

CSE Annual Conference. July 1979.

Collectivism, Statism, and the Associated Mode of Production: Notes towards the critique of the political economy of socialism as it actually exists.

Brighton Labour Process Group.

"The capitalist stock companies, as much as the co-operative factories, should be considered as transitional forms from the capitalist mode of production to the associated one, with the only distinction that the antagonism is resolved negatively in the one and positively in the other." Capital Vol III p.431.

Summary of paper.

1. Importance of the analysis of socialism as it actually exists. Political significance, most notably among revolutionary movements in the third world, and in understanding transitional or pre-figurative forms as they develop in our own political and economic practises in advanced capitalism.

2. Theories as they actually exist. Distinguish first those approaches which question the usefulness of the concept of the mode of production. Against structuralism and the priority given to the revolutionary break. Issue rather class struggle and the composition of the oppressed classes. (Castoriades). Among those theses using concept of mode of production, distinguish:

- exchange theories. socialist countries/^{state}capitalist either because they are in competitive relationship with capitalism (law of value via world market, or through military competition) or because exhibit internal means of commensuration similar to capitalism (commodity relations, wages, law of value via plan: cf Bettelheim school). Others, more restricted in definition, emphasise crucial survival of labour power as commodity.
- consumption theories. socialism to be distinguished from capitalism by consumption according to need rather than market demand. (see theories of need and the Budapest school). In as much as consumption relations remain similar to capitalism, then indicates survival of capitalist relations in socialist countries (sale on the market, market research, individual rather than collective consumption, advertising,).
- distribution theories. evident in liberal theories of socialism. Distinctive criteria sought in income distribution, privileges and perquisites. Equality, abstinence, absence of rank and hierarchy (e.g. in wartime) taken as an indication of socialist relations. Existence of privileged elite, with relatively high incomes and capitalist consumption habits, indicates the contrary.
- labour process theories. Capitalist relations of production in production (Taylorism/Fordism) raised to new level: in some versions Taylorism extended outside immediate production to all social relations.
- power. Some approaches (particularly liberal ones) emphasise the monopoly of political power as the key relation of socialist countries. No explanation of the economic basis of this power, and thus of how this power is reproduced against classes whose material basis lies in production.
- monopolisation of key element in production and reproduction. generally, analyse mode of production in terms of some such monopoly: grain/seed (tribal society), labour (slave/feudal) land; key use values (salt, water: Asiatic modes); collective means of production; circulation (Incas); means of production (capitalism). In relation to socialist countries, either: means of production no longer monopolised, therefore relations of production socialist (when controlled by communist party) or non-capitalist (when ruling party not communist).
or: some new key monopoly. To be clarified.

Generally: either 'social' control of means of production privileged, and other characteristics of class society explained away; or some relation similar to capitalism privileged, and social property explained away as form; or amalgam.

3. Collectivism. Distinguish 4. eras in development of capitalist labour process: simple co-operation, manufacture, machinofacture, systemofacture. The last based on the information/communications revolution, extending relations of machinofacture from factory to great corporate systems; cf. also science as independent force of production. Problem for capital; labour and means of production no longer distinct - grades of technical labour which are themselves means of production and expanded reproduction. Thus issue not ^{merely} one of separating labour from means of production (though capital constantly trying to objectify knowledge as distinct means of production) but of separating technical labourers from each other. Decomposition of technical labour as of labour in general. Contradiction between capital and technical labour over control of system of production and reproduction sharpens with the development of systemofacture. Class project of reduction/abolition of private capital via the state; adequate expression in socialist countries with developed systemofacture, where state defends revolution against internal re-emergence of private capital, but political and economic unity (synthesis) achieved via competition and the market and not merely by state planning. Strict economic insulation from world market and international law of value. Distinct mode of distribution (surplus product appropriated by collective technical class via unequal wages, plus privileges and perquisites, determined directly, often at enterprise level). Key relation: individual 'ownership' of skill/technique, 'accumulated' via education, and 'profit' realised by individual sale of monopolised skill on the labour market. Individual wage payments, individual ownership of skill, and restricted higher education all features of collectivism. Main point: class monopoly of productive knowledge which achieves significance in the current stage of development of the forces and relations of production which we term systemofacture.

4. Statism. Most socialist revolutions - distinguished decisively as the destruction of the political and economic power of private capital - take place in underdeveloped countries where private capital is weak. There is no adequate base for the consolidation of collectivism. At first we observe a Bonapartist phase, succeeded by statism. The latter is based on a class monopoly over circulation (the allocation of use values and labour between different units of production, - i.e. the determination of the division of labour between units of production - and the control of surplus product and its investment). We want to raise the question: under what conditions can the monopoly of circulation allow a class to reproduce itself as a ruling class when it has no direct power in production. Key condition: the absence of a market (see Inca mode of production). Centralised planning, rigorously separated from the world market, and with market relations largely confined to the consumption (i.e. individual wage earner) sector: this is the key economic basis of statism. There is a parallel political centralism. Since those in control of the central state base their power on control of economic synthesis (rather than direct production) so they must reproduce that power by centralised control of political synthesis, or put another way, they must prevent the independent political organisation of those classes based in production. If we consider the political sphere as itself a process of production, then we may observe in many socialist countries similar relations of production within the labour process to those we analyse in the economic spheres of late capitalism and socialism. This mode is marked by a distinct form of commensuration, appropriation, and political organisation.

