new global order, in which nations become integrated into a global society (Thayer and Whelan 1989, 123; Knight 1989b, 239). The emergent global society will be a loose system of specialized cities acting in their own economic self-interest within a global network mediated by ad hoc setups of international governmental and nongovernmental organizations (Knight 1989c, 39–42).

Believers in this global society argue that it is now forming through trade blocs like the common market of the European Union, intergovernmental agreements like the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which hasten transnational mergers as corporations compete for advantage in the newly opened opportunities in global trade (Knight 1989b, 228).

In sum, the advent of the global economy implies city-building in a new way. In the past, nation-states built cities to promote and regulate industry and finance centers to advance national economies. The global economy, however, integrates national economies by deregulation (freeing market forces from nation-state controls) and privatization (opening nation-state assets and functions to corporate exploitation). In the global

economy, therefore, cities rise in importance as tractable global production-consumption links driven by profit initiatives.

Conclusions

The advocates of globalization are not wholly certain and sanguine. With no consistent theory, only seemingly plausible ideas, they harbor some misgivings. Looking pragmatically at its appearances, mainstream writers state expectations belied by admitted contradictions seething below the surface.

Even if the hurrahs of the most gung-ho advocates are dismissed as a naive delusion, the seductive allure for the media and the sedative effect on public consciousness permit no complacency. Rather, they warrant setting off alarms. Preying on the age-old hope for a world of peace and well-being, and enticing people to believe that self-seeking corporate power will bring it about, constitute fraud. Making people believe that globalization will produce stability and bring cultural progress to all nations on earth, and that globalization is inevitable in any event, amount to political trickery. Behind the drive to get people to surrender their cities and civil rights to the political will of the TNCs or suffer economic punishment is a thinly veiled authoritarian threat. The reason for the bluster is not hard to deduce. Upgrading the power of cities as opposed to the state is part of corporate strategy to weaken nation-state regulation. Stronger cities–the seats of corporate global control–will better serve the physical, social, and political needs of those corporations..

The theory of the more sophisticated mainstream advocates is hardly more sound. They also view globalization as having begun in the 1970s, without essential connection to the prior history of capitalism, and as though its contradictions were not rooted in that past but were merely functional aberrations that its much-tooted flexibility can overcome.

Indeed, proglobalization theory, such as it is, is not doing well. The image of the "new global order" is tarnished by its own advocates' expressed doubts. Some have questioned even the very concept of globalization. "One should be careful in

assuming," writes one such theorist, "that a global economy is now the salient characteristic of the world economic system. The terms of trade for the world's major economic regions (America, Japan or Europe) have hardly altered between 1960 and 1990" (Budd 1995, 395).

Others question the resilience of globalization and fret over its longevity. Given the tendency of TNCs to speculate and to rely on the competing small-service firms for vital data in their hazardous field, what will happen, they wonder, when the competition among these firms ends in mergers, hardening the essential flexibility of the information infrastructure? And at what point may the reckless speculation of the TNCs force the big banks to reign in and throttle it? And at what point will the debt-based speculative market propelling globalization exhaust its possibilities and cause a global economic crisis (Sassen 1991, 12–13)?

Other contradictions within the big cities on which the TNCs feed intensify as globalization develops. It is typical of a big city that not all of it, and not all of its people, are linked to the global economy. The city's center and suburbs have grown massive clusters of office towers, and some rundown parts have been gentrified, but most parts of the city, including the working-class and industrial districts, continue to go downhill. Only certain social groups benefit from global operations of the TNCs, which sift through populations for the most exploitable workers, leaving out most and destroying the good jobs of many. Unemployment, poverty, demoralization, homelessness, morbidity, and crime have risen in big cities, threatening to bring civil unrest. Thus concern arises about what lies in store for the big city when the point is reached at which its destabilized life may become an unacceptable cost to the TNCs.

Globalization advocates are also concerned over the contradiction between the growth of TNCs and the weakened national state. On one hand, the TNCs need a strong state. The state aids their growth and global expansion. Loans to cover state deficits have been a major source of profit to big corporations throughout the history of finance capital, and state promotion of the

international interests of national corporations enhanced their power in world competition. On the other hand, TNC deregulation politics and export of manufacturing jobs lower the state's revenues and weaken its ability to promote the national economy. The worry arises about when the "decline of the national state will cause decline in the economy of cities" (Sassen 1991, 329–30).

This is not an idle concern. The TNCs require the big cities for their very existence. To cope with their myriad problems and daily changing data, TNC bases of operation must be versatile, flexible instruments to help them succeed in a competitive world full of pitfalls. The big cities, with their constantly modernizing infrastructures, must be able and willing to serve TNC needs. Even the poorest sectors of a big city's economy, resting largely on the labor of women and low-wage workers, are indispensable parts of the infrastructure. Without such routine work in offices, maintenance, food supply, health care, education, goods distribution, and city services, neither the cities nor the TNCs could function. The image of a "new global order" granting TNCs freedom to move about at will and break established ties to a place is belied by their actual immobility. They are, in fact, anchored geographically, and most have tended to stay in their countries and cities of origin.

The more rational advocates of globalization have amply shown that TNCs are not free to leave their base cities. It is a false notion that cities court the danger of a crippled economy if they resist TNC dictates. Most corporations cannot profitably leave their base cities. TNCs need the cities more than the cities need them. The people of their host cities actually have more bargaining chips than do the corporate giants.

This reality has apparently had a sobering effect on mainstream pundits who not long ago were convinced the big cities were dying. Back then, finance capital was heavily investing in high-profit suburban building and mortgage financing and disinvesting in the lower-profit central cities, with disastrous effects on city neighborhoods and municipal revenues. Mainstream social history then spun the notion that the rapidly

developing telecommunication technology would inevitably decentralize cities, with workers increasingly living and working dispersed in the countryside. In the words of one mainstream theorist:

> The widely spread notion that density and agglomeration will become obsolete because global telecommunications allow for maximum population and resource dispersal is poorly conceived. It is . . . precisely because of the territorial dispersal facilitated by telecommunication that agglomeration of certain centralizing activities has sharply increased. (Sassen 1991, 5)

So much for scientific objectivity in mainstream social science and the integrity of its pundits!

But even as mainstream advocates spin their mythical notions of a "global society," reality mocks them. They claim, for instance, that globalization carries everywhere the fruits of modern technology, homogenizing the cultures of the world's great cities and thus shaping a global society. Field studies, however, have shown the contrary–that invading capitalist market relations do not overwhelm local cultures, that the world's cities "are not becoming similar to each other, every one of them is more diverse, various and complex than ever" (Berner and Korff 1995, 208).

In reality, only parts of a few world cities–the finance-capital centers of New York, London, and Tokyo–fit the description of a cosmopolitan global city. Other great cities, playing supporting roles to the centers of finance-capital power, have changed in proportion to their integration in the global economy. What economic booms globalization could bestow have landed mainly on parts of some metropolises in the rich countries. They have come down progressively less on cities less involved in the global market (Moulaert and Shachar 1995, 206). The cities least able to benefit from globalization are in the poor, formerly colonial countries that still retain the infrastructures designed by their conquerors to fit them as depots for the commodities produced for colonial trade. Former colonies enter the global economy

indirectly through old colonial channels with exports of only a few commodities produced for advanced industrial countries. To compete in the global economy, however, they must increase their exports–an impossible task without the capital, technology, and trade outlets the TNCs dominate (Gilb 1989, 98–101).

The mainstream notion that globalization brings technical and cultural progress to all people on earth is equally false. In truth, technological spin-offs from TNC centers to their global peripheries have been of a lower order of expertise. Corporate centers relate to their branches as authorities to subordinates. Advanced technology like head-office knowledge and planning are jealously guarded secrets. In fact, TNCs have tended to pillage the technology of developing cities by luring their talent to low-wage service in their global centers (Gertler 1989, 272–82).

All advances in history, even in its coldest times, bear seeds of progress to blossom in its springs. Progress in computer technology, serving mostly the upper and middle classes in centers of finance capital, bears great promise also to their political opposites–the exploited working classes in their own cities and the wretched masses in the crowded cities of their economic peripheries. In the long run, advancing technology helps make the planet into humanity's one true home, for it enables the exploited to unite worldwide to turn their cities into crucibles of struggle for human freedom and progress (Gertler 1989, 273, 281–82).

In sum: At best, the mainstream advocates spin naive myths about the creation by TNC globalization of a peaceful and prosperous global society. At worst, they lay down a smoke screen to cover up a global fraud–the real socially destructive agenda of imperialist monopoly capital.

With thanks to Betty Smith for her helpful comments and editing of the original text.

Pittsburgh

"Globalization: Part 2–Its Radical Critics" will appear in *Nature, Society, and Thought,* vol. 14, no. 4.

REFERENCE LIST

Berner, Echard, and Rudiger Korff. 1995. Globalization and Local Resistances: The Creation of Localities in Manila and Bangkok. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 15, no. 2:202–21.

Budd, Leslie. 1995. Globalization, Territory and Strategic Alliances in Different Financial Centers. *Urban Studies* 32, no. 2:345–60.

Cohen, Stephen S., and John Zysman, 1987. *Manufacturing Matters; The Myth of the Post-Industrial Economy*. New York: Basic Books.

Gertler, Len. 1989. Telecommunication and the Changing Global Context of Urban Settlement. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 272–84.

Gilb, Corinne Lathrop. 1989. Third World Cities: Their Role in the World Economy. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 47–107.

Gottman, Jean. 1989. What Are Cities Becoming the Centers of? Sorting Out the Possibilities. In Knight and Gappert 1989. 58–67.

Holm, Hans Henrik, and Georg Sorensen. 1995. *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Knight, Richard V. 1989a. City Building in a Global Society. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 326–34.

——. 1989b. City Development and Urbanization: Building the Knowledge-Based City. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 223–42.

——. 1989c. Introduction: Redefining Cities. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 15–43.

Knight, Richard V., and Gary Gappert, eds. 1989. *Cities in a Global Society*. Urban Affairs Annual Reviews, vol. 35. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Moulaert, Frank, and Arie Shachar. 1995. Introduction to Special Issue: Cities, Enterprises and Society at the Eve of the 21st Century. *Urban Studies* 32, no. 2:205–11.

Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Globa1 City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press.

——. 1993. Economic Globalization: New Geography, Composition, and Institutional Framework. In *Global Visons: Beyond the New World Order*, edited by Jeremy Brecher, John Brown Childs, and Jill Cutler, 61–66. Boston: South End Press.

——. 1994. *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.

Selar, Elliot D., and Walter Hook. 1993. The Importance of Cities to the National Economy. In *Interwoven Destinies: The Cities and the Nation*, edited by Henry G. Cisneros, 48–53. York: Norton.

Spybey, Tony. 1996. *Globalization and World Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press.

Thayer, Ralph, E., and Robert E. Whelan. 1989. Port Cities Face Complex Challenges. In Knight and Gappert 1989, 120–31.

The Antipolitics and Politics of a New Left Union Caucus: The Workers' Voice Committee of UAW Local 6, 1970–1975

Victor G. Devinatz

The relationship between the New Left and the U.S. trade-union movement in the 1960s was marked by tremendous tensions and contradictions (Levy 1994). Although it was not monolithic in its attitude towards the labor movement, much of the New Left can be characterized in its early years as sharing "an anticlass perspective," believing that terms such as "class struggle" and "class structure" were not useful in understanding the experience of U.S. workers (Levy 1994, 111). For them, U.S. workers appeared to be, for the most part, relatively affluent, satisfied with society, and largely uninterested in social change.

How can we define the New Left? According to Gitlin, the "New Left" was a term initially adopted by the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1963 (1980, 293); the SDS itself had borrowed the term from the British New Left of the late 1950s. The New Left was "new" in the sense that it was different from the "Old Left" (it was neither Communist, Trotskyist, nor social-democratic in orientation), but it was clearly "left" in the sense that it was "committed to social equality, opposed to militarism and racism, and loosely socialist." Breines defines the New Left in its infancy as comprising "the largely student and racially white social movement that emerged in the United States in the late 1950s and early 1960s" (1982, 8), although Gitlin

Nature, Society, and Thought, vol. 14, no. 3 (2001)

includes the SDS and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) as the two major organizations comprising the New Left in this period (1980, 294).

Much of the New Left, according to this analysis, initially rejected the Old Left's belief in the "labor metaphysic," a term coined by radical sociologist C. Wright Mills, which placed undying faith in the strategic roles of the trade unions and the working class in the revolutionary transformation of society. Mills did not believe in the "labor metaphysic." He argued that wage workers were incapable of serving as agents of revolutionary change in advanced capitalism, and had no desire to do so. He also stated that the trade unions would be no more useful in this struggle because they had become increasingly ossified and conservative (Levy 1994, 112).

If the traditional proletariat was written off as the vanguard of social change, to whom did the New Left relegate this role? At first, serious consideration was given to an alliance between New Leftists and an "interracial movement of the poor"–that is, the unemployed and the underemployed–as a substitute proletariat to bring about social change. As the civil rights movement spawned the "Black Power" movement of the late 1960s, much of the New Left shifted its focus to the radical African American student movement as an alternative proletariat.

By the late 1960s, significant segments of the New Left had accepted the ideological analysis of the radical African American student movement that "African Americans occupied an objectively revolutionary" place in society because they were the "most exploited group suffering from both colonialism and racism" (Levy 1994, 115). According to this analysis, the slavery of African Americans was the foundation for the surplus wealth on which the United States was built. Even after the abolition of slavery and the transformation of the United States into an industrial giant, African American labor continued to be the basis of white capital because significant numbers of African Americans worked in the "modern steel forges, slaughterhouse yards, and automobile assembly plants" (Levy 1994, 116).

The New Left continued its ideological trajectory through 1968 and 1969, when many in the New Left adopted Marxism as an ideology and joined Marxist-Leninist groups (Breines 1982, 112), primarily with a Maoist orientation, such as the Revolutionary Union (RU) and the October League (OL) (O'Brien 1977/1978). According to Carl Oglesby, an SDS leader, the reason for adopting this ideology was apparent. In 1969, he stated,

> The necessity of a revolutionary strategy was, in effect, the same thing as the necessity of Marxism-Leninism. There was–and is–no other coherent, integrative, and explicit philosophy of revolution. (Vickers 1975, 129)

With this shift towards Marxism-Leninism, many in the New Left realized for the first time the strategic importance of trade unions and of organizing the working class. And while there is evidence of ex-student New Leftists entering factories to organize and "colonize" the working class in the early to mid 1970s after the implosion of the SDS (O'Brien 1977/78; Klatch 1999), no studies have addressed the issue of how the New Left caucuses initiated by these activists actually functioned within U.S. trade unions.

Since the League of Revolutionary Black Workers (LRBW), a caucus that first emerged in United Auto Workers (UAW) locals in the Detroit automobile industry, had a Marxist-Leninist ideology and also stressed the centrality of African American workers in the revolutionary project (Georgakas and Surkin 1975; Geschwender 1977), it is not surprising that trade-union-oriented New Leftists were immediately attracted to this group and viewed it as a source for positive change in the bureaucratized trade-union movement. Although the LRBW may not have been an explicitly New Leftist union caucus, it did represent the beliefs of New Left activists enamored with militant rhetoric.

My purpose here is to discuss the emergence, politics, and activities of a New Left union caucus, the Workers' Voice Committee (WVC), which was formed within the UAW Local 6 in 1970. Unlike the other political caucuses that had emerged in

UAW Local 6 since its reorganization in 1946, the WVC was the first caucus to focus many of its activities around the shop floor rather than exclusively around the local's electoral politics. Although the caucus's activities and rhetoric from its formation in August 1970 through November 1971 were very similar to the Detroit-based LRBW, I will argue that as the caucus evolved (December 1971 through 1975), its vision of trade unionism became one that was consistent with the trade unionism of the Old Left, specifically with the Communist Party (CP)-influenced UAW of the 1940s before the defeat and purge of the CP from the autoworkers' union beginning in 1946–1947.

The politics and activities of the LRBW will be discussed first, followed by a brief history of the early years of UAW Local 6. Next a treatment of the WVC and the evolution of its politics and activities will be presented. Finally, I will analyze the activities and politics of the WVC in the context of "Old Left" trade-union history.

The League of Revolutionary Black Workers

The League of Revolutionary Black Workers (LRBW), which was legally incorporated in June 1969 and survived until 1973, had its origins in the activism of radicalized African American workers in the Detroit auto industry (Geschwender 1977, 206). On 2 May 1968, four thousand workers participated in the first wildcat strike to occur at the Dodge Main (Hamtramck assembly) plant in fourteen years over a speedup in the assembly line (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 24, 84). A number of the African American workers who had taken part in this interracial strike met in a bar during this dispute to discuss the formation of an organization that would organize the African American workers "to fight the racial discrimination inside the (auto) plants and the overall oppression of the Black workers" (Geschwender 1977, 89). From this meeting, the first component of the LRBW–the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM)–was formed.

The group issued a newsletter that presented DRUM's program and criticized Chrysler, the UAW Local 3, and the UAW International for perpetuating the racist system inside auto plants

in the Detroit area. After holding a rally of three hundred workers and meeting with the UAW Local 3 Executive Board, but feeling that their concerns were not adequately addressed, DRUM launched a three-day wildcat strike on 8 July 1968, which was honored by approximately seventy percent of Dodge Main's African American workers. Although UAW Local 3 and Chrysler did not meet any of DRUM's demands, no worker was fired for participating in the strike (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 46–47; Geschwender 1977, 90–93).

This DRUM-led wildcat strike was the inspiration for the formation of two additional revolutionary union movements later in 1968: the Ford Revolutionary Union Movement (FRUM) and the Eldon Revolutionary Union Movement (ELRUM), established at Chrysler's Eldon Avenue Gear and Axle plant. Both groups began to publish their own newsletters and, at the end of January 1969, ELRUM led a wildcat strike of the African American workers that forced the total shutdown of the Eldon Avenue plant (Geschwender 1977, 94–95).

With more revolutionary union movements popping up at Detroit auto factories as well as other workplaces throughout the nation, a decision was made that a central organization was needed to coordinate the strategies and activities of the various components. Although the League had a central staff of eighty members and was strictly administered by a seven-man executive committee, the organization was not run on a hierarchical model. The League coordinated "general policy, political education and strategies" and acted as a forum for the discussion of ideas and tactics for its various semiautonomous branches, although it never issued directives (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 83–85; Geschwender 1977, 95–96).

In terms of ideology, the League described itself as a Black Marxist-Leninist organization whose focus was to organize Black workers at the point of production. The constitution of the organization stated that it was interested in organizing Black workers not only in the United States, but wherever they were found throughout the world (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 86).

The League considered unions to be both corrupt and racist and argued that it was necessary to have "an internal revolution" within the UAW. Specifically, it charged that the UAW tolerated racism in the auto plants and "had only token integration at decision-making levels." Because of these problems and the feeling that the UAW did not represent the interests of the African American workers, the League called for the union dues of African American workers to be turned over to it so that it could set up a Black "United Foundation" (Geschwender 1977, 127, 130–32).

The League, however, was not a typical union caucus that only struggled to reform and achieve power in what it considered to be corrupt and racist unions. Rather, it had a loftier goal of transforming the underpinnings of advanced capitalist society:

> The League of Revolutionary Black Workers is dedicated to waging a relentless struggle against racism, capitalism, and imperialism. We are struggling for the liberation of black people in the confines of the United States as well as to play a major revolutionary role in the liberation of all oppressed people in the world. (Geschwender 1977, 127)

Thus the organization was active in various forms of community organizing to supplement its primary focus of organizing Black workers at the point of production (Geschwender 1977, 138–52).

History of UAW Local 6, 1946–1970

The birth of UAW Local 6 began with the local's decisive National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) 1942 election victory at the newly constructed Buick Aviation plant located in Melrose Park, Illinois (thirteen miles west of downtown Chicago). The local aggressively defended the workers' interests in the plant from 1942 to 1945, although it folded when the factory closed at the end of World War II in August 1945. In November 1945, the International Harvester Corporation bought the plant from the U.S. government (Seidman et al. 1958, 92), and by the start of January 1946, the company began to hire workers, many of whom had been Local 6 members and had previously worked at

the Buick Aviation plant. In April, the company established the assembly lines that were to produce diesel engines for industrial power usage as well as crawler tractors to be used in highway/construction work and logging operations (Seidman et al. 1958, 92; Shier interview 21 June 1989; Stack interview 20 June 1989).

As soon as the production lines were up and running, both the UAW and the Farm Equipment Workers Union (FE) attempted to unionize the Melrose Park plant workers by establishing competing organizing committees. In the November 1946 NLRB election, UAW Local 6 defeated FE Local 103 by a three-to-one margin. By early 1947, the reconstituted local was in the process of negotiating an interim agreement with Harvester.

The relationship between Harvester and UAW Local 6 was contentious throughout the late 1940s and the 1950s. The local conducted strikes against the company in 1948 (sixteen days) and in 1952 (two months), while the UAW International held a nationwide ten-week strike against Harvester in 1950. Between these last two sanctioned walkouts, a wave of wildcat strikes swept the Melrose Park plant in 1951 and 1952, primarily over the company's attacks on piece-rate prices and occupational classifications. Due to a backlog of thousands of unresolved written grievances across all Harvester plants throughout the mid to late 1950s, the "New Look" procedure, an innovative oral grievance-processing procedure, was implemented in 1960.

With respect to the local union's politics, from the late 1940s through the late 1950s, the two major caucuses were the Positive Action Caucus (PAC), led by the Shachtmanite Workers Party/Independent Socialist League, and the Committee to Build Local 6 (CBL6), led by the Communist Party. For most of this decade, the PAC controlled the local's executive board and the shop committee, while the CBL6 was the major opposition caucus in the local. With the dissolution of the CBL6 by 1959 and the reorganization of the PAC in 1963, a number of "business union" caucuses dominated the local's political life throughout the 1960s.

In 1970, Harvester's Tractor Works in Chicago closed, leading to approximately nine hundred former Tractor workers entering the Melrose Park plant that year. These workers brought with them a more militant and aggressive shop-floor unionism, acquired from their years of FE membership that lasted until the union's merger into the UAW in 1955. Besides transferring the Tractor workers to Melrose Park, the company hired an additional six hundred workers, many of whom were young and deeply influenced by the civil rights, and antiwar movements. This potent combination, which increased total employment in the plant to nearly four thousand workers, led to a renewed vibrancy (largely absent since 1952) within Local 6, and set the stage for the formation and subsequent activities of the New Left-oriented WVC.

WVC's antipolitics: Ideology of the LRBW and DRUM

Although the Workers' Voice Committee did not adopt this specific name until 1972, under the name Workers Action Committee (WAC), the caucus began to publish an opposition newspaper, the *Workers' Voice* (WV), in the summer of 1970 (*Workers' Voice* 1, nos. 1 and 3). Even though the group's politics remained the same, the WAC briefly renamed itself the Melrose Revolutionary Workers Movement at the end of February 1971 when the group decided to form "a revolutionary workers organization at Melrose Park" ("Fellow Wage Slaves" 1971). It seems the new name was directly inspired by the LRBW, which had politics similar to that of the WAC. By 1972, the group changed its name to the WVC, basing the group's name on the title of its opposition newspaper, *Workers' Voice.* (For consistency, I refer to the caucus as the WVC throughout.)

While the WVC was the first explicitly left-wing caucus in the plant since the CP-led CBL6 dissolved in the late 1950s, the WVC differed from the CBL6 in its orientation to union politics. Although the CP members in the CBL6 adopted Marxism-Leninism as their philosophy, the CBL6 based itself on the popular-front principle of forming a broad caucus including non-Communists, with the group's work almost entirely focused on

the local's electoral politics. On the other hand, the WVC explicitly adopted Marxism-Leninism as the caucus's guiding philosophy in its first (LRBW) phase and oriented its activities around shop-floor militancy.

The WVC was an interracial group composed of a majority of African American workers, a number of young white workers, and some Latino workers. The core of the caucus included "several dozen" people who worked on all three of the plant's shifts (Goldfield interview 13 January 1990). Although the caucus had several nonindigenous white workers as members, such as Mike Goldfield, who served as leaders and had backgrounds in the SDS and/or other left-wing groups such as the (nominally Maoist) Sojourner Truth Organization, the majority of caucus members were indigenous African American workers. In addition, the group received considerable support for its activities from other African Americans working in the plant who were not necessarily formal members of the organization.

In addition to rank-and-file African American workers, a number of older, experienced, and prominent Local 6 African American activists participated in caucus activities during the organization's life. Jesse Gipson, a shop-floor organizer for the FE in the 1946 representation election campaign and a CBL6 activist, was a WVC leader throughout the group's entire existence. In addition, Murray Dillard, a PAC activist during the late 1940s, and Bob Jones, who was elected Local 6 president for one term (1957–1959) on the PAC ticket, supported the caucus (Goldfield interview 13 January 1990).

In the first issue of the *Workers' Voice*, the striking similarity between the ideology of the caucus and that of the LRBW is clear. The caucus argued that, for all practical purposes, Local 6 members did not have a union to represent them in confronting the company. The lead article opened:

> The problem at Harvester is that we don't have a union to fight for our interests and defend us from the crap the company hands down. Now, some brothers here may think the statement that we don't have a union here is nonsense.

> What about Local 6 they may say. Let's face the facts. ("No Union at Harvester" 1970)

After accusing Local 6 leaders of working "hand and glove with the white shirts and the slave-drivers from IR," as well as allowing "white supremacist discrimination in the skilled trades" to exist, the WVC reiterated that a union did not exist at Melrose Park. It defined what a union is and concluded that it was necessary to build such an organization at Melrose Park:

> In an April UNION Voice, Egan said, "Without a union we would be at the mercy of a ruthless company." We agree wholeheartedly. We don't have a union here. A union is an organization of workers that fights the compnay [*sic*] by any means necessary–slowdowns, overtime bans, workstoppages [*sic*], strikes, plant takeovers, pulling people together, exposing shit the company is doing, keeping everyone informed. The Workers' Voice will attempt to spread the word, give opinions, and aid anyone who wants to build a fighting organization of workers. ("No Union at Harvester" 1970)

The second article in the first issue, "We Finally Got the News about How Are [*sic*] Dues Are Being Used," discussed how a good portion of the workers' dues money was used to provide expensive furnishings, such as a desk, conference table, and conference chairs for the Local 6 Executive Board ("We Finally Got the News" 1970). The title of the article is significant because it alludes to the documentary made about the LRBW, "Finally Got the News," which opens with one League leader chanting to UAW Local 3 members:

> Finally got the news
> How your dues are being used
> Be bad, be bad, be bad, be bad, be bad!
> Can't do nothing if you ain't bad! (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 138)

Finally, a third article, entitled,"Defend Ike Jernigan–Free Ike Jernigan–Hail Ike Jernigan," sought to raise money for the

legal defense of Isaac (Ike) Jernigan, and called for justice in his case. Jernigan was an African American International Association of Machinists (IAM) union member who in July 1969 shot and killed his foreman at the Lockheed Aircraft plant in Los Angeles, as well as the IAM Local 707 president and another Local 707 official. According to the article, Jernigan became active in the Lockheed Employees Unity Association, a group fighting for improved working conditions and for fair treatment for African American workers. Because of Jernigan's participation in this group, both the company and the local union harassed him. The event that directly led to Jernigan's killing rampage was his being fired "for wearing an African shirt to work" with the union refusing to defend him ("Defend Ike Jernigan" 1970).

The Ike Jernigan case is almost identical in its details to the James Johnson case, which the LRBW championed. After James Johnson, an African American working at the Eldon Avenue Gear and Axle plant, was suspended from his job on 15 July 1970 for refusing to take part in a work speedup, he returned later that day with an M-1 carbine hidden in his overalls and killed two foremen, one African American and one white, as well as one job-setter (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 9–10).

Although Johnson was not affiliated or associated in any manner with ELRUM, the group published a leaflet several days after the shooting with the headline, "Hail James Johnson." The leaflet provided biographical information about Johnson and discussed in detail a number of incidents that occurred prior to the shootings. ELRUM's analysis made it clear that the working conditions at Chrysler's Eldon plant, as well as Johnson's cumulative experience "as a victim of racism," had led to the killings. The group put the blame squarely on Chrysler's shoulders, although the UAW was also implicated because it did not fight to improve the working conditions at the Eldon plant (Georgakas and Surkin 1975, 10).

The WVC, like the LRBW, argued that struggles within the unions must be directly linked to the fight against racism, capitalism, and imperialism. The introductory section, entitled

"Here's Where We're Coming From," of an important document outlining the League's ideology, declared its dedication to the "liberation of all oppressed people" (quoted earlier, p. 290).

The League pointed out that "the black liberation struggle is part of a worldwide struggle of oppressed against oppressor" and that the African American worker was determined to be "the most crucial element in the coming struggle." Only certain African American workers, however, such as those who labored in factories and mines, were seen as occupying strategic positions, thus forming the core of the revolutionary struggle. These occupational groups were considered to be instrumental because of the large numbers of African American workers that they contained, the high percentage of employees in these occupations that were African American, and "the key position of factories and mines in the capitalist extraction of profit." Thus, the League considered it necessary to build DRUM-type structures within the established unions to battle both management and the union leadership and fight to implement its program (Geschwender 1977, 129, 132).

Because of this ideology, the WVC provided coverage of labor struggles throughout the world to show Local 6 members that their struggles were related to those of workers in other countries. In the fourth issue of the *Workers' Voice*, an article entitled "Know the Enemy" discussed the situation in Harvester's South Africa plant. After providing some basic information about the apartheid system in South Africa as well as some rudimentary information about IHC South Africa, the article explained how Harvester's policies in the Melrose Park plant and the South African plant were related:

> Is IH upset about the slave-like conditions in their South Africa plant? Hell no! They are willing PARTNERS IN APARTEID [*sic*], because it brings them super-profits. Did you ever wonder why there are so few black workers in the skilled trades and higher classifications at Melrose Park? Why there are so few black foremen, engineers, and other salaried personel [*sic*]? ITS [*sic*] ALL PART OF THE SAME POLICY. . . .

> What's *our* policy? . . . We *all* must unite to fight Harvester, this racist, imperialistic, greedy, inhuman capitalistic company. UNITED WE STAND. DIVIDED WE FALL. ("Know the Enemy" 1970)

In an article a few issues later, the WVC argued that the struggle of the Palestinian guerrillas against the reactionary government of King Hussein of Jordan was directly connected with "the struggle of the people of the United States against oppression and exploitation both in the community and at the work place" ("Why Civil War in Jordan?" 1970). In "Power to the People," the WVC argued that one way of attacking capitalism and imperialism was to build support for a "revolutionary workers' movement" at the Melrose Park plant. They stated that their struggle was not isolated, but was connected with workers' struggles throughout the world:

> All you brothers, Black, White, Chicano, or whatever, you are all workers. The only real enemy you have is the Capitalist, Imperialist pig Power Structure. The only real war to be fought will be between the haves and the have nots, which includes every worker around the world. The people who control the wealth of this country and 85–95% of the worlds [*sic*] wealth. These are the Motherfuckers I'm talking about. ("Power to the People" 1970)

And when HRUM (Harvester Revolutionary Union Movement), which was affiliated with the LRBW, was established at the Melrose Park plant, the WVC welcomed the new organization and stated that it would "support and ally" with all forces "to build a revolutionary union movement here at Melrose that will deal with all the conditions in the plant and fight for liberation and the rights of working people all over the world" ("Right On, HRUM" 1970).

Although the WVC was an interracial group, its analysis of the centrality of African American labor was virtually the same as that of the LRBW (see Levy 1994, 116). The WVC stated that the slavery of African Americans was the foundation "for the

creation of surplus value or capital" that led to the establishment of "modern capitalism." The Committee argued that African American labor was still the "backbone of the modern industrial proletariat" and that this "new slavery" was not fundamentally different from the old slavery because the African American workers have neither control nor a voice in the decisions that affect them ("Brothers Get Ready" 1970).

The WVC implied that white workers had barely more power than African American workers; each worker was expendable (especially at Harvester) because of the existence of the "reserve labor force of unemployed" that could be used as replacements. However, African American workers were *more* expendable than white workers due to racism in hiring within the job classifications in the factories ("Brothers Get Ready" 1970). In terms of the UAW, the Committee argued that the union represented only a tiny fraction of the total number of African American workers in the union. In addition, the UAW willingly accepted "vicious racial discrimination against black workers in skilled trades jobs, upgrading, discipline and other areas" and currently "represented only a small segment of older white workers" ("Fellow Wage Slaves of Harvester" 1971).

Because of the centrality of the experience of the African American worker in the WVC's labor ideology, it is not surprising that the first demand in the group's eleven-point program dealt with the problems of the African American worker in Harvester's Melrose plant. This lead demand, which was published in two separate issues of the *WV*, stated: "We demand an end to White Supremacy and Racism in the Plant" ("The Workers' Voice Program" 1970; "Get It Together" 1970).

Specifically, the caucus called for ending discriminatory hiring practices such as the exclusion of African American workers from the skilled trades; ending discriminatory educational requirements that were applied to African American workers but not to white workers; and ending discrimination with respect to reference checking. Secondly, the WVC demanded an end to Harvester foremen's racist treatment of African American workers, including discrimination in job classifications, timing rates,

down-time allowances, and in reprimands, suspensions, and firings. Thirdly, the Committee called for an end to racism in the medical department by requiring the presence of at least one African American nurse at all times so "that black workers do not get treated like animals." Finally, the WVC demanded that Harvester disband its bowling and golf leagues that excluded African American employees ("The Workers' Voice Program" 1970; "Get It Together" 1970).

The WVC's program also called for changes in the daily practices of Harvester in a number of areas such as the hiring of women workers in the plant (none worked in the plant as of 1970), the immediate resolution of all grievances, an end to all suspensions and firings, the removal of all safety and health hazards in the factory, a major improvement in delivering medical services, and an end to piecework. However, the caucus presented four "maximum" demands: having employees work five hours per day for four days per week and calling for "the UAW (to) use its immense political and strike powers to call a general strike" in order to put an immediate end to the Vietnam War, to stop workers from having to pay any taxes (increases in both property and industrial taxes would make up the deficit), and to halt government repression against various groups such as African American militants, students, etc. ("The Workers' Voice Program" 1970).

Versions of two of these last four demands also were contained in the League's program. It called for the UAW to use its political power by conducting strikes to end the Vietnam War as well as to eliminate unemployment through the reduction of the workweek (Geschwender 1977, 132).

In February 1971, the WVC became even more similar to the LRBW when it put out a leaflet announcing the first meeting in order to build a "revolutionary workers organization" at the Melrose Park plant. The leaflet, addressed to "Fellow Wage Slaves of Harvester," argued that the time was ripe for forming a "revolutionary workers organization" because of the steadily deteriorating conditions inside the plant. The Committee pointed out that major problems that had to be dealt with were speedup

on the assembly lines, "dozens of firings, increased disciplinary actions," dangerous and unsafe working conditions, and rampant racism. The WVC predicted that things were going to get worse, not better, under "the new flimsy UAW contract" ("Fellow Wage Slaves of Harvester" 1971).