5. Statism/collectivism. Both statism and collectivism have much in common. There is the basis of an alliance between the dominant classes in each, both with respect to private capital, and with respect to labour. But there is also a contradiction between the two, between a class based on control of production, and one based on the control of circulation. With the development of systemofacture in Eastern Europe, and the social (quite apart from the technical) difficulties of direct statist synthesis in an advanced 'differentiated' economy, this contradiction sharpens. We would interpret the events of Eastern Europe from

3.

1956 onwards in part as a conflict between technocrats (defined in the collectivist terms outlined above) and bureaucrats (as the 'bearers' of statism). In Czechoslovakia in 1968 the technocratic element in alliance with the working class temporarily dominated until statism was restored by Soviet statism. In the USSR the statist have successfully resisted the undermining of the central control of economic synthesis post 1965, as they have in Eastern Germany. Central to these events has been the relations of these contending and emergent classes with different sections of the working class.

6. There is a third mode which we want to discuss, which we call associationism. This is distinguished by the absence of monopoly over any part of its economic and political reproduction. One way of considering associationism is to grasp the conditions upon which particular monopolies have been founded (means of production, labour, information and communications, circulation or more generally direct economic and political synthesis, knowledge) and construct ways of undermining these monopolies. Thus:

- knowledge. attack the division of head and hand by a) circulating tasks; b) abolishing the significance of knowledge in production; c) universalising higher education; d) collectivising the ownership of skill in production units.
- political synthesis. attack the division between leaders and rank and file by: circulation of leadership (even by lot); opening the political books; making leadership subject to instant recall and reducing all privileges; limiting the range over which politics has to be synthesised (federalism of small units); criticism and self-criticism.
- economic synthesis. reduce the range over which production units have to be synthesised; free flow economy; subordinate centralised economic synthetic process to 'democratic' political process; restore the market.

Another way is to consider examples of associationism in practise. Here we should consider the history of co-operatives, of the Owenite movement, of the Clarion and all that it stood for, of council communism, and the innumerable examples of associated forms developed by the working class both in economic and political production. Today the richest examples in advanced capitalist countries have been created - in the teeth of statist and collectivist opposition on the left - by the women's movement. And in the third world there are the numerous associated modes created by guerilla movements in liberated zones. All these forms of associationism have been concerned with problems of economic and political democracy: the form of meetings, the character of personal relations between men and women, young and old, leaders and led, the head and the hand. What we would like to register is that many of their practises have developed 'democratic' structures which go well beyond the formal theories of democracy within which most of us are still enclosed. Liberal theories of democracy, with its emphasis on delegation, voting, and so on still imposes many of its categories on us. In contrast let us consider the key democratic disciplines that operate in say the liberated zones of the EPLF in Eritrea: the refusal to impose either taxation or conscription on those in the liberated areas; the insistence on periods in the front for all members of the movement; the concrete rather than abstract forms of political synthesis; the acknowledgement of the individual right of secession, the attempt to universalise political education and discussion. Many of these characteristics developed in the course of the liberation movement in Mozambique and in Vietnam. In all these movements associationism, collectivism and statism co-exist. The first tends to be strongest in pre-revolutionary periods, and weakest after the capture of state power. But our perspectives suggest that the battle between them is not determined alone after the revolution. The post-revolutionary society is in part shaped by the way in which the revolution is made, by the way in which we make our politics, our production, and our relations now.

The Collective Mode of Production.

Brief notes following discussion with Olivier, 14.11.78.

1. Many writers have treated the question of control of the means of production in Soviet societies in terms of the problematic of control (ownership/possession, forms of property). Rather we should approach the matter in terms of the problematic of the means of production.

2. The distinct feature of the means of production in the era of manufacture, in particular after the advent of Taylorism and Fordism, is that science and knowledge become separated from the immediate production process. Taylorism marks not only the separation of head and hand explicitly and militantly in production, but the development of a collective head within the organising unit of production, the firm.

3. There are two main tasks for the head. The first is the control of production in all its forms: the product, the labour process, the distribution, the co-ordination between different parts of the production process, and between production and circulation. The second is the conscious application of science to the reproduction of the firm, to the development of all sides of production (new products, transformed inputs, new processes, new systems of relation between the units of the firm). The first task is control, the second design.