The caucus claimed that the forming of this organization would be part of the "new labor movement" developing in U.S. factories, "led by revolutionary black workers, the most exploited, oppressed part of the workforce." The WVC specifically cited the LRBW, the United Black Brothers of Mahwah Ford (New Jersey), Polaroid Workers Revolutionary Movement (Boston), and the Black Workers Council (Louisville) as representing the "first great wave" of this movement ("Fellow Wage Slaves of Harvester" 1971).

On 28 February 1971, the Melrose Revolutionary Workers Movement (MRWM) was formed at a meeting where the attendees heard Herman Holmes of the LRBW speak and saw the documentary film, "Finally Got the News," which chronicled the development of the League. The MRWM resolved to work both inside and outside the union and to do whatever was necessary in order "to solve the problems of workers at Melrose and workers everywhere" ("Melrose Revolutionary Workers Movement" 1971).

While not representing all of the Local 6 shop-floor activists, the WVC appeared to be the organizational core of this movement in terms of articulating a coherent ideology of shop-floor politics as well as aggressively organizing workers at the point of production. Because of this focus, the caucus was a disciplined and organized force with which the local leaders had to deal on a regular basis. Jesse Gipson, a WVC activist, believes that its daily contact with people on the shop floor led to a high level of support within the plant and provided the group with its base of power:

> And I think "The Workers Voice" group was the most powerful group to ever hit that shop that wasn't elected to

> office. . . . They were very respected by all the workers and the workers would move when "The Workers Voice Committee" would tell 'em to move. . . . We had some wildcat, threatened wildcats, they couldn't let it go too far because they knew how powerful we were. (Gibson interview 20 December 1989)

Because of its radical ideology, many of the local's leaders throughout the 1970s viewed the WVC as an antiunion and pro-company group. For example, Joe Valenti, a former Tractor worker who was a Local 6 leader during the 1970s, stated:

> And nine times out of 10, I always felt, I says (to WVC members), "If you were really a labor man and really a true union man and you really believed in something, why are you always anti? I never seen you were for something. You know, you have to be for something. . . . Sometimes I felt that they were company people, you know. And that's what I feel about . . . all those radical movement groups. (Valenti interview 8 August 1989)

Ed Graham, an executive board member throughout the 1970s, expressed views similar to Valenti's on the WVC:

> In my opinion, . . . in the bulk of the times . . . the objectives were not union-orientated and that they (the WVC) sowed more seeds of dissension and division than . . . of unity. And then by virtue of that . . . they defeated the purpose of unionism if a program like his (Goldfield) was to be indoctrinated into this local. (Graham interview 2 August 1989)

Even Norm Roth, the leader of the CP-led CBL6 during the late 1940s and 1950s and one of the few remaining "Old Leftists" in the plant, was critical of the WVC in its early years:

> And they (the WVC) proclaimed themselves as Marxists and denounced capitalism and called for socialism and called for people to man the trenches. The revolution is

> here and made big plays about racism, you know, being the staunchest defenders of rights, of those who were victims of racism and chauvinism.
>
> They came out with . . . the call for immediate revolution or a revolution the day after tomorrow. . . . And people like myself . . . were then called revisionists and betrayers of the class struggle movement. And we became enemies of the working class and the company got a free pass. (Roth interview 1 July 1989)

After several weeks of the caucus's existence, the Local 6 leaders escalated their attacks on the WVC in the summer of 1970 after the caucus published and distributed several leaflets criticizing the local union leadership. At this time, the local's leaders began to physically harass the WVC members while they were distributing caucus literature one morning before work. An issue of the *WV* described this incident in detail:

> Union goons were out at the gates trying to keep workers and workers wives [*sic*] from passing out the Workers Voice. They chose to try to intimidate the revolutionary sisters, but they did not succeed. They threatened to run over the sisters and even went so far as to come within a few inches of them.
>
> When one of the workers going on 1st shift confronted these goon-baboons and told them to stop pushing people around, he was told that the goons were officials of the union. In fact, said one, "I am a member of the executive board." This same executive board member then threatened to "fix up this worker's car."
>
> Ain't it nice to know what we pay our union officials to do to us? ("Chump Eagan. Calls Out the Goons" 1970)

The WVC during its LRBW phase: The practice of militant shop-floor unionism

While the WVC advocated that the Local 6 workers adopt a more militant shop-floor unionism, a number of shop-floor

events provided the caucus with an opportunity to put its principles into practice. With the hiring of many younger workers in 1970, a larger number of stewards elected at the Melrose Park plant were young, militant, and aggressive. The company had only one labor relations policy for dealing with these militant shop stewards–firing them (Goldfield interview 13 January 1990).

When the first shop steward was fired at the end of August 1970, the WVC began to organize workers aggressively around this issue. Although Harvester claimed that it had fired Alan Fenske, the repair department's young steward, for allegedly falsifying job-application information, the WVC argued that the real reason was that he had been leading a six-day departmental "overtime strike," a job action in which all of the workers in a department (or factory) systematically and collectively refuse to perform any overtime work until there is a resolution to their immediate shop-floor problems, on both the first and second shifts ("Steward Fired" 1970). Harvester felt that it was justified in firing Fenske because conducting "overtime strikes" had been made illegal with the negotiation of the 1967 UAW-Harvester agreement.

The WVC placed no confidence in the contractually agreed-upon grievance and arbitration procedures in obtaining justice for Fenske. The caucus argued that there were structural limitations to both systems that prevented workers from obtaining fair treatment.

A special edition of the *WV* devoted to Fenske's termination implicitly charged that Local 6 had collaborated with the company. The only way to deal with this collaboration, according to the WVC, was to defend Fenske through direct action on the shop floor ("Steward Fired" 1970).

In its criticism of the grievance procedure, the WVC claimed that the formal structure of the process prevented workers from exercising their shop-floor power. However, the caucus argued that the union was complicit because it had collaborated with the company in agreeing "to forbid work stoppages, job actions and

strikes between contracts and to rely instead on the grievance system (and arbitration) . . . in keeping production continuously going" ("Shop Report" 1970).

Instead of allowing the grievance to become entangled in the bureaucratic grievance and arbitration procedures, the WVC counterposed direct action as a strategy that shifted the power to decide grievances from union officials back to the shop floor. The caucus called for using "overtime bans, slowdowns, walkouts, wildcats, whatever the situation calls for" in order to resolve grievances ("Shop Report" 1970).

In essence, the WVC's program called for a principled shop-floor militancy rather than resorting to militancy as a tactical weapon to be used as a last resort only after the breakdown of the grievance procedure. The caucus viewed the grievance and arbitration procedures as being structural impediments to industrial justice for the workers. Therefore, the group advocated using shop-floor militancy at all times to settle all grievances.

Fenske's firing was the company's opening shot in its attacks on the workers. Because of the plethora of terminations, such as the firing of the second shift steward council chairman (the second shift steward of Department 51) when he refused to weld over paint upon a foreman's direct order, as well as the numerous suspensions and reprimands occurring throughout the summer and fall of 1970, by late autumn the WVC actively encouraged shop-floor militancy through the holding of job actions ("Harvester on the Rampage" 1970). Due to the WVC's organization, by December, the workers in Departments 53 and 57 were in the midst of holding a three-week "overtime strike" ("Assembly Workers Show the Way" 1970).

Within six months of the outbreak of illegal "overtime strikes," the WVC was actively organizing and leading actual plant walkouts over the extreme heat in the plant. These wildcat strikes (or "heat walkouts") began in the summer of 1971 and were concentrated primarily on the plant's assembly lines. The walkouts first occurred on the Medium Size Tractor Line (Department 53) and then spread to the Large Tractor Line (Department 33) and the Small Tractor Line (Department 45)

(Goldfield interview 13 January 1990). Although there had been a number of illegal "overtime strikes" in 1970, these wildcat strikes were the first actual work stoppages in the Melrose Park plant since the wildcat strike involving twenty workers in April 1954.

These wildcat strikes provided a mechanism for the workers to vent their feelings over the unbearable heat in the plant, as well as other grievances that remained unresolved by the local plant management. Mike Goldfield, a WVC leader as well as a Department 53 steward, stated:

> And while the walkouts were ostensibly over the heat, a lot of other grievances got thrown in. And often, in fact, when there were problems, walkouts over the heat, other grievances were in the hopper and management would sometimes try to resolve these to get people symbolically and literally cooled down. (Goldfield interview 13 January 1990)

Once these heat walkouts started in the summer of 1971, these job actions often took on a life of their own and workers participated in wildcat strikes even when the temperature was relatively cool, such as only 70 degrees (Fahrenheit) outside. Mike Goldfield recalls that during one week, his department (Department 53) struck on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday but not on Thursday, because it was payday. Once the workers realized that their paychecks would be extremely low because of all the work hours that they had missed during the first three days of the week, they decided to strike on Friday also because that week's paycheck was already ruined.

The politics of the WVC: Ideology of the "Old Left"

Beginning in December 1971, through the written documentation on the group ending in 1975, there was an ideological shift in the WVC that continued throughout the remainder of the caucus's existence. At this time, the WVC began to develop a theoretical analysis that it would be desirable to fight within Local 6 for a return of the UAW to its militant and independent

status in the 1940s prior to the Reuther purge of the CP, when the autoworkers' union exhibited high levels of shop-floor militancy, rank-and-file democracy, as well as independence from the companies with which the union negotiated. This change in the caucus's politics neither affected the quality nor quantity of the WVC's shop-floor activities during this period, although the caucus did become involved in the local union's electoral politics with the adoption of this new ideology.

In its revised analysis, instead of claiming that there was "no union" to represent the workers at the Melrose Park plant, the WVC began to acknowledge that there was a union at the plant, only that it was a "business union." The caucus argued that the UAW was no longer "a rank-and-file democracy" but had become a "business union." The WVC stated that this was a "total change" from the days when the UAW and the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) were first organized in the 1930s. At this time, the UAW International "was a democratically controlled rank and file movement" which "did not beg the companies for concessions" but engaged in "militant actions" such as wildcat strikes as well as the Flint General Motors sit-down strike during 1936 and 1937. The caucus also noted that the leader of the Flint sit-down was Bob Travis, a Communist ("UAW Business Union" 1971; "Scare Tactics" 1974).

According to the WVC, at this time rank-and-file democracy existed within the UAW because the union had one-year contracts and the leaders were elected to one-year terms of office. Because the union leaders had to be reelected on a short-term basis, they fought for the interests of the workers and they continually mobilized the members for struggle. The WVC pointed out that there was a high turnover of union leaders when the UAW was in its early years, particularly in the late 1930s ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975).

The caucus also argued that things were different in the early years of UAW Local 6. The WVC stated that at this time Local 6 was "an independent local with its own strike fund" that engaged in "walkouts, strikes, slowdowns" as well as overtime strikes when it was deemed necessary ("UAW Business Union" 1971).

The internal political life of Local 6 was also one of rank-and-file democracy where union meetings had much higher levels of attendance and a number of the caucuses such as the PAC and the CBL6 had a few hundred active members between them ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975).

According to the Committee, many of the UAW's early leaders were Communists, as were the leaders of the UAW organizing drive at Ford ("Scare Tactics" 1974). In addition, in its early years, the UAW "had many features of being a class-struggle organization" ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975). At this time, grievances were handled on the shop floor between the shop steward and the foreman. If the workers felt that the grievance was not resolved to their satisfaction, they would "lay down their tools" and walk out of the plant ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975).

The union's militancy at this time was "due to the courage and dedication of the left wing." It is clear that the WVC considered the "left wing" to have been the U.S. Communist Party (CP), because the caucus proceeds to argue that the downfall of the UAW came after Walter Reuther purged "its left wing and militants, in the late '40's." According to the Committee, this "vicious red-baiting, which made all militancy and attacks on the company suspect," was the major force responsible for weakening both the UAW and the class struggle occurring within UAW shops ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975). The WVC is obviously referring to the purge of the CP beginning in the 1946 UAW elections when Reuther pursued a vicious anti-Communist campaign to defeat the rival Thomas-Addes caucus.

Continuing with its analysis, the caucus argued that the outcome of this purge forced Reuther to align "with many reactionary and pro-company elements in the UAW," who were not interested in struggling for the workers' rights. This established a trajectory in the union that brought it ideologically "closer and closer to the companies," eventually agreeing to keep production going "at all costs." This resulted in the UAW abandoning the one-year contract in 1950. Shortly thereafter, terms of office for UAW leaders were extended from one to two years. Other

significant changes included the UAW giving up its right to strike during the collective-bargaining agreement as well as the right to engage in overtime bans or strikes. According to the WVC, this transformed the UAW into a "cop for the company." The union had become more concerned with controlling the membership by ending work stoppages and ramming through unsatisfactory contracts than in fighting the companies ("UAW Business Union" 1971; "Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975).

Because of these historical developments, the WVC argued that "an independent workers movement" had to be built at the Melrose Park plant in order to eliminate "UAW business unionism." Such a movement would place power in the workers' hands rather than keep such power in the hands of the local union leaders and the International ("UAW Business Union" 1971).

The WVC after the ideological shift: Electoral activity and militant shop-floor unionism

Although the WVC did not become involved in the 1971 spring Local 6 elections during the caucus's LRBW phase, after the group's shift in ideology, the WVC became quite active in Local 6 electoral politics, viewing this activity as a supplement to its militant shop-floor activity. Although the League also participated in local union electoral politics, the electoral perspectives of the LRBW and the WVC diverged to a significant degree. From 1968 to 1970, DRUM participated in three separate elections that included a UAW Local 3 trustee election, a Local 3 vice-presidential election, and a Local 3 officer/delegate (to the UAW International convention) election, by running its own candidates and slates specifically on LRBW platforms. When the League abandoned the running of its own candidates and slates in local union elections, its strategy shifted to supporting militant African American candidates who had, at a minimum, a nationalist orientation (Geschwender 1977, 103–26). However, in contrast to the LRBW's electoral strategy, the WVC, for the most part, supported broad Left-front electoral coalitions within Local 6. This perspective was similar to the CP's popular-front strategy

utilized within the CIO unions from approximately 1936 through 1945.

While the WVC did not run its own slate of candidates during the 1973 Local 6 executive board/shop committee elections, it did became active in these elections by providing what was, in effect, "critical support" for the candidates of the Solidarity Caucus (SC). Organized by Norm Roth, the SC was significantly to the left of the caucuses that he organized in the 1960s, although it was not nearly as far to the left as the CP-led CBL6 in the 1940s and 1950s. Besides the reappearance of a moderately left program, the SC ticket was noteworthy because it was the first time that Latino candidates ran on a caucus ticket in the history of Local 6 executive board/shop committee elections ("Walking on Water" 1973).

The SC offered a two-pronged program for handling the local's problems. The portion dealing with shop-floor issues argued that it was necessary to "fight speedup; abusive discipline; discrimination; unsafe working conditions [and] excessive noise," although the SC did not outline the strategy it would use to combat these problems. Concerning the UAW's problems at the national level, the caucus criticized the union's participation on Nixon's Pay Board, arguing that the union would gain little because of industry representative domination ("Vote the Solidarity Slate" 1973; "Walking on Water" 1973).

According to the SC, having the UAW International President on the Pay Board prevented the union from obtaining wage increases that would match the inflation rate. In defense of its position, the caucus argued that the United Mine Workers, which did not sit on the board, was able to win higher raises than the participating unions. Because of this, the SC demanded that the UAW International leaders get "off the Nixon Board!" ("Walking on Water" 1973).

Throughout the election campaign, the SC also focused on the current local leadership's inability to resolve significant problems in the shop. These included Harvester's firing of stewards and issuing dozens of reprimands to workers, as well as the

continued proliferation of grievances ("*Win* With Solidarity!" 1973).

Of the caucuses competing in the election, the WVC's sympathies clearly lay with the SC candidates. The caucus noted that Roth was "closer to the real issues concerning workers in the shop" than any of the other candidates. The group also praised Roth for having "taken some good actions" in defense of the workers' medical treatment by the company physician, Dr. Welter. The WVC also stated that Roth had "a better position on discrimination" than the other two presidential candidates, although his position was not strong enough to affect Harvester's discriminatory practices. The caucus also liked Roth's opposition to the wage freeze; its major criticism of Roth was that he was "more concerned with going thru [*sic*] the legal and bureaucratic grievance procedure" than actively aiding the workers' shop-floor struggles ("The Upcoming Union Election" 1973).

Although six runoff elections were required after the tabulation of the 15 June 1973 results, the SC fared well with three of its candidates–Norm Roth (president), Clem Watts (vice-president), and Art Richardson (health and welfare representative)–qualifying for the runoffs. In the runoff elections, Richardson was defeated by one vote; Roth defeated Egan, the current local president, who had a business unionist perspective, by a margin of 1151 votes to 1023 votes ("Results of Runoff Election" 1973). There is little doubt that the WVC's critical support of Roth's candidacy contributed to his victory.

In the 1974 UAW convention delegate election, the WVC fielded its first and only Local 6 electoral slate in caucus history. The Workers Slate (WS), the electoral vehicle of the WVC, focused its campaign around company discrimination against minority workers. The WS called for "making Company discrimination a strikable [*sic*] issue, starting with the racist hiring practices here at Melrose Park." Other planks in the WS platform represented a combination of minimum and maximum demands. The caucus called for a contract reopener so that wages could be renegotiated significantly above Nixon's 5.5 percent limits; for no restrictions on the right to strike, to cease work, or to hold

"overtime strikes"; to have more minorities represented in "higher union bodies" such as the Harvester Council; to get rid of Woodcock and other procompany bureaucrats in order to return "rank-and-file" democracy to the union; "for a short work week with no loss of pay" and for the establishment of a labor party ("Who Is the *Real Enemy*?" 1974; "What the Workers Slate Will Do" 1974; "Come to the Meeting" 1974; "What the WORKERS SLATE Stands For" 1974).

For the eight delegate slots, the thirty-five candidates in the field were divided among five slates, combined with a handful of independents. The WS did not perform well. The WVC's slate finished in positions 20, two tied at 21, 24, and 28, with only the Militant Action Slate, affiliated with the (Trotskyist) Spartacist League, faring worse ("Election Results" 1974).

Early in 1975, much of the Left regrouped within Local 6, forming a new caucus, the Rank & File Coalition (R&FC), containing elements of the SC as well as New Leftists not affiliated with the WVC. The R&FC was an interracial caucus and a broad Left grouping that attempted to gain support from African American and Latino workers, as well as workers who wished to adopt a more aggressive posture toward the company ("Rank & File Coalition with Program" 1975). The R&FC's basic program was very similar to that of the WVC: fighting racism and sexism in hiring, promotion, and discipline; the right to engage in strikes and overtime bans in order to resolve any grievance; and the launching of an unmitigated struggle against the speedup at the Melrose Park plant.

Shortly after its formation, the R&FC became allied with the WVC in a campaign to prevent the extension of the term of office for both shop stewards and shop committeemen from two to three years. The campaign within the local was initiated because a resolution had been passed by the Woodcock administration at the 1974 UAW Constitutional Convention extending the term for all union offices from two to three years. However, the terms of the shop stewards and shop committeemen could be limited to only two years through a local union membership's vote ("Oppose 3 Year Term" 1975).

The campaign against extending the terms of shop stewards and shop committeemen began with a petition drive that demanded a membership vote on this issue. Nearly five hundred members signed these petitions, which were given to the local union officers at the February 26 executive board meeting. Bob Stack, the Shop Committee chair, made a motion at this meeting to "receive and file" the petitions. The motion was approved, meaning that no action was taken on scheduling a vote ("Rank & File Coalition: Petitions A Success" 1975; "Rank & File Coalition Leaflet" 1975).

The major forces supporting the term extension were members of both the executive board and the shop committee, led by Bob Stack. The WVC called for a defeat of the three-year term in order to "strike a blow for union democracy" in Local 6. The caucus argued that extending the term of office occurred because of "the rapidly accelerating pro-company movement of the UAW International in the last three years" ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975). The WVC pointed out the contradictory pressures placed on shop-floor representatives and argued that a longer term for these officers was not in the interests of the workers:

> By having a 3-year term for local officers, the International and the company, not the rank-and-file will control our local leaders. We must all recognize that there is a lot of pressure on stewards and committeemen to be pro-company, and not be fighters. The company can make things difficult for the steward or committeeman who organizes his or her constituents for struggle, who fights the company, and does not "get along" with the boss. A steward or committeeman elected every year will feel the hot breath of the rank-and-file on his or her neck, along with this pressure from the company. A steward or committeeman elected every three years can get the boss off his back by hopping in bed with the company for two-and-a-half years before he or she has to appeal to the ranks to get re-elected. ("Defeat the 3-Year Term" 1975)

On March 9 more than three hundred members came out to the local union meeting to hear discussion and to vote on this controversial term extension. After the issue was placed first on the meeting's agenda, the membership heard three speakers argue for and three argue against extending the term of office. Increasing the term of office to three years was voted down by approximately a three-to-one margin ("Rank & File Coalition: 3 Years Crushed" 1975).

Although the *WV* ceased publication with the issue announcing the defeat of the three-year term in early spring of 1975 (*Workers' Voice* 6, no. 4), the WVC still remained a major force within the local, continuing to organize around both worker discrimination and shop-floor issues for several more years. Nevertheless, in the 1975 local union elections, the WVC did not field a slate as it had in the 1974 delegate elections. However, the R&FC did field a complete ticket of candidates for these local elections, a slate that was most likely supported by the WVC because of the similarity between the basic beliefs of these two caucuses.

Of the twelve candidates running on the R&FC ticket for the executive board (and chairman of the shop committee) elections, four were African American, four were Latino, and four were white. An African American woman was slated for an executive board position for the first time since the World War II period. All three white candidates were members of left-wing groups; one was a CP member and the other two were affiliated with the (neo-Trotskyist) International Socialists ("Rank & File Coalition: Organize" 1975; "Come to the Union Meeting" 1975).

The RF&C's program opened with a preamble reminiscent of the preamble of the syndicalist Industrial Workers of the World at its founding convention in Chicago in 1905:

> It is our firm belief that the interests of the company and the interests of the rank and file, have nothing in common. We stand in opposition to all those forces which side with and collaborate with the company against the workers.

> One of our aims is to build the power of the rank and file. We pledge to fight for the interests of the workers. ("Rank & File Coalition: 3 Years Crushed" 1975)

The caucus's election program outlined concrete proposals for increasing shop-floor militancy by fighting the speedup underway in the plant, by implementing the right to strike in resolving grievances, and by forbidding overtime in any department if workers are on layoff. In addition, the R&FC called for eliminating "racist and sexual [*sic*] practices in hiring, upgrading and the use of discipline"; transforming the Steward Councils into organizations "with real power"; and "to reopen the contract" calling for raising retirement pay, guaranteeing full Supplemental Unemployment Benefits pay throughout the entire period of a worker's layoff, and instituting the six-hour work day for eight hours of pay ("Rank & File Coalition with Program" 1975). The R&FC's major criticism of the current local union leaders was that they were not doing anything to actively oppose the speedup and layoffs occurring within the plant ("Rank & File Coalition: Organize!" 1975).

On 7 May 1975, the R&FC was badly beaten by its business unionist rival, the Positive Action Leadership (PAL) caucus in an election involving three slates. The R&FC failed to win a single race, losing to the PAL by large margins in virtually every race. In the two races that the PAL candidates failed to win, runoff elections were scheduled with the two PAL candidates competing against candidates from another business-union-oriented caucus ("Results of Election Held" 1975).

Even with the WVC's foray into the electoral arena, the caucus still focused the majority of its activity around militant shop-floor unionism. In addition to overtime strikes, sit-down strikes, shop-floor meetings during working hours, wildcat strikes and "heat walkouts," the WVC led other types of shop-floor job actions from December 1971 through the end of 1975 over issues such as discipline, managerial harassment, and discrimination. Many of these job actions used the tactic of

attempting to settle industrial disputes by confronting management directly at the point of production. A typical example of the use of these tactics occurred on 11 August 1972 when Harvester fired Department 53 steward Mike Goldfield, alleging insubordination. At the hearing, the company refused to consider Goldfield's arguments seriously since all of the witnesses were management representatives. When the workers in Department 53 returned from lunch at 12:15 p.m. and learned that Goldfield had been discharged, they gathered at the time clock in front of the departmental office. Not a single departmental worker went back to work until Goldfield's termination was rescinded. Even after Superintendent Al Pellegrini threatened to fire all workers who did not return to work within five minutes, all one hundred workers refused to budge from their original demand. A short time later, upon Goldfield's reinstatement with back pay, all of the men went back to work. In spite of Pellegrini's threats, none of the departmental workers were disciplined or fired ("Goldfield Fired" 1972).

From 1972 through 1975, other similar job actions at the point of production led by the WVC occurred–for example, among Department 57's second-shift workers after Murray Dillard, their shop steward, was discharged for insubordination ("Murray Dillard Fired" 1972) and among Department 45 workers after the termination of one of the department's workers ("IHC Asks for Cooperation" 1973). In addition, workers of Department 53 stopped work when the foreman discriminated against an African American woman laborer in the department ("The Problems of the Plant" 1973).

Conclusion: Putting "Old Left" trade-union history into context

The role of the New Left in the U.S. trade-union movement in the 1970s is a history that largely remains to be written by future scholars. Although we know that the New Left and affiliated political groups entered factories to organize the working class in this decade, we have only a preliminary understanding of their

role in strike-support work, in union organizing drives, and in forming union caucuses during this era. For example, a few of the more successful and notable efforts during this period were the RU's work in establishing support committees during the Farah garment strike from 1972 to 1974, the OL's help in building the Brotherhood Caucus in the General Motors plant in Fremont, California, in 1973, and the (neo-Trotskyist) International Socialists' reform activities and efforts within the Teamsters Union (O'Brien 1977/1978). Besides these positive achievements, however, factionalism within the New Left in the 1970s harmed union organizing efforts among workers at the Duke Medical Center (Sacks 1988) and led to problems between the RU and OL working on trade-union activities in a unionized factory in Baltimore (Pfeffer 1979).

This factionalism among New Left union caucuses in trade-union activities, as discussed by Sacks (1988) and Pfeffer (1979), indicates one potential problem with adopting Marxism-Leninism as the guiding philosophy of union factions. With each of these union caucuses viewing itself as the kernel of the vanguard party, their focus could become the recruitment of workers into their organizations as opposed to building broad left-wing union groups having a real effect on mobilizing workers in combating capital on the shop floor and in reforming the union. Such recruitment activities can be highly destructive if workers become disillusioned with the behavior of such groups and abandon all types of shop-floor and union activity.

So how should we evaluate the effectiveness of the New Left WVC's activities in UAW Local 6? The WVC was quite effective in providing leadership in the organization of shop-floor actions because the caucus tapped into the frustrations over daily problems experienced by a significant number of the plant's assembly-line workers. The group's acceptance by these workers is indicated by the fact that a number of WVC members were elected to lower-level union leadership positions as departmental shop stewards and assistant shop stewards after working a relatively short time in the plant.

The caucus's record of electoral activity within the local, however, is mixed. Certainly, when the WVC ran its own slate of candidates in the 1974 UAW delegate elections, the caucus fared rather poorly. However, when the WVC united with other left-wing groups in the local in a broad Left front, the WVC experienced considerably more success. For example, as I have attempted to show here, the WVC's critical support of the SC in the 1973 local elections may have been the crucial factor in Norm Roth winning the presidency of the local that year. Its probable support of the R&FC in the 1975 local elections surely helped the caucus's chances even though it ultimately lost in every race. Finally, when uniting in a broad Left front with the R&FC in opposition to the extension of the terms of office, the WVC was successful in defeating the three-year term.

The WVC's strategy utilized in the local after its LRBW phase was similar to the CP's popular-front strategy in organizing and leading a significant number of the CIO unions from their formation in the mid to late 1930s until the end of World War II. Unfortunately, the onset of the Cold War and the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in the immediate postwar era put the CP on the defensive in the trade unions, eventually undermining the Party's popular-front strategy within the CIO.

What happened to the CP trade unionists in the UAW after 1947 occurred on a larger scale when the eleven CP-led unions in the CIO were purged from the federation in 1949–1950. This purge caused a rupture and a vacuum of politically progressive leadership within the remaining CIO unions. Since CP-led unions negotiated superior contracts to those of non-CP-led unions–that is, they were more "prolabor" in the sense that they were better able "to undermine the sway of capital within production" (Stepan-Norris and Zeitlin 1991, 1151), and since CP-led unions were more likely to have had a more activist orientation on the shop floor than non-CP-led unions (Gilpin 1988; Stepan-Norris and Zeitlin 1991; McColloch 1992), this change of leadership in the CIO had a negative effect for many rank-and-file workers. And this homogenization of the CIO silenced not only the CP trade unionists but other labor radicals and union

opponents of business unionism throughout the politically conservative, if not outright reactionary, 1950s. The merger of the AFL and CIO in 1955 only further solidified the conservative direction of the U.S. trade-union movement.

Nevertheless, in spite of the 1949–50 purge of the CP-led unions from the CIO, the Party still retained the largest, albeit a significantly diminished, organized left-wing presence in the U.S. trade unions during the 1970s. Although the CP leadership admitted at this time that it did not have a strong rank-and-file base within the unions, the Party had achieved influence over a broad base of primarily lower-level trade-union officials through decades of dedicated and committed work. This influence was reflected in the numerous endorsements, even from national officers of some unions, of the Party's organizing of the Rank and File Conference in June 1970, out of which emerged the Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy (TUAD). Approximately 875 union members attended this event, over a third of them African American (O'Brien 1977/1978).

With a significantly reduced progressive voice within the U.S. trade unions for nearly two decades, it is not surprising that this gap was filled by the New Left entry into the unions in the 1970s. But, as I have argued here, the New Left caucus organized in UAW Local 6 in 1970 jettisoned its earlier ideology in favor of one that viewed the Old Left (primarily the CP) as having been a role model in the UAW of the late 1930s and 1940s. The WVC tried to reform Local 6 and model it after the UAW as it had been before its purge of the CP trade unionists in 1947. If these purges of the late 1940s had not occurred, however, the WVC's reform effort might not have been necessary.

Department of Management and Quantitative Methods
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

REFERENCE LIST

Many of the references in this paper are based on archival material found in the Michael Goldfield Personal Collection (MG). Goldfield is currently a professor of political science at Wayne State University (Detroit, Michigan). The UAW Local 6 Office archives are currently located in the UAW Local 6 Office at 3520 W. North Avenue in Stone Park, Illinois.

Assembly Workers Show the Way—Fight Back with Direct Action. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 14. MG.

Breines, Wini. 1982. *Community and Organization in the New Left: 1962–1968*. South Hadley, Mass.: J. F. Bergin Publishers.

Brothers Get Ready. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 12. MG.

Chump Eagan [*sic*] Calls Out the Goons on the Workers. 1970. *Workers' Voice*, Special Edition. MG.

Come to the Meeting of the Workers Slate. 1974. MG.

Come to the Union Meeting! 1975. *Labor's Struggle*, 7 August. MG.

Defeat the 3-Year Term. 1975. *Workers' Voice* 4, no. 3. MG.

Defend Ike Jernigan—Free Ike Jernigan—Hail Ike Jernigan. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 1. MG.

Election Results. 1974. MG.

Fellow Wage Slaves of Harvester. 1971. *Workers' Voice* 2, no. 3. MG.

Georgakas, Dan, and Marvin Surkin. 1975. *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Geschwender, James A. 1977. *Class, Race, and Worker Insurgency: The League of Revolutionary Black Workers.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Get It Together—Right Now. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 11. MG.

Gilpin, Toni. 1988. The FE-UAW Conflict: The Ideological Content of Collective Bargaining in Postwar America. North American Labor History Conference, Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich., 20–22 October.

Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press.

Goldfield Fired . . . Dept. 53 Walks . . . He is Re-Instated. 1972. *Workers' Voice* 3, no. 6. MG.

Harvester on the Rampage—More Firings. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 10. MG.

IHC Asks for Cooperation from Melrose Workers; Harassment, Discharges, Discrimination, B.S. Continue; Workers Respond with More Job Actions. 1973. *Workers' Voice* 4, no. 2. MG.

Klatch, Rebecca E. 1999. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s.* Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press.

Levy, Peter B. 1994. *The New Left and Labor in the 1960s*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Know the Enemy. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 4. MG.

McColloch, Mark. 1992. The Shop Floor Dimension of Union Rivalry: The Case of Westinghouse in the 1950s. In *The CIO's Left-Led Unions*, edited by Steve Rosswurm, 183–99. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press.
Melrose Revolutionary Workers Movement. 1971. *Workers' Voice* 2, no. 4. MG.
Murray Dillard Fired . . . 2nd Shift Walks Out. 1972. *Workers' Voice* 3, no. 12. MG.
No Union at Harvester. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 1. MG.
O'Brien, Jim. 1977/1978. American Leninism in the 1970s. *Radical America* 11, no. 6/12, no. 1: 27–62.
Oppose 3 Year Term. 1974. *Labor's Struggle*, 17 December. MG.
Pfeffer, Richard M. 1979. *Working for Capitali$m*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
Power to the People. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 14. MG.
Rank & File Coalition: 3 Years Crushed. 1975. MG.
Rank & File Coalition: Leaflet on 3-Year Term. 1975. MG.
Rank & File Coalition: Organize! 1975. MG.
Rank & File Coalition: Petitions A Success. 1975. MG.
Rank & File Coalition with Program and Candidates. 1975. MG.
Right on, HRUM. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 11. MG.
Results of Election Held May 7 for Executive Board Members and Shop Committee Chairman. 1975. *Union Voice*. UAW Local 6 Office. 9 May.
Results of Runoff Election. 1973. *Union Voice*. UAW Local 6 Office. 29 June.
Sacks, Karen B. 1988. *Caring by the Hour*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
Scare Tactics. 1974. *Workers' Voice* 5, no. 5. MG.
Seidman, Joel, Jack London, Bernard Karsh, and Daisy L. Tagliacozzo. 1958. *The Worker Views His Union*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
Shop Report: The Union Outlook Remains Status Quo. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 3. MG.
Stepan-Norris, Judith, and Maurice Zeitlin. 1991. Red Unions and Bourgeois Contracts? *American Journal of Sociology* 96, no. 1, 1151–200.
Steward Fired—On Trumped Up Charges. 1970. *Workers' Voice*, Special Edition. MG.
The Problems of the Plant Are Growing, But So is the Struggle. 1973. *Workers' Voice* 4, no. 2. MG.
The Upcoming Union Election. 1973. *Workers' Voice* 4, no. 5. MG.
Workers' Voice. 1970. 1, no. 1. MG.
Workers' Voice. 1970. 1, no. 3. MG.
Workers' Voice. 1975. 6, no. 4. MG.
The Workers' Voice Program. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 8. MG.
UAW Business Union. 1971. *Workers' Voice* 2, no. 10. MG.
Vickers, George. 1975. *The Formation of the New Left*. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.
Vote the Solidarity Slate. 1973. MG.
Walking on Water Would Be. 1973. MG.