4. The consequence of this development is that the crucial element for control is no longer purely the fixed means of production, those means in which living labour has been materialised in an objective form separable from ~~xxxx~~ the labour it represents. Rather it is control of a) the knowledge and b) the capacity of scientific development, or, what we can call the means of expanded reproduction.

5. The problem for capital is that these two elements commonly take a subjective rather than objective form, i.e. they cannot be divorced from ~~xbxbxbixx~~ technical labour. Technical labour has the knowledge and the capacity to redesign embodied in it. Suddenly ~~xx~~ labour no longer finds itself separated from the means of production since it is itself the means of production, it embodies scientific knowledge which has become the ^{key} part of the labour process in the period of systemofacture.

6. In previous modes of production, there have been ~~xxxxxxx~~ many cases of a low level of means of production, few tools, or congelations of plant and equipment. But they have all needed land, and the control of land ~~xxx~~ has been the crucial control in all such cases. Their problem has been how to separate labour from the land, or, how to force labour to work for an exploiting class. In the Middle Ages the problem was a land surplus, and thus a labour scarcity. The institutions of serfdom, tying ~~thxbxbxf~~ labour to particular stretch of 'privatised' land was one way out. The South Africans developed a ~~xxxx~~ tied system for rural labour on Boers farmsx in the 20th century. Slavery in the ~~xxx~~ empires of antiquity represented a similar monopoly over labourx. In all these cases labour power had to be united to the means of production (land) in order to produce the output, but it was simple labour, Simple labour power and the means of production remained quite distinct, whatever form the juridical relations took.

7. I say control over land was crucial, but would it in some cases be more satisfactory to say control over labour? Duby makes the point about the centrality of controlling labour in the Middle Ages. In most countries land was in abundance. The problem, particularly in the early Middle Ages, was the lack of labour. Just as in capitalism we have free labour and private property over material objects, in feudalism there ~~is~~ are proprietary rights over labour - a lord's serfs, a king's vassall - and relatively free land. The latter was not formally free. It was ~~xxxx~~ within the domain of some kingdom. . . . A lord would lay claim to a particular territory and then grant rights to that territory, rights of passage, of ~~xxxxxxx~~ production, or taxation. The determination of the effectiveness of the claim lay in the power of ~~xxxx~~ the lord's army, and this in turn depended on the number of soldiers that the lord could get to fight for him (his vassalls, villeins, tenants, et al.). Thus it was not the formal property in land, with rights enforced by the armed forces of a centralised state, that was crucial. It was the control of labour (agricultural and military) which determined the extent of land ^{xxxxxx} which one could lay claim as a terrain on which to exploit the controlled labour.

8. Direct control over labour meant that the form of exploitation was direct. The direct appropriation of surplus labour, or surplus product. Feudal rent was a ~~xxxxxx~~ late form of this direct appropriation. Modern ground rent was and is entirely different, since the landed property rights on which it is based is not dependent on the individual control of labour as in feudalism, but on the existence of a capitalist state with centralised armed force. Modern landed property no more depends on the control of labour, and instead develops land as a commodity (or rather landed property rights). This would have been senseless in feudalism, since such rights (before an effective centralised state) would have been meaningless without access directly or indirectly (through a ~~xxxx~~ suzerain) to controlled labour.

9. In those modes of production where labour has to be directly controlled, direct force is only one means (slavery, feudalism). It may be sufficient to control (by force) a key use value. The theorists of hydraulic societies suggest that the control of water was one such use value. Salt is another, and as Barbara points out, may explain the material basis of control in hydraulic societies better than water. The key point~~x~~ is that if labour is the key 'means of production', then there have to be different forms of control (direct enslavement or control of key use values) than societies where certain means of production are the crucial determinants of class power and class development. Capitalism is ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{distinctive} because it was the first class society with free labour (is this so?).

10. In the early period of capitalism, class control rested on private ownership of the means of production which had been produced by labour, i.e. labour's product was now privatised and stood against/above those who had created it. But in the modern era of ~~xxxxxx~~ system of manufacture this distincti

between labour and the means of production is no longer clear. For as we have suggested, labour itself becomes once more the key means of production, not as simple labour, but skilled technical labour.

11. Capital does all it can to materialise technical labour so that it can be privatised. Systems of control are written down, so that innovations become standardised practise and can be followed by deskilled technical labour. The same with chemical formulae and patents. The points about patents is not only that they *monopolise* knowledge against other capitals, They also materialise knowledge which can be privatised against the creators of that knowledge, the technical labourers. Always the technical labourers are required to write their results down. In writing they can be circulated, stored, worked upon. But *the* very independence *of the written word* *is* turned against the technician in the form of capital.