We Finally Got the News about How Are [*sic*] Dues Are Being Used. 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 1. MG.
What the WORKERS SLATE Stands For. 1974. MG.
What the Workers Slate Will Do If Elected. 1974. MG.
Why Civil War in Jordan? 1970. *Workers' Voice* 1, no. 7. MG.
Who Is the *Real Enemy* Faced by Workers at IHC? 1974. MG.
Win with Solidarity! 1973. MG.

MARXIST FORUM

The Contemporary Significance of Karl Korsch's Marxism

Tom Meisenhelder

Introduction

Much has been written lately about the need to enter a "post-Marxist" era. Most often the argument is that Marxism, perhaps as an intellectual project for understanding capitalism, but certainly as a political project of the working class, has failed. Less dramatically, it sometimes is argued that the theory-praxis unity of classical Marxism has been split, reducing Marxism to a disembodied academic perspective and/or a dogmatic political strategy. The conclusion is then drawn that radical theory and related social movements must move "beyond Marxism." A glance back at the often overlooked writings of Karl Korsch (1886–1961) can shed illuminating light on the "post-Marxism" argument.

Korsch was a leading figure in the socialist and Communist movements of early twentieth-century Europe who opposed both the social democracy of Kautsky and the Bolshevism of Lenin. Born near Hamburg to middle-class parents, Korsch received a doctorate in law.[1] Although his attraction to socialism came first via the British Fabians, Korsch's activism began within the German Social Democratic Party (SPD). He became a leader of the SPD's left-wing faction that finally split to form the German Communist Party in 1920. Within this group, Korsch argued that socialism required both economic planning and democratic rule,

Nature, Society, and Thought, vol. 14, no. 3 (2001)

as manifested in the workers' council movement. Korsch's writings also stressed the role of revolutionary subjectivity and the unity of theory with practice. Although he was an early supporter of the Russian Revolution and some of Lenin's work, Korsch eventually became quite critical of both. As a result, he was regarded as an "ultra-leftist" and a revisionist idealist within the Communist movement and was condemned (along with Georg Lukács) by Zinoviev in 1924 and Stalin in 1926. Objecting to the organizational structure of the Moscow-dominated Third International, Korsch continued to argue for workers' councils and eventually came to believe that the Soviet Union was a dictatorship over the working class. He was expelled from the German Communist party in 1926.

Korsch then wrote and worked as "an independent Marxist," critical of both Lenin's identification of party and state as well as Kautsky's state reformism (Kolakowski 1978, 310). When Hitler came to power, Korsch emigrated to Denmark and then to England; and in 1936 he moved to the United States, where he remained for the rest of his life.

The key to the continuing relevance of Korsch's body of work is his self-conscious attempt to apply the Marxist historical method to Marxism and his recognition that Marxism itself must change with history. Korsch's historical analysis of Marxism uncovered two varieties of Marxian thought, one positivist and dogmatic and the other critical and dialectical. Korsch sided with the latter.

Korsch on Marxism

Korsch accepted the "fundamental 'historicity' of all scientific knowledge'" (Ceppa 1975–76, 110), meaning that the truth was a historical fact. Searching for the truth, Marxism is the "science that has the proletarian class as its *subject* . . . and the bourgeois mode of production as its object" (108). Marxism is both historical and scientific, both ideology and truth, because its subject and object are historical, while its dialectical method is scientific. Korsch's understanding of Marxism also emphasized the theory's relationship to practice and class struggle.

> Marxian theory . . . is a new science of bourgeois society. It appears at a time when within bourgeois society itself, an independent movement of a new social class is opposing the ruling bourgeois class. . . . It is . . . not a positive but a critical science. It "specifies" bourgeois society and investigates the tendencies visible in the present development of society, and the way to its imminent practical transformation. Thus it is not only a theory of bourgeois society but, at the same time, a theory of proletarian revolution. (1938, 86)

In Korsch's view even the dialectic itself had to be understood through the lens of historical specificity. Thus, the Marxist materialist dialectic was distinguished from the original Hegelian idealist dialectic; the latter was a product of the revolutionary bourgeoisie of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while the former corresponded to the emerging proletarian class of the nineteenth century.

Korsch considered Marxism to be the theoretical agency of the proletariat. He famously disagreed with theorists like Lenin and Kautsky, who believed Marxism to be an "objective" science, developed more or less external to the working class and imported into it. Korsch recognized that despite their political differences, Lenin and Kautsky both had deformed Marxism by portraying it as a positive "science" unconnected to the historical proletariat. To the contrary, Korsch argued that Marxism was the theory of the working class, the organized class consciousness of the proletariat. Korsch came to define Marx's work as an empirical and theoretical analysis of the capitalist economy from the point of view of the workers' movement at one particular stage in its history (Breines 1972, 101–2). Korsch's Marxism remained in a dialectical connection with the actually existent working class, changing as its historical circumstances change. In fact, he felt that the nondialectical understanding of Marxism by Lenin and Kautsky turned it into the political ideology of the Bolshevik and social democratic states, respectively. This dogmatic Marxism became an ideology for the development of state capitalism

in Russia and passive social democracy in Germany. To the contrary, Korsch believed that Marxism must be the theoretic expression of the workers' struggle for a stateless and partyless communism (1977d, 211).

Korsch's study of Marxism resulted in a conception of the three historical "stages of Marxism" corresponding to the history of the workers' movement (1971). Stage one, from 1843 to 1848, represents the so-called "early Marx" and a revolutionary historical period. The second stage entered the twentieth century with a relatively quiet working class and an unfortunate separation of Marxist theory from actual revolutionary practice, creating "dogmatic Marxism." This period was defined by Kautsky and the social democracy of the Second International. Marxism's third stage came with the attempts to reconnect Marxist theory and working class revolution.[2] However, too often this attempt was characterized by the imposition of a dogmatic Marxism into the economic and political struggles of workers. This produced distortions such as those becoming visible in postrevolutionary Russia, where the state and party were taking control of the workers.

A second aspect of Korsch's understanding of Marxism gave special emphasis to the importance of the "social and cultural superstructure." This point of view derives directly from Korsch's conception of the theory-practice dialectic and the idea that Marxism must develop as the historical consciousness of the working class. Korsch's point is that the subjective dimension of history and society should not be excluded from Marxist theory. He adopted the idea that capitalist society was a relational totality composed of both "base" and "superstructure" (1938, 81). This model distinguished Korsch's critical Marxism from other brands of Marxism, such as that proposed by Kautsky, that stressed the economic base in general and the forces of production in particular.

Korsch saw that the relations of production cannot be understood apart from their cultural, political, and ideological aspects and connections. Ideology should be seen as a material force in

society and consciousness as a part of being. For instance, when Korsch analyzed modern corporate capitalism and fascism, he emphasized that in both cases capital's power stems in part from its control over the "means of mental production" through the media. He also argued that superstructural factors are key in the process of revolutionary struggle. While Kautsky stressed that material conditions had to be right for a revolution to succeed, Korsch focused on the need for "revolutionary consciousness" (Breines 1972, 68). He proposed that "revolutionary fantasy" and belief play a crucial role in the class struggle (Kellner 1977, 16–17).

Korsch's critical Marxism

Taking these emphases together, we see that Korsch, along with Lukács and Gramsci, is one of the founders of critical Marxism. Korsch understood the failure of socialism in Europe to be the product of a lag in the consciousness of a proletariat encompassed by bourgeois ideology and a dogmatic Marxism vested in the nineteenth century. This explanation led Korsch to consider the centrality of ideological struggles to revolutionary movements. He proposed that revolutionary organizations must conceptualize, imagine, and enact a postcapitalist society. Marxism must include specific proposals about how communism and socialism would be organized.

Korsch strongly believed that Marxist theory must design constructions of the socialist future derived from the "creative fantasy" and "faith" of revolutionary practice. These plans for socialism had to be material and exacting in order for theory to become a revolutionary force. Objecting to the passivity and reformism of Kautsky, Korsch argued that socialism did not emerge from the capitalist collapse in Europe in 1918 because

> a decisive *belief* in the immediate capacity for realization of the socialistic economic system that could have carried the masses onward was nowhere to be found. (1977a, 127–28)

Theory had failed to take ideological struggle seriously. It failed to develop "concepts of action" and a decisive belief in the real possibility of socialism.

Korsch also critiqued Marxian crisis theory, arguing against the notion that capitalism must experience a final economic collapse. History reveals, he claimed, that capitalism experiences a continuing but unpredictable series of crises. Revolution required that the working class be subjectively prepared for the possibility of radical social change. Korsch noted that Lenin began to develop such a critical-revolutionary Marxism, but failed in the task by restoring Marxism rather than developing it (1977c, 187–93). In the last analysis, he argued, Lenin's work returned to the political thinking of the nineteenth century, complete with a prioritizing of bourgeois forms of political struggle focused on the party and the state. Overemphasizing the role of the state in revolutionary communism, Lenin pushed back the real liberation of the working class to at best the "second stage" of a revolution, supposedly under the direction of a party acting in part as a substitute for class-conscious workers.

Writing in a more positive vein, Korsch uncovered three general principles he felt were crucial to a critical Marxism that could express the revolutionary consciousness of the working class. These are the principle of historical specificity, the principle of change and transition, and the principle of revolutionary practice (1938). The first of these is the belief that Marxism must always conceive of social processes as occurring in a specific historical context and that Marxism is a theory of capitalism rather than a general science of society and nature. He believed it was wrong to attempt to apply Marxism blindly to societies on a trajectory different from that of European capitalism. The second refers to the idea that Marxism is especially alert to those factors in capitalism that lead to social change. Korsch saw Marxism as a living critical theory of capitalist society that holds important practical significance for the working-class movement. The third principle is that Marxism is a theory of revolutionary practice that expresses the interest of the working class. This last principle announced that revolution must be the self-conscious work of

the workers themselves. Contrary to the Marxism of Lenin and Kautsky, according to which the party's possession of truth enabled it to educate and lead ordinary workers, Korsch grounded Marxism in the historical experience of the working class. Marxism was a theory for a "bottom-up" revolutionary movement.

In his construction of a critical Marxism, Korsch was traveling along a path that also carried Antonio Gramsci.[3] Like Gramsci, Korsch accepted the view that science and Marxism were contained in history. From this position, both men derived a similar critique of dogmatic Marxism as fatalistic and too impressed with the causal role of the development of the forces of production. Gramsci also emphasized subjectivity and the significance of culture as an arena of class struggle. Finally both men were active in the workers' council movements of their time. Gramsci and Korsch agreed that workers councils could become a new form of social organization that was more revolutionary and political than trade unions and that pointed to a new form of future communist society.

Korsch on practice

The conflict with Leninism and Social Democracy was defined and continued by Korsch's support of, and involvement in, movements for workers' councils and council communism. Intellectually, Korsch combined his critical Marxism with the ideas of Sorel, Bakunin, and others to criticize the unfortunate "statism" of texts by Lenin and Kautsky and the political strategy of the socialist parties. He realized that the tendency for Marxists like Lenin and Kautsky to emphasize the role of a strong state in postcapitalist society was based on some of Marx's own writings, but he felt they refused to see those writings within the historical context of nineteenth-century capitalist society. While classical Marxism contained a recognition of the administrative necessity of the state, Korsch suggested that Lenin performed a positivist reading of Marx that directly led to a distorted statist form of the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat." Recognizing that Marxism, as a product of the bourgeois historical period,

contained a tendency to overestimate the role of the state in socialism, Korsch argued instead that

> the essential *final goal* of proletarian class struggle is not any one *state*, however "democratic," "communal," or even "council-like," but is rather the classless and stateless Communist *society* whose comprehensive *form* is not any longer some kind of political power but is "*that association in that the free development of every person is the condition for the free development of all.*" (1977d, 211)[4]

Korsch's position seemed to be that while the creation of the democratic state was the realization of the class consciousness of the bourgeoisie, the workers' councils were the realization of the class consciousness of the proletariat. While social democratic and bourgeois unions settled for legal recognition by the state, revolutionary workers' councils sought to replace the state. With legalization, even strikes lost their revolutionary character as they accepted the lawful limitations that come with state authorization. Indeed most previous workers' councils experiments failed as revolutionary models because they did not challenge the state. To be instruments of revolutionary change, councils must involve complete, unhindered self-management, going beyond bourgeois political forms and transforming the relations of production themselves. Korsch proposed a nonstatist model of communism. Korsch's communism was based in a definition of the "socialization of the means of production" that brought together both administrative planning and "bottom-up" democracy. He also recognized that workers' and consumers' councils must be integrated through some form of central planning lest local desires grounded in individual councils ignore societal needs. He believed that this balance could be achieved through democratic workers' and consumers' councils guided by a developing socialist consciousness. The latter would be in part the product a new socialist educational system combining learning and production in educational cooperatives (Kellner 1977, 9–18). Korsch's study of the Paris Commune, the early Soviets, and Spanish anarchists' collectives convinced him that workers'

councils could be the organization that informed a future communist society.

Korsch's ideas about a future communist society came from his observation of the council communism movement in Europe during and after World War I.[5] For instance, in Germany the defeat of World War I brought a spontaneous rebellion in several cities grounded in the creative work of workers' councils. Begun perhaps by mutinies in the military and general strikes, councils declared a short-lived republic and established a federated organization in 1918. Similar events took place in Italy and a decade or so later in Spain. Though these projects failed, they established the possibility that democratic councils could be a transition to a council communism based in worker self-management, a federated system of worker and community councils, and bottom-up democracy.

Conclusion

Korsch's theoretical work has a lot to offer contemporary radical theory. It allows a response to the "post-Marxism" argument that finds the alternative to orthodox dogmatism, whether social democratic or Leninist, within Marxism itself. Looking at Korsch's work generates the conclusion that what is needed is not going beyond Marxism but a return to Marx and the application of Marx's ideas to Marxist theory. Korsch's work points out that Marxist theory is not limited to its dogmatic interpretation and provides a variety of radical left theory that is neither Bolshevik nor Menshevik.

Perhaps the most significant of the errors of dogmatic Marxism is its neglect of the subjective, its refusal to see the crucial importance of ideology and ideological struggle. Korsch argued that revolution would be preceded by the creation of the belief that socialism and communism are possible. Theory must enable a "revolutionary fantasy" by designing realistic models of how a communist or socialist society would work.

Korsch also recognized that the means often determines the end. A nondemocratic party or state-centered strategy of transition tends toward a nondemocratic future society. He questioned

the socialist movement's reliance on the state and feared that the supposedly transitional role of the state would instead become more or less permanent. As Kolakowski put it, Korsch argued that the result would be not a dictatorship of the proletariat but a dictatorship *over* the proletariat (1978, 310). Instead Korsch proposed a future society based in democratic worker and consumer councils, or "council communism." He developed an image of a society based in both economic planning and real democracy.

In addition, Korsch argued that workers' councils must have both political and economic functions (Kellner 1977, 18–19). They must be political *and* economic bodies. If they only function economically, they will fail to be revolutionary organs since they operate within the coercive and legal apparatus of the state. It is important, he argued, for councils to end capitalism's artificial separation of the political and the economic by organizing together relations of production in the work place and relations of consumption in the community. Neither social democratic nor Leninist, council communism presents a model of a participatory workers' democracy that remains relevant today.

Department of Sociology
California State University, San Bernardino

NOTES

1. A brief biography of Korsch can be found in Kolakowski 1978, 309–10.

2. Korsch placed Lenin's work up to *State and Revolution* and the events of 1917 within this historical stage of Marxism.

3. For a good introduction to Gramsci, see Boggs 1976. [For an alternate view of Gramsci, see András Gedö, "Gramsci's Path through the Tension between 'Absolute Historicism' and Materialist Dialectics: Marxism as Historical Philosophy," *Nature, Society, and Thought* 6, no. 1 (1993):7–40; also available online at <www.umn.edu/home/marqu002/gedo61.pdf>—Ed]

4. It is also important to note that toward the end of his life Korsch became a strong internationalist with great hopes for revolution in the third world and unity among all exploited groups.

5. For a brief description of the council movement, see Horvat 1982, 135–56.

REFERENCE LIST

Albert, Michael, and Robin Hahnel. 1981. *Socialism Today and Tomorrow*. Boston: South End Press.
——. 1997. *Looking Forward*. Boston: South End Press.
Boggs, Carl. 1976. *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto.
Breines, Paul. 1972. Praxis and Its Theorists. *Telos* 11 (spring): 67–103.
Ceppa, Leonardo. 1975–76. Korsch's Marxism. *Telos* 16 (winter): 94–119.
Horvat, Branko. 1982. *The Political Economy of Socialism.* Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe.
Kellner, Douglas. 1977. Korsch's Road to Marxian Socialism. In Korsch 1977b, 5–29.
Kolawkowski, Leszek. 1978. *Main Currents of Marxism.* Vol. 3. New York.
Korsch, Karl. 1938. *Karl Marx.* London: Chapman and Hall.
——. 1971. *Marxism and Philosophy*. New York: Monthly Review.
——. 1977a. Fundamentals of Socialization. In Korsch 1977b, 124–34.
——. 1977b. *Karl Korsch.* Edited by Douglas Kellner. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
——. 1977c. Marxism and the Present Task of the Proletarian Class Struggle. In Korsch 1977b, 187–93.
——. 1977d. Revolutionary Communue. In Korsch 1977b, 199–211.

The Radical Voluntarism of Karl Korsch

Robert Steigerwald

Among the causes of the strong interest in Marxism in the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) in the 1960s and 1970s were the youth and student revolts, and the existence of the German Democratic Republic. The literature emerging from this interest actually weakened, rather than strengthened, Marxist and socialist thought. Attention was focused on writings that were especially critical of Lenin and the Soviet Union. Used for this purpose were works of Trotsky, the (early) Lukács, Rosa Luxemburg, and Karl Korsch. Not a single large publisher in the Federal Republic failed to put out such literature, with hundreds of such books and articles being published. Now that the "spirit of the time" is shaped by the false view that Marx is dead, these publishers no longer feel the need for such literature. The various forces espousing "socialism with a human face"–a neo-Marxism critical of the Soviet Union, of Lenin, and of the GDR–have faded from view. As a result, silence rules in this area.

Accordingly, very little current interest is evident in the writings of Karl Korsch. Whether this lack of interest is justified can only be shown by looking at his life and work. Born in 1886, Korsch joined the Fabian Society during his student years, his interest shaped by the ideals of reformist humanism. He was attracted to the neo-Kantian subjective-idealist positions of Eduard Bernstein. Like some other figures of the political and intellectual life of this time, he developed a voluntarist-based expectation of revolution. This led him during the revolutionary

Nature, Society, and Thought, vol. 14, no. 3 (2001)

times of 1918 first to the antiwar and revolutionary Independent Social-Democratic Party (USPD), and later to the Communist Party of Germany (KPD). The KPD subsequently concluded that capitalism had come to a period of relative stabilization. Korsch saw this as an expression of political defeatism, and could not abandon his conviction that an immediate revolution was possible.

Korsch's voluntarism led him to left-radicalism, and the KPD distanced itself from him. He tried to gather similarly oriented forces in left-radical groups, but with little success. In this period he came close to anarchocommunist positions. He was not able to establish himself in these circles either, however. At the time of his death in 1961, he had already broken his ties to Marxism.

In the period before World War I, the Social Democratic Party (SDP) had become powerful in Germany–its voter potential had already then reached approximately the level of today! The dominant view in the SDP was that the growth would continue and would lead to the revolution. "Socialism cannot be stopped in its course by either an ox or an ass," said Bebel. The party leadership was determined to avoid all provocations by the Kaiser government, which wanted to tempt the labor movement into a premature struggle in order to destroy it. "You shoot first, sirs," called out Bebel in 1910 to the reactionary forces at the Magdeburg party congress. Lenin praised this position highly in his report on the party congress. But this was only one side of the issue. The other was that on this basis a theoretical concept was developing whose main representatives were Karl Kautsky and Rudolf Hilferding. They interpreted the real process as evolutionary. They did not orient themselves on the insights of dialectical development, but on an oversimplified Darwinian theory of evolutionary development. The result was a pure trust in an evolutionary process that would automatically go over to socialism. The SPD and the trade-union bureaucracy were guided by this view–one that was the least dangerous for their own positions in the bureaucracy. When more radical forces arose in the party, they were labeled as adventurist.

Against this background, critical personalities of quite varied philosophies and worldviews emerged at the fringes of the party. Rosa Luxumberg's constant critiques of the party leadership's role is well known. She was, however, not able or willing to develop an extraparliamentary struggle. She stood only for electoral and parliamentary struggle. Other critics were Anton Pannekok and Herman Gorter, later to become fathers of left-radicalism. Max Adler should also be mentioned here and, somewhat later, Karl Liebknecht (in his prison drawings), and Lukács and Gramsci in their early periods.

Despite all their individual theoretical differences, they were united in the criticism of the lack of struggle on the part of the Social Democratic Party and the trade-union leadership. In one way or another, they were all convinced that the way to the socialist future must grow out of the action of the working class. This was also true of Korsch, who gave a most important role to consciousness, as did Lenin, Rosa Luxumberg, Gramsci, and Lukács. The difference with Lenin concerned the question of how such a revolutionary consciousness arises, and the question of the character of the thinking, of consciousness itself.

Marx wrote in the introduction to "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law" that the proletariat–the heart–must be united with the head–correct theory (1975, 184). Only then can the liberation struggle of the oppressed and exploited be possible and successful.

This idea–that Marxist theory, arising outside the working class but allied with it, must be brought into the class–was supported by Kautsky and Lenin. How could workers in the first half of the nineteenth century have access to the educational elements necessary to create Marxism: thorough knowledge of classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, the writings of the French historians of the great French Revolution, the writings of the utopian socialists–all the equisite language knowledge? Korsch's polemic against the idea "from outside" was an ignorant position regarding real history. It arose out of his own philosophical worldview, according to which class consciousness arises simultaneously and spontaneously out

of working-class struggles. Intellectuals do not bring it into the class; rather the class infiltrates the intellectuals.

Lenin refuted this interpretation in *What Is to Be Done?* in 1902, showing that revolutionary class consciousness cannot be built on the basis of socioeconomic class struggle alone (1973). The social-democratic and trade-union struggles are essential. Using classical examples, Lenin described the advances in knowledge that the working class derived from such struggles. He emphasized, however, that the struggles for improving the selling of labor power as a commodity do not necessarily lead to the insight that the fight for better conditions is not in itself sufficient. It is necessary to eliminate the conditions that underlie the commodity *labor power* and the laws that govern its buying and selling. What is required is insight into the necessity of a socialist revolution. The working class can only achieve this consciousness when it opposes its enemy, the bourgeoisie, in all social areas–from the economy to politics and ideology. In this sense, consciousness from the outside is brought into the socioeconomic class struggle. This is the second version of "from the outside" in Lenin's *What Is to Be Done?*–which is so conveniently forgotten or ignored by Lenin's critics.

Korsch accuses Lenin of underestimating the class and its struggle, and of insisting on the leading role of the intellectuals. He sees the later negative developments in the Soviet Union as resulting from this.

The fundamental difference between Lenin and Korsch is philosophical in nature: how does consciousness arise and develop? For Korsch, this is essentially a spontaneous process. For Lenin, it is a process of involvement and leadership, for which a party is necessary. If the history of communism shows a tendency to separate the Party, later its leadership and the state it leads, from the class, it does not result from the thesis of *What Is to Be Done?* This interpretation of Lenin's theory would be mechanistic social Darwinism.

Korsch's "consciousness theory" is derived from the foundations of a neo-Kantian-subjective-idealist heritage. This

ultimately results in the rejection of materialism. In *Marxismus und Philosophie* (1923), his overriding concern is with the correct meaning of the Marx's eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it" (Marx 1976, 8). This work by Korsch is oriented on the unity of theory and practice and on the denial of philosophy as an independent entity. This denial is contrary to Lenin's thesis that consciousness is a reflection, a picture, a reflex of reality. Consciousness is already intellectual action (praxis). Not to see this is to underestimate the subjective factor in order to emphasize the objective. This could lead away from a scientific critique of capitalism, resulting in the assumption of a spontaneous dissolution of capitalism.

A simple, effortless glance at Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* will show that this is a caricature of his theory of knowledge. It is also a caricature of Lenin's political theory, which was the opposite of waiting for an automatic collapse of capitalism. On the other hand, one finds that Korsch smoothes over the difference between reform and revolution:

> We consider fundamentally all so-called social reforms as an integrating component of one great historical process of social revolution. . . . Until today almost without any positive effect of the socialist parties to carry through the social policy of the capitalist state and also the union wage struggles as partial steps in a revolutionary process, it is obvious that one must also similarly evaluate the cooperative rights of a factory council. (1968, 89)

There is no need to analyze this text further; it is enough to point to his leveling of the difference between reform and revolution. Korsch considers Lenin's concept to be as evolutionary as that of Kautsky. This is stated at first tentatively in *Marxismus und Philosophie*:

> Insofar as Lenin and his like place the dialectic one-sidedly in the object, nature, and history, and knowledge as a simple passive reflection and picture of this objective

> reality in the subjective consciousness, they actually destroy every dialectical relationship between existence and consciousness, as a necessary result the dialectical relationship between theory and practice. (1923, 62)

Korsch writes later that Lenin returned Marxism to the level of the philosophical materialists of the eighteenth century (1967, 146). Instead of grasping social consciousness in its varied forms of appearance as real, if also ideal or ideological, parts of bourgeois reality, Korsch views in a totally abstract and basically almost metaphysically dualistic way all consciousness as a completely dependent–or only relatively independent and finally dependent–reflex, of the real, material process of development (Korsch 1923, 120). Thinking is a part of existence itself. Or should one understand Marxism as a simple reflex of the labor movement?

There are three basic elements of existence: economics, politics, and idea. Certainly Marxism is not merely a reflex of the working-class and labor movements. It incorporates such sources as classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, the French theoreticians of revolution, history, utopian socialism, as well as recent knowledge of the natural sciences. But it is also a reflex of the rise of capitalism and class struggle between capital and labor. Thus it has ideal and material roots.

There is a consequence in Korsch's thesis that Marxism cannot be a reflex of the working class and its movement. "As every form, also the economic form" (Korsch speaks here of Marxism!) "Social theory itself is neither positive nor negative, but rather is transformed into a historical process from a form of development to a fetter of intellectual history" (1967, 217). Marxism thereby becomes a time-conditioned moment in intellectual history and even, under certain conditions, even a shackle of history!

The consequences extend even further: if ideas within existence have their own manner of existence, the result is the conscious or unconscious rejection of the basic question of philosophy once formulated by Engels about the relationship

between thinking and existence, mind and matter. In putting this position forward, Korsch (as is the case with other left-radicals, such as Pannekok), reduces Lenin's philosophical conception and the resulting reflection theory of knowledge to the level of mechanistic and metaphysical pre-Marxist materialism.

Korsch saw the social democratic as well as the Bolshevik Leninist conception as having suffered defeat. He considered the old bourgeois form of organization incapable of holding back social progress, so that another way had to be found–statism, which took the form of fascism in Germany and the Soviet system as it developed in Russia. Both served to throttle social and labor movements. Korsch is the founding father of totalitarian mythology. Korsch was convinced that the objective conditions for socialist transformation existed, but that the masses were not capable of accomplishing revolution because of their backward consciousness. Therefore, the task of a critical analysis of Marxism itself had to be carried out.

To do this, Marxism itself must be subjected to analysis by the Marxist method. This necessarily leads to a distanced relationship to Marxism itself. Korsch was thus led to the rejection first of materialism, then of the dialectic, and finally Marxism itself.

> It is a shame that in the overcoming of the bourgeois nonsense a genuine "German" mystic from over 100 years ago, who in the best case reflected and distorted the results of the great bourgeois revolution of 1789, today repeatedly hinders the workers and their clear thinking. (1974, 210)

Korsch maintained that the dialectic was no longer useful to explain the revolutionary process. He turned to the mythological concepts of Sorel in order to be able to predict by Sorelization what was impossible through the dialectic. In this period Korsch went over to the philosophical concepts of the then-prevailing version of positivism.

It should be added that Korsch repeatedly made predictions about things to come that never came to pass. I have already

mentioned that he still held fast to the immanent revolutionary orientation when the revolutionary process of the immediate postwar period was replaced by a relative stabilization of capitalism. Between 1933 and 1939, he also rejected the insight of his friends that events were leading to a new world war, that it was necessary to work against this danger. Even one month before war broke out, he did not believe war would come.

In "Ten Theses on Marxism Today," published in 1950, Korsch rejected Marxism as the resurrection of a theory of social revolution that had today become reactionary (1977, 281–82). What seemed to lead to socialism brought only a new type of capitalism, he argued, because reality had passed Marxism by. On occasion the reputation of Brecht has been invoked to place Korsch in a favorable light, since Brecht had called Korsch his teacher in matters of Marxism. It is true, of course, that in this attempt Brecht's criticism of Korsch was suppressed.

> My teacher is a disappointed man; things in which he took part did not turn out as he had projected. Now he does not blame his projections, but rather the things that turned out differently. . . .
>
> My teacher serves the cause of freedom. He has kept himself rather free of all unpleasant tasks. Sometimes it seems to me therefore that if he concerned himself less about his own freedom, he could do more for the cause of freedom. . . .
>
> He is very much for the struggle, but he himself does not actually struggle. He says it is not the right time. He is for the revolution, but he himself contributes more to what actually occurs. . . .
>
> I believe he is fearless. What he does fear is becoming involved in movements that have problems. I believe he cares a little too much about his own integrity.
>
> Also he would only be a guest in the house of the proletariat. One does not know when he is to depart. His luggage is always packed.

> My teacher is very impatient. He wants all or nothing. I often think: to this demand the world gladly responds: nothing. (Brecht 1967, 65–66)

Eschborn, Germany

Translated by Leonard Herman
Philosophy Department
St. John's University, New York

REFERENCE LIST

Brecht, Bertolt. 1967. *Über meinen Lehrer,* in *Marxistische Studien 1926 bis 1939*. In *Schriften zur Politik und Gesellschaft, 1919–1956*, 45–123. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Korsch, Karl. 1923. *Marxismus und Philosophie*. Leipzig: C. L. Hirschfeld.

——. 1967. *Karl Marx*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

——. 1968. *Arbeitsrecht für Betriebsräte.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

——. 1974. Letter to Paul Mattich, 27 March 1939. *Jahrbuch Arbeiterbewegung*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

——. 1977. *Karl Korsch*. Edited by Douglas Kellner. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Lenin, Vladimir I. 1972. *Philosophical Notebooks.* Vol. 38 of *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works.* 1961. Reprint, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

——. 1973. *What Is to Be Done?* In vol. 5 of *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works,* 347–529. 1961. Reprint, Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, Karl. 1975. Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. In vol. 3 of *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Collected Works,* 175–87. New York: International Publishers.

——. 1976. Theses on Feuerbach. In vol. 5 of *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works,* 3–9. New York: International Publishers.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

by Herbert Aptheker

Anti-Semitism in the U.S. Army

A profoundly significant book that has not received the notice it deserves is Joseph W. Bendersky's *The "Jewish Threat": The Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army* (New York: Basic Books, 2000). This carefully documented work demonstrates that "a racial anti-Semitic worldview persisted in the officer corps of the army through World War II and affected the perspectives and activities of some retired officers long thereafter." Official works like the Reserve Officers' *Training Manual* were permeated with anti-Semitism and denounced democracy as marked by "demagogy, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy" (13). The *Manual of Instruction* for Medical Advisory Boards contained this gem: "The foreign born and especially Jews, are more apt to malinger than native born" (38).

Viciously racist and anti-Semitic books, such as those by Edward A. Ross, William Ripley, and Lothrop Stoddard, were the texts used in the education of officers. The occasional objections by scholars like Carlton J. H. Hayes were derided, and the authors themselves were suspect. Leading generals, like George Patton, Charles Willoughby, Albert Wedemeyer, and George Moseley, were profoundly anti-Semitic, as were, of course, J. Edgar Hoover and Allen Dulles. These open anti-Semites retained the respect and friendship of less overt anti-Semites like Eisenhower, Marshall, and Stimson. Official departments of the Army "actively propagated the infamous Protocols of Zion," and

even after its exposure as the fraud it was, the army "never did denounce" that forgery (142, 145).

John Beaty's *Iron Curtain over America* (1951), which enjoyed at least seventeen printings, was a "vicious anti-Semitic diatribe," containing lines like "our alien-dominated government fought the war for the annihilation of Germany, the historic bulwark of Christian Europe." This book was approved by various generals–George Stratemeyer, Edward Almond, William Cannon (former West Point superintendent), and, of course, Senator Pat McCarran (408–10).

As late as 1974, George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, displayed deep anti-Semitism (426). The horror of the Holocaust did alter some opinions, but here is the book's final paragraph:

> Racist anti-Semitism planted, nourished and institutionalized in the officer corps in the early part of the 20th century, in fact became so deeply rooted that it survived decades of momentous historical change, bearing fruit well into the postwar era.

My own experience (of which the author apparently was unaware) belongs in an account of the anti-Semitic politics of the U.S. Army. As a captain in the field artillery during the Second World War, I was slated to attend the advanced training school in Washington. Upon successful completion, a graduate was promoted in grade. While preparing for this momentous change, I was told by my immediate commanding officer, Lt. Colonel Theodore Parker (who knew the eminent role his ancestor Theodore Parker had played, with Garrison and Douglass, in combating slavery), that my order to attend this school had been cancelled. I was to leave my outfit in Texas and join one in North Carolina.

Of course, there was no recourse. Parker expressed to me–in writing–his deep regret at this display of "unfortunate prejudice" by the commanding officer, Colonel Buehl Smith. Months later, in North Carolina, preparing for duty overseas, I was told to

report to the camp's headquarters–a general wished to see me. I feared this might mean that, because of my well-known radicalism, I was not to join in the fight against Hitler.

Reporting as ordered, however, I was surprised to learn that there was interest in my hasty transfer from Texas. The officer inquiring into my presence in North Carolina wanted to know why I had been summarily transferred from Texas (my ratings were "superior"). I stated that Colonel Smith was deeply anti-Semitic, that I was Jewish, and that this was the reason for my transfer. "Did you have proof of this?" I was asked. It was notorious at the time, I replied. "No," I was told, "do you have proof?" Then Parker's letter came to mind. "Let me see it," said the inspecting officer. It was a personal letter, I replied, and I would not surrender it unless Parker approved. I was told to get the approval. Parker responded at once and, with his permission, the damning evidence against Smith was turned over to the investigating officer.

Soon thereafter I went overseas. At the war's end, while lecturing in Wisconsin, I was told by a rabbi who had been in the army of the trial of Colonel Smith. He was found guilty of impermissible behavior and was sentenced to remain in rank and denied combat service.

I was promoted to major before the war's end. That, however, is not the end of the story. In 1950, at the order of President Truman, my commission in the U.S. Army was taken from me. The story of that scandal is told in the *Journal of American History* for June 2000. That belongs in Professor Bendersky's book.

Prophets, sung and unsung

Freedomways was a radical literary quarterly published throughout the 1960s and into the early 1980s. A collection from its pages, edited by Esther Cooper Jackson and Constance Pohl, was recently published. *Freedomways Reader: Prophets in Their Own Country* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2000) contains writings by most of the foremost Black literary figures of those momentous twenty years, from Alice Walker to Ruby Dee,

from Harry Belafonte to Arna Bontemps, from Lorraine Hansberry to Sterling Brown.

Its most consequential essay is one of the final addresses of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., delivered before a packed house at Carnegie Hall in New York City. The date was 23 February 1968. The occasion was the hundredth anniversary of W. E. B. Du Bois's birth and the fifth anniversary of his death.

Dr. Du Bois, who had chosen to join the Communist Party shortly before leaving for Ghana to undertake a projected Encyclopedia of the African Peoples, was anathema to the controlling powers in Washington. Indeed, they had actually tried, unsuccessfully, to send the Doctor to prison.

King, speaking under the auspices mentioned and eulogizing the Communist Du Bois, made perhaps the most radical speech of his life. He announced his plans for continuing and deepening the struggle for Black liberation. King concluded his remarkable effort by insisting that Dr. Du Bois's "greatest virtue was his committed empathy with all the oppressed and his divine dissatisfaction with all forms of injustice." King here insisted, "We are still challenged to be dissatisfied." It is very difficult to believe that this declaration by King, and his projected plans for action to express this dissatisfaction, are unrelated to his murder a few weeks later.

A limited account

A huge volume (656 pages) is entitled *A War to be Won: Fighting in the Second World War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000). Its authors, Williamson Murray and Allan R. Millett, of Ohio State University, are, as they write, "children of World War II," and as young men "one of us combatted communism in the Caribbean, and the other took on the same mission in Southwest Asia."

Of course, Hirohito, Mussolini, Franco, and Hitler undertook "the same mission." It is slightly surprising that these young professors are not aware of their ideological kinship with those departed ones. Their book, especially as it seeks to minimize the fundamental part of the USSR in warning of the threat of fascism

and finally in playing a decisive role in defeating it, shows the severe limits of these "children of World War II." Its outlook helps ensure the tenure of these professors in the present era graced by the current resident in the White House.

Otherwise the accounts of some of the major campaigns of the war are not without value. The numerous illustrations enhance the book's interest.

J. Edgar Hoover, chief fascist

A book of great importance is *"Communists": FBI Surveillance of German Emigré Writers* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2000), edited by Alexander Stephan. This is a shortened version of a massive study published in Germany in 1995. It documents the fascist-like activity led by the FBI and joined by the State Department and other federal and local police agencies. Throughout the Cold War years, Hoover and his superiors engaged in quite illegal and massive spying upon scores of distinguished emigrés like the Mann family, Bertolt Brecht, Erwin Piscator (who trained figures like Rod Steiger and Harry Belafonte)–and, especially, Anna Seghers, author of the widely popular *Seventh Cross.* This book is an updated examination of Hoover's obsessive and criminal activities; it supplements earlier exposés, especially Herbert Mitgang's *Dangerous Dossiers* (1988).

That the Washington building housing the Department of Justice is named after J. Edgar Hoover certainly is appropriate now that a moral idiot holds the office once graced by Lincoln and FDR.

Again, racism's crime

Early in March 2001, the Civil Rights Project, connected with Harvard, released findings showing the dastardly labeling of many Black children as retarded and misassigning them in school placement. The project was produced by scholars from Virginia Commonwealth University and East Tennessee State University. It reported that "a substantial number" of Black students were "labeled mentally retarded inappropriately." On the

basis of 1997 data–the latest available–the study reported that Black students were almost three times more likely to be classified as "retarded" compared with white students. Data of this nature can produce "devastating results throughout the nation."

The discrimination is not an accident; the study does not make clear that it is the product of criminal practices reflecting and bolstering a foul racial order. The source must be altered if the result is to be transformed.

Real history of Japan

Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan by Herbert P. Bix (New York: HarperCollins, 2000) convincingly demonstrates the utter falsity of Washington's postwar policy of presenting Hirohito as having been a mere figurehead unhappy with the expansionist and murderous policy of Tokyo decades prior to and during the Second World War. On the contrary, Hirohito was a decisive force favoring Japan's expansionist policy. He was also "far and away the nation's biggest landowner and wealthiest individual" (552).

With Japan's defeat, Washington's central purpose (as in Europe after Germany's defeat) was to assure that movement towards socialism was thwarted. In Japan (as in Germany) Washington's aim was to sustain a capitalist social order. If implementers of this policy faltered, as in the case of MacArthur and his fanatically reactionary aide, Brig. General Bonner F. Fellers (later in the United States a leader of the Christian Right), usually by too-open support of right-wing and anti-Semitic elements, it was modified to mute its blatant nature. But the central purpose–the defeat of the Left and the retention of capitalism–was clear in Asia as it was in Europe. I wish this truth were made clearer by the author, but its reality is there (especially in the notes, confined to pages 689-770).

Transforming Hirohito from the expansionist, warmongering reality that he was into an inconsequential figurehead was Washington's doing. Its aims were to conceal the awful nature of Tokyo's wars, especially against China, where millions were

slaughtered, and to transform Hirohito into a well-meaning, but alas powerless, figurehead.

I wish the book had made clear the heroic effort of the Communists to thwart Hirohito and the martyrdom that many suffered. This belongs in any effort to fully expose the history of Japan since the end of the First World War. Something of this is hinted here. Someday a socialist Japan will do this justice.

Little appears here on the atrocity connected with the atomic bombs. There is mention–nothing more–of Hiroshima, and no notice at all of Nagasaki. Both were directed, I believe, toward the USSR, which had entered the conflict. They resulted in the slaughter of tens of thousands of civilians, including women and children, and in criminality rival some of the exploits of Hitler. With the author's current conventional anti-Soviet stance, perhaps the brevity here is a virtue. In a biography of Japan's emperor, this matter deserves more attention. Still, Bix's *Hirohito* does refute Washington's effort to falsify the history of Japan and Hirohito's major role in it.

Artists and McCarthyism

Reflective of the growing literature on artists of the Left in the 1950s and later is the excellent study, *Robert Gwathmey: The Life and Art of a Passionate Observer*, by Michael Kammen (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

I am not competent to analyze this work, but I did know Gwathmey, as well as other artists mentioned in the work like Jacob Lawrence, Charles White, Philip Evergood, Ben Shahn, and Helen West Heller. Some of them I knew very well as comrades together resisting the foul McCarthy and his less obnoxious helpmates, like Truman and Eisenhower. I should like to make this point: many writers of the Left yielded, and some even informed. But the graphic artists did not. I do not know why this was so, but it is a fact often missed, I think, in the literature, and well worth noting. These artists remained staunch supporters of the Left in the most difficult times.

The prison industry

Joseph T. Hallinan's *Going up the River: Travels in a Prison Nation* (New York: Random House, 2001) is an important book, offering a description and some analysis of a new industry–the incarceration of hundreds of thousands of men (and an increasing number of women).

Washington's turn to war (without termination, we are promised) may be alleviating the urgent problem of finding employment for young men, although leaving undone the task of managing the hundreds of thousands incarcerated. Still, a good, useful examination of what the author calls "the power of the prison industry" is helpful.

Communities anxious to keep their young folk from leaving home actively offer themselves as sites for prisons, having been promised tax abatements, job training, and, the author writes, "all sorts of municipal goodies." Crime–or allegation of criminal behavior–has become a big business. The incarceration of its practitioners–or alleged practitioners–is now a major industry. Short of making war, it is an ideal way for the bourgeoisie to moderate demands for basic social change. As an additional benefit for the ruling class, here is a new way in many instances to realize a handsome profit from legalized forced labor.

Hallinan now employs himself by writing for the *Wall Street Journal*. That is one way for a young man to avoid prison or war-making. The morality of it is another matter. In *Going up the River*, the author has illuminated a way of earning a livelihood other than fighting or writing for Wall Street.

Book Reviews

British Marxist Criticism. Edited by Victor N. Paananen. New York, London: Garland Publishing, 2000. 506 pages, cloth $70.00.

British Marxist Criticism, a volume in the Modern Critics and Critical School series, is an impressive reconstruction of the native British tradition of Marxist literary criticism since the 1930s. The book provides selective but extensively annotated bibliographies, introductory essays, and excerpts from the writing of eight major critics. These writers (Alick West, Christopher Caudwell, Jack Lindsay, A. L. Morton, Arnold Kettle, Margot Heinemann, Raymond Williams, and Terry Eagleton) seek to explain literary production on the basis of Marx's philosophical, political, and economic thought. While both the essays and the bibliographies focus on these critics' insights into the relations between literary production and social structure, Paananen also includes in his discussion and bibliographies some of their writing that does not deal directly with literature–such as Caudwell's studies in bourgeois psychology and religion and Williams's political and cultural criticism.

The reader wonders at times (although, to be sure, the bibliographies do not claim completeness) why certain important studies, such as Caudwell's *Crisis in Physics* (1939), are ignored. Yet, this approach is crucial because it reminds the reader that Marxist critics, from the beginning, tried to break through the confines of specialized disciplines; they understood that to remain within the confines of the particular discipline is to

prevent the perception of a particular problem and its solution as a function of the historical context. In short, they knew that writing from a genuinely Marxist perspective is, by its very nature, interdisciplinary, explaining the generation of new ideas in terms of the complexity of historical processes.

The book is important in more ways than one. First, the reputation of Marxist literary criticism has never been high either in or outside Britain. In contrast to the contribution made by Marxists to other aspects of British political and intellectual life, British Marxist literary criticism has up until recently always been looked down upon as some sort of politically partisan, alien activity in that highly individualized literary culture that is still haunted by the ghosts of F. R. Leavis and I. A. Richards. Apart from a few studies of individual critics, there is to date no systematic critical reconstruction and evaluation of the British Marxist tradition. In this context the volume is immensely valuable because it highlights the fact that a Marxist tradition exists and shows where it is to be found.

Secondly, the essays and excerpts illustrate the fruitfulness of the Marxist methodology in the context of the bankruptcy of what may be called the dilemma of much postmodern critical work that stresses the deconstruction of wholes, a perspective of the world in terms of its fragmentation, and a rejection of so-called "master discourses," including Marxism. While a deconstructive perspective may have something to offer by way of destroying the illusion that cultural products represent coherent and independently existing entities, such an approach does not allow for interpretations of the past and the present, which must lead to the shaping of a more humane society. Yet the need for alternatives to late capitalism and its so-called postmodern culture in the context of a renewed U. S. arms race, the global contamination of food, and an unprecedented neocolonialism is more urgent than ever. Any form of constructive cultural criticism must address the problem of offering socialist alternatives to the present crisis of capitalism.

Paananen's book illustrates that this is precisely what Marxist critics have been doing from the very beginning in their attempt

to develop a theory of culture that explains cultural production as part of the more general mode of social and material production. In contrast to bourgeois criticism from the New Criticism via structuralism to deconstruction that treats culture as divorced from the prevailing conditions of production and historical process and thus as the foundation of a sustaining human nature, the Marxist tradition has tried to work out the complex relations between cultural and material production. As Marx argued in *The German Ideology*, the production of ideology, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with human material activity and intercourse–the language of real life. This approach allows us, on the one hand, to understand thinking and the forms of its cultural representation as part of the superstructure generated by historical circumstances. On the other hand, it enables us to see the realm of aesthetics, in Terry Eagleton's words, as "the story of the struggles of men and women to free themselves from certain forms of exploitation and oppression" (*Marxism and Criticism* [London: Methuen, 1976], vii). Seen in this light, Marxist literary criticism is also the reconstruction of the story of the struggle for a more humane future in which alienation, scarcity, and oppression are eliminated, and for the building of socialism. All the essays of the writers represented in this book illustrate their attempt to explore the culture of the past in terms of this struggle, as, for example, in Alick West's excellent study of Walter Pater or A. L. Morton's discussion of the novels of the Brontë sisters.

To be sure, British Marxist criticism, except perhaps Terry Eagleton's work, is still looked down upon as some sort of vulgarized version of the Marxist base-superstructure model that is mechanistically wedded to a reflectionist theory of literature and culture. While it is not hard to find evidence in the writing of the 1930s and 1940s to substantiate this criticism, it is also true that this body of criticism–as uneven and partially flawed as it was–began to explore the main problem of a politically effective Marxist criticism, namely the relation between literature and history, and provided the basis for immensely valuable work since then. Moreover, Caudwell, Ralph Fox (who is, unfortunately, not

represented in the book), and Alick West exercised a preeminent influence on the work of the later generation of Marxists, such as Raymond Williams and Terry Eagleton, who freely acknowledge their indebtedness to the Marxist critical tradition of the prewar period.

The essays also illustrate that Marxist critics have, from the beginning, tried to avoid a mechanistic interpretation of the base-superstructure model and struggled for a dialectical cultural theory. Alick West, for example, did not interpret Pater's works in terms of a mere reflection of the decadent Victorian bourgeoisie; he did not believe that imaginative literature simply reflects history or a writer's class position. Rather, he explores how Pater's aestheticism–although an artist's general theory of art may indirectly express and serve "the ruling ideas of the ruling class" (in Marx's well-known phrase)–is rooted in the activity of the people who are society and never wholly in society's political form, and thus also constitutes an expression of the desire to move beyond Victorian capitalism (371). Or Raymond Williams, in "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory," argues against the widespread proposition of the determining base and the determined superstructure and stresses the need to grasp that all thinking, the production of ideas, is itself material and social–that is, that all cultural activity is material activity. Paananen is right to point out that one of Williams's major achievements is

> to return to Marx to demonstrate that the production of literature–and all other cultural production–is the creation of a material social process. . . . When the labor expended is alienated labor, the distortions of such alienation are evident in the product, whether that product is a sonnet or a skyscraper. But all work, literature included, reaches for full humanity. (196)

This is precisely the work Marxists are called to perform, namely the building of socialism to achieve this humanity. Williams's work, from the vantage point of the study of culture in the broadest sense, helps us to see how human labor has always contained

within it this strife that is an essential part of the historical movement toward socialism.

While the writers represented in this volume have made a major contribution to what Terry Eagleton calls "a revolutionary criticism," we are far from finished with this task. As a book-length study of British Marxist criticism does not yet exist, readers will particularly appreciate the carefully annotated und suggestive bibliography presented here as a guide for further research. Moreover, the concise introductory essays to each writer draw attention to some of the major theoretical debates within the Marxist tradition, such as the relation between social being and consciousness or the problem of concept formation, and thus to the challenging work still ahead of us.

Stephan Lieske
English Department
Humboldt University
Berlin

The Consolation of Ontology: On the Substantial and Nonsubstantial Models. By Egon Bondy. Translated by Benjamin B. Page. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2001. 254 pages, cloth $90.00.

Zbynek Fiser, whose pen name is Egon Bondy, although well known in the Czech and Slovak Republics, has had little recognition elsewhere. This book originally was published in 1967, with a second edition in 1999. Benjamin Page's translation from Czech into English gives us a glimpse of the magnitude of his thought.

A central theme of our time is domination vs. liberation. Many groups have confronted oppressive structures through their actions. What is often lacking is a theoretical structure that explains the ontological basis of domination and the elements of

liberation. Egon Bondy's work provides us with such a theoretical framework. His thesis is that the substantial model of ontology is an ideological reflection of social classes in a class society. It is dualistic and subordinates other levels of existence to an ontological substance. This becomes the basis for power groups to oppress others. Bondy claims that the substantial model contains many logical contradictions and postulates a nonverifiable substance. Cogent arguments are presented throughout his work to substantiate these claims.

Bondy uses a conversational format in discussing some substantial conceptions of God, skillfully showing their inadequacy. He contends that if God is a substance, then God can ask himself why He exists or has any value. He also could will his nonexistence. Bondy believes we need to go beyond theism and atheism and use the insights of different religions to build a new society.

Bondy argues in support of a nonsubstantial model of ontology. He maintains that there is no ontological reality except for individual units and no privileged status is to be given any level of reality. Bondy uses dialectical laws to explain both quantitative and qualitative changes. He claims that a nonsubstantial model expresses more adequately the importance of freedom, responsibility, and value as open categories within a Marxist perspective. Explaining why oppressive forms continue existing in people's character structure in a classless society and the changes needed to eliminate them would have enhanced this work. Interestingly, Bondy's concept of nonsubstantial ontology is consistent with modern science.

The significant contribution of this work is the unity of thought that it represents. It utilizes diverse fields of study, such as cosmology, evolution, theology, axiology, and Buddhism, in developing a nonsubstantial model of ontology. Its originality is manifested in developing a nonsubstantial model of ontology within a dialectical-materialist conception of the universe that would be appealing to different groups with multiperspective and cross-cultural viewpoints. The content and themes in this work

will interest process philosophers, Marxists, Buddhists, socialist ecologists, socialist feminists, and system theorists.

Ben Page's translation is clearly written, and the technical concepts in ontology do not impede an understanding of their references and applications. The translator's introduction provides much information about the author. Page informs us of Bondy's varied life as a published philosopher, Indologist, novelist, and poet. He uses references to personal conversations, interviews, and recent writings to elucidate aspects of Bondy's nonsubstantial ontology and his current views. Bondy is at present a critic of consumerism and believes that communism is still needed to combat the oppressive nature of globalization.

Edward D'Angelo
Quinnipiac University
Hamden, Connecticutl

Black Workers Remember: An Oral History of Segregation, Unionism, and the Freedom Struggle. By Michael K. Honey. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999. 402 pages, cloth $35.00; *The Bridge over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics.* By William Julius Wilson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999. 163 pages, cloth $19.95.

The two books under review here furnish a captivating look at the interplay between race, class, and economic exploitation. Michael K. Honey, professor of African American, Ethnic, and Labor Studies at the University of Washington, Tacoma, provides us with a fascinating perspective on the history of Black American workers, U.S. economic development, and the multigenerational African American freedom struggle. This work, which contains narratives from the 1930s to the present, rests on the author's quest to refute the "false assertion" that "the search for profit in a capitalist market economy will eliminate poverty"

and to recapture the important role labor organizations (and labor organizers) played in the lives of Black American workers, particularly during the civil rights movement. Also crucial is Honey's claim that "we still have much to learn about the interconnection between racism and economics" (13).

On the other hand, William Julius Wilson, a MacArthur Prize Fellow and Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, taking a more contemporary look at America's continuing racial and economic divide, calls for the creation of a grassroots, progressive, and multiracial coalition to enhance the political effectiveness of ordinary people by pressuring government on all levels to enact policies and programs that will achieve full employment, correct the trade imbalance with foreign nations, and alleviate the economic hardships all Americans face.

Honey's *Black Workers Remember: An Oral History of Segregation, Unionism, and the Freedom Struggle* is organized both thematically and chronologically. Chapter one provides a broad historical context introducing the various themes and topics of the book. The next two chapters explore the lives of Black American workers during the early part of the twentieth century, when many African Americans were transformed into industrial employees. Also examined are the struggles Black women faced as they attempted to join the workforce during and after World War II. First, Honey asserts that despite the slight improvements in wages Black wage earners obtained during the 1920s and 1930s, most Black American laborers continued to face the issues of racial segregation and discrimination, and experienced almost daily violence. Second, in his analysis of the working conditions of Black women during this same period, the author maintains that their conditions were much worse as a result of the interlocking and exploitative concepts of class, race, and gender oppression.

Honey next turns to the topics of the resistance of Black American workers to overt racism and racial segregation in factories and in unions during the 1940s and 1950s, and the parallels between the civil rights and union struggles during the

1960s. He shows how the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers' strike that culminated in the death of the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. helped to merge a concrete nexus between the Black freedom struggle and the union movement.

During and after the Second World War, African American workers began to challenge their status as second-class citizens by joining or organizing unions. Many of these activities, however, were curtailed by the emergence of the Cold War era and its anti-union (as well as anti-Communist) atmosphere. Nevertheless, a large number of Black American employees continued to establish or become members of unions because they saw that gradual improvements in working conditions and wages occurred when the civil rights and union rights struggle were linked. Honey concludes that the climax of this effort occurred with the involvement and eventual assassination of King during an early stage of the Memphis sanitation workers strike in 1968.

Honey's volume ends with several chapters on the plight of African American workers during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. In these accounts, the author claims that as soon as the barriers of racial segregation were dismantled in a large number of factories, especially during the late 1970s and early 1980s, many industrial jobs were moved to nonunionized countries in Latin America and Asia. Moreover, by the 1990s enormous unemployment rates began to characterize most urban African American communities.

Michael K. Honey's *Black Workers Remember* is a valuable study that makes an enormous contribution to our historical understanding of labor, African American, and economic history. It covers a number of important topics such as the influence of the labor movement on the African American freedom struggle as well as the participation of Black American workers in the economic development of the United States. Honey's powerful and emotional collection of documents, taking the reader on a journey that is both painful and inspiring, is a priceless testimony to the lives of those who contributed to the continuous quest of African Americans for social and economic justice. The author should be congratulated for his topnotch piece of scholarship.

Despite these strengths, there are some weaknesses. One problem is the organization of the book. The transition from thematic to chronological to topical makes Honey's main arguments and themes a little difficult to follow. Also, some chapters are a little weak in terms of historical context. Finally, the analysis of the connection of the economic plight of African Americans and the global economy could have been expanded. However, these minor problems do not take away from the impact of this gripping and passionate volume.

William Julius Wilson's *The Bridge over the Racial Divide: Rising Inequality and Coalition Politics*, an expansion of several previously delivered lectures and parts of various published essays, offers a number of solutions to the racial and economic problems examined in Honey's work. First, Wilson notes that America's continuous racial and economic divide can only be reduced with the development of a new discourse on race and economic exploitation. Second, the author asserts that old and outdated affirmative-action programs and policies must be transformed into class- and merit-based, nonfriction entities. Finally, the author contends that a progressive, multiracial political coalition must be created to "put pressure . . . on both Democratic and Republican leaders to pursue and adopt policies that reflect the interest of ordinary families" (5).

Wilson's first chapter explores the connection between the expanding racial and class divisions in the United States. He asserts the need for a comprehensive understanding of the social, economic, and political forces that cause racism and class divisions to exist and flourish.

The author next turns to the connection between the ever-changing global economy and the economic shift within most African American communities. Wilson shows how over the past few decades the demand for laborers has shifted from low-skilled workers to highly skilled wage earners as low-skilled jobs have been moved from the various urban centers in the United States to Latin America and Asia, where strong unions are not present. Furthermore, the jobs that have replaced these positions are predominantly service-oriented, located in the suburbs, far

away from the urban communities where large numbers of African Americans reside. As a result of this situation, the rate of unemployment has increased greatly in these cities. These dramatic and deadly changes, Wilson contends, are linked directly to the power of the global economy and its intensifying world marketplace.

The topics of restructuring affirmative action to affirmative opportunity and the fundamentals of building a multiracial political cooperative are discussed in the next three chapters. Wilson notes that building a multicultural alliance for change must start with the transformation of affirmative-action programs to affirmative-opportunity programs because politicians, certain communities, and many ordinary Americans have racially politicized this issue highly over the past few decades. With the development of this new framework, the author concludes that America's commitment to fairness and merit, regardless of income, race, and gender, will resurface and thrive.

Wilson's book ends with a short chapter that calls for the creation of a new discourse to discuss America's expanding economic and racial divide. The author illustrates how such a dialogue could be developed and be used to initiate and redefine solutions to the problem of the evolving economic and racial gulf among the various groups in today's society. Wilson concludes that this movement can only occur if "ordinary citizens embrace the need for mutual political cooperation" (123).

William Julius Wilson's *The Bridge over the Racial Divide* clearly establishes a new paradigm for discussing the interplay between race and class. His meticulously researched and lucidly written section on how to develop a progressive, multiracial political alliance is a must read for anyone interested in "real" social and economic justice. Room for further analysis remains, however, particularly in the area of transforming the nature of affirmative action programs.

Although Honey and Wilson's books represent different approaches to America's racial and economic divide, there is a unity to them. Both acknowledge the powerful and prolonged intersection of race and class in the history of the United States.

Also, the ultimate goal of trying to solve this problem (or problems) links the works of these two fine scholars. All in all, both authors should be commended for making such a monumental contribution to the fields of African American history and the study of race relations in the United States.

Eric R. Jackson
Department of History and Geography
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Affirming Action: A Comment on the Work of William Julius Wilson

Jeffrey R. Kerr-Ritchie

From a position of relative academic obscurity in the sociology department at the University of Chicago, William Julius Wilson quickly became the darling of the American sociological profession and public foundations studying poverty with his intellectual explanation that race and racism were no longer of significance in late twentieth-century America. The spark was his first book, *The Declining Significance of Race* (1979), which argued that the economic racial oppression experienced by virtually all Blacks during both slavery and industrialization had moved to a point of economic subordination for the Black underclass in modern industrial America. In *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987), Wilson pursued the logical consequence of race's "declining significance" by rejecting race-specific social policies like affirmative action for more class-based approaches. His 1996 book, *When Work Disappears*,* argues for a public-works program supplemented by extended welfare provisions as the

panacea for poor Black America. Along with professional plaudits earning him a prestigious spot on Harvard's dream team of Black academics, Wilson even gained the ear of former President Clinton.

Unlike several critics, I find it hard to read the corpus of Wilson's work and not appreciate his genuine concern with the plight of poor Black people. His focus on the structural nature of Black poverty distances him from the ideology of individual bootstrap uplift proposed by followers of Booker T. Washington, while his call for public programs and government intervention makes his work anathema to conservative academics and policy makers. There are, however, serious limitations to both his social scientific approach as well as his advocacy of liberal capitalist reforms.

I shall focus on only three points, because of limited space. First, race *does* matter. How else can we explain the consistently higher rates of unemployment, incarceration, and poor health among Black compared to white Americans? Furthermore, since the publication of Wilson's first book, we have witnessed the rise of a white vigilante movement together with church burnings and lynchings in the South and racial attacks on Black people in the North. Most recently, the significance of race has become apparent in discrimination against Black agents in the FBI, racial profiling of Black motorists, and discriminatory policies against Black customers in certain hotels. We do not have to subscribe to complicated psychological notions of "whiteness" to recognize the systemic and ongoing practice of racial privilege.

Second, affirmative action has worked. It is important not to forget the protest struggles of the civil rights and Black power movements that pressured the government to pass positive discrimination laws. This legislation sought to tackle systemic racism as the logical consequence of a long history of racial slavery, racial Jim Crow, and institutionalized racism. The result was the desegregation of labor markets as well as the opening of public employment to Black working people. As a professional historian who occasionally works in the national archives in Washington, D.C., I have been struck by the impressive number

of Black federal employees. It has been estimated that one sixth of all Black families earned over $50,000 annually by the early 1990s. In short, the making of the Black middle class in modern America has less to do with the sudden emergence of the right attitudes among Black people or the declining significance of race than with the structural transformations largely wrought by affirmative-action programs.

Third, sites of struggle must transcend the workplace. The implementation of low-paid work through government-sponsored programs, while practical in the context of a depressed industrial economy, is simply no solution to the very real problems of urban poverty and deprivation in modern deindustrialized societies. The technological revolution of the last two decades is transforming the nature of work, unemploying people, demanding an educated workforce, and dividing the skilled haves from the unskilled have-nots. There is a critical need for investment in education and retraining programs. If most Black graduates hail from historically Black colleges, and a degree leads to better job opportunities, then it makes sense to make these important institutions of Black higher learning the beneficiaries of more financial, technological, and human resources. And this education should not simply be for getting a job or making an adjustment process within a racist society, but rather it should constitute a force for changing the values of society that make it racist.

Along with education, another site of struggle must be the media and forms of communication that convey Black views both independently as well as in mainstream broadcasting. In addition, famous cases can raise important issues. The struggle for the acquittal of death-row inmate Mumia Abu Jamal has become a lightning rod for critiquing the racist judicial process and its underlying prison-industrial complex across the nation and in Europe. (It might be noted that Wilson's proposed cheap-labor system already operates–behind bars).

In 1848, Marx and Engels wrote that the history of hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle. Ten years later, Frederick Douglass explained that power concedes nothing

without struggle–never has and never will. Any future strategies for tackling social and racial inequality in the modern United States must come from organized protest rather than the philosopher's respectable reforms.

*For a detailed review of this book, and a critical analysis of Wilson's work up to its publication, see Stephen Steinberg, "Science and Politics in the Work of William Julius Wilson," *New Politics* 6 (winter 1997)–Ed.

Schomburg Center for Research in Black History and Culture
New York

ABSTRACTS

***Jürgen Rojahn*, "A *MEGA* Update"**–The author discusses the expansion of the activities connected with the publication of the complete works of Marx and Engels in their original languages (*Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe,* or *MEGA*) from 1999 through 2001.

***Pradip Baksi*, "*MEGA IV/3*: Marx's Notes, 1844–1847"**–The review presents a detailed summary of the contents of *MEGA IV/3*.

***Morris Zeitlin*, "Globalization: Part 1–Its Advocates"** –Mainstream advocates of globalization see transnational corporations as the agents of a new global order based on globally organized cost-efficient production and distribution using modern information and communication technology. Some question the stability of the process. Others hail the formation of institutions to promote and control global trade; they believe the establishment of seats of global economic power in "global cities" spells the decline of nation states and the emergence of a new global society. (**"Globalization: Part 2–Its Radical Critics"** will appear in the next issue of *NST*.)

***Victor G. Devinatz*, "The Antipolitics and Politics of a New Left Union Caucus: The Workers' Voice Committee of UAW Local 6, 1970–1975"**–This article discusses the emergence, politics, and activities of a New Left union caucus, The Workers' Voice Committee (WVC), within the United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 6. The author argues that the caucus's activities and rhetoric from its formation in August 1970 through November 1971 were very similar to the politics of the Marxist-Leninist League of Revolutionary Black Workers. From December 1971 through 1975, however, the WVC's trade unionism became consistent with the trade unionism of the Communist Party-influenced UAW of the 1940s before the

defeat and purge of the Communist Party from the UAW beginning in 1946–1947.

***Tom Meisenhelder,* "The Contemporary Significance of Karl Korsch's Marxism"**–The author maintains that Karl Korsch (1886–1961) provides a corrective to "post-Marxism" in current social and political thought. Emphasizing revolutionary subjectivity and the unity of theory and practice, Korsch created a nondogmatic and reflexive Marxism. Disagreeing with both Kautsky and Lenin, Korsch tied Marxist theory to the developing consciousness and political practice of the working class. Contrary to the heavy reliance on the state in European social democracy, the Soviet Union, and corporate capitalism, Korsch proposed a nonstatist communism based in local worker and consumer councils. The author finds this concept still relevant today.

***Robert Steigerwald,* "The Radical Voluntarism of Karl Korsch"**–Interest in Karl Korsch revived in the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1960s and 1970s. The author attributes this revival to the youth and student revolts, and to the interest in socialism stimulated by the existence of the German Democratic Republic. Korsch and Lenin differed most significantly, according to Steigerwald, in their understanding of how the working class acquires a revolutionary class consciousness. Korsch saw this consciousness as arising directly from struggle, while Lenin argued that a political party of the working class was necessary to shape the development of the necessary class consciousness in the working class. Korsch's philosophical position on consciousness effectively led him to reject Engels's postulation that the basic question of philosophy is the relation of thinking and being. Ultimately, the author argues, this led Korsch to reject materialism, and thus Marxism itself.

ABREGES

***Jürgen Rojahn,* «Un bulletin sur *MEGA*»** – L'auteur rapporte sur l'expansion des activités liées à la publication des oeuvres

complètes de Marx et Engels à leurs langues originelles (*Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe*, ou *MEGA*) de 1991 jusqu'à 2001.

***Pradip Baksi,* «*MEGA* IV/3 : Les notes de Marx 1844–1847»** – Ce compte-rendu présente un résumé détaillé du contenu de *MEGA IV/3*.

***Morris Zeitlin,* La mondalisation : Partie 1–Ses partisans»** – Les partisans centristes de la mondalisation voient les corporations transnationales comme agents d'un nouvel ordre global basé sur une production rentable organisée à l'échelle globale et une distribution qui se sert de la technologie moderne d'information et communication. Quelques-uns mettent en question la stabilité du processus. D'autres louent la formation des institutions à promouvoir et contrôler le commerce mondial; ils croient que l'établissement des sièges du pouvoir économique global aux «villes globales» signifie le déclin des états-nations et l'apparition d'une nouvelle société globale. (**« La mondalisation : Partie 2–Ses critiques radicaux»** apparaîtra au numéro prochain de *NST*.)

***Victor G. Devinatz,* «L'antipolitique et la politique d'un comité électoral syndical de la nouvelle gauche : le comité de la Voix Ouvrière de l'UAW Local 6, 1970–1975»** – Cet article discute de l'apparition, la politique, et les activités d'un comité électoral syndical de la nouvelle gauche, le Comité de la Voix Ouvrière (WVC), à l'intérieur des Ouvriers Unis d'Automobile (UAW), Local 6. L'auteur constate que les activités et le discours du comité dès sa formation en août 1970 jusqu'à novembre 1971 ressemblaient à la politique de la Ligue marxiste-léniniste des Ouvriers Noirs Révolutionnaires. De décembre 1971 jusqu'à 1975, cependant, le syndicalisme du WVC a commencé à s'accorder avec le syndicalisme du UAW, influencé par le Parti Communiste, des années quarante avant la défaite et la purge du Parti Communiste du UAW à partir de 1946-1947.

***Tom Meisenhelder,* «La signification contemporaine du marxisme de Karl Korsch»** – L'auteur maintient que Karl

Korsch (1886–1961) pourvoit une rectification au « post-marxisme » de la pensée sociale et politique actuelle. En soulignant la subjectivité révolutionnaire et l'unité de la théorie et la pratique, Korsch créait un marxisme non-dogmatique et réfléchi. Se trouvant en désaccord avec et Kautsky et Lénine, Korsch liait la théorie marxiste à une prise de conscience en voie de développement et à la pratique politique de la classe ouvrière. Contraire à la dépendance lourde de l'état dans la démocratie sociale européenne, l'Union soviétique, et le capitalisme de corporation, Korsch a proposé un communisme non-étatiste basé dans des conseils locaux d'ouvriers et consommateurs. L'auteur trouve que ce concept est toujours pertinent à notre situation d'aujourd'hui.

***Robert Steigerwald,* « Le Voluntarism Radical de Karl Korsch »** – On a recommencé à s'intéresser à Karl Korsch à la République fédérale d'Allemagne aux années soixante et soixante-dix. L'auteur attribue ce renouveau aux révoltes des jeunesse et étudiants en 1968, et à l'intérêt au socialisme stimulé par l'existence de la République démocratique allemande. Korsch et Lénine se distinguaient à la façon la plus signifiante, selon Steigerwald, dans leur compréhension de comment la classe ouvrière acquérit une conscience révolutionnaire de classe. Korsch envisageait se lever directement cette conscience de la lutte, tandis que Lénine argumentait qu'un parti politique de la classe ouvrière était nécessaire à former le développement de la conscience de classe nécessaire dans la classe ouvrière. La position philosophique de Korsch sur la conscience l'a mené, en effet, à rejeter le postulat d'Engels que la question philosophique de base est le rapport entre penser et être. En fin de compte, l'auteur argumente, cela a mené Korsch à rejeter le matérialisme, et donc, le marxisme lui-même.