12. The history of computers is the history of a forshortened development from artisan production to systemofacture, with all the characteristics which the name implies: division of head and hand, hierarchy, division of labour within both head and hand, deskilling particularly of intellectual labourers (ITT and the computer programmes of North London as the modern Ford workers), fragmentation of tasks. In such a system the bulk of the simple reproducible jobs are separated and assigned to a white collar proletariat. Principles of organisation and operation are specified on paper by technical artisans and materialised in manuals. The skilled technicians are boiled down to a cadre identified with capital through ~~staxx~~ salary, share options, places in management or aspirations to the same. Such skilled technicians are the quintessence of the new unity of living labour and means of production. "The most precious asset" as Saül Steinberg would say.

13. What capital is doing is to restructure the collective labourer. While collective technical labour~~x~~ represents the means of production most crucial to contemporary capitalism, capital maintains its control by separating such labour not from the means of production (which it cannot do) but from each other. We have talked in previous discussions about the reconstitution of the collective labourer against capital. That point is all the more sharply focussed when we see technical labour~~x~~ not merely as simple labour divorced from the means of production but as means of production ~~thmsbtxbtx~~ itself.

14. One further point about dynamics. Capital can attempt to control the collective ~~labourer~~ technical labourer by getting ~~thmsbtxbtx~~ knowledge objectified on paper and privatised by capital. But the pace of capitalist transformation now that science is independent of production, now that systems are consciously organised, means that it is not merely what is known that is important, but a capacity to know more, to develop, to restructure in the future. Hence the importance to companies of having research teams which they are reluctant to disband even when there is no immediate thing for them to work on. Or see Mary's arguments about the military research teams and the need for new prototypes to

keep them constantly employed. Nor is it merely research teams. It is also those parts of the modern corporate 'system' which remain artisanal, unmechanised: the key executives of a business empire. In spite of ~~mixing~~ or ITT there are still many functions whose dynamics (rather than statics) cannot themselves be reduced to objective systems materialised in alienable, privatisable writing.

15. We may call this complex labour. Or we can adopt Arghiri Emmanuel's notion, of the organic composition of labour. The latter acknowledges the ambiguity in technical labour, its character as means of production, as embodying dead labour within living labour itself.

16. There is a history of the relationship between technical labour and capital. At first the technical labour is artisanal and individual. It may be atomised in ~~the~~ process of production, or socialised only with simple technical labour (the white collar proletariat, e.g. clerks and secretaries, punch card operators). In this case, technical labour can separate itself from capital and start on its own. Money capital, which represents alienated labour in its most abstract form, is no discriminator against technical ~~labour~~ where it offers as much as industrial or finance capital. Post war history is full of examples of technical labourers separating and starting on their own, often selling to their original firm as sub-contractors (cf Gross and the printed circuit boards), or developers (cf the German example of Olivier's) or licensees, strategists of technical founders benefit and so on. IBM originally began in this way.

17. Again individual capitals will attempt to insulate themselves against such defections. Long contracts (limiting freedom of labour), contractual clauses ruling out movement to rival firms (cf solicitors and articulated clerks), threats of suits against the betrayal of firm secrets. But in as much as it is technical capacity rather than knowledge which is defecting (as though a machine were to walk out ~~from~~ the factory floor: a modern Animal Farm where the machines break loose and found their kingdom) ~~there~~ there is ultimately little that the individual capital~~s~~ can do. (cf consultants/ .. Dillons).

18. With the development of science and its organic composition even complex technical labour may be socialised with other technical labour. A division of labour takes place within the highest ranks of technical labour and individual defection are thus made less damaging (as far as the defector's ability to start a rival operation). But as in Olivier's German example it may still just be possible for a whole team to move (the report said it had been very difficult to unite even this small grouping of collective technical labour). The more socialised the process of technical production, the more imprisoned is the individual technical labourer in the grip of capital.

19. Furthermore, the relations of technical production - the structuring of the collective technical labourer - reflects the relations of capital. Skilled labourers are

deskilled. They are conscious both of their alienation and the fact of their exploitation. With no way out, they turn on capital. The rise of the white collar unions, a rise of extraordinary rapidity, with distinct features of its own, testifies to this stage in the development of capital-technical labour relations in the modern era of systemofacture

20. What is distinct about technical labour is that it is clear/ as it was to the manual labourer in the early industrial revolution, that the capitalist's contribution to production in no way ~~deserves~~ merits the profits accruing to it. There is no mystique to capitalist control in the eyes of the technical labourer since that labourer is commonly involved as an agent in ~~the~~ control. Nor is there any mystique about the capitalist system as such. ~~As~~ As part of capital's collective head, they share the universal visions ~~of~~ that intellectual labour has thrown up since it first made its count. The waste, the crisis, the despairing poverty coexisting with idle surfeit, all contradict the tenets of technical ideology.

21. As systemofacture develops the necessity for expanding intellectual labour, and as that intellectual labour is itself ~~socialised~~ socialised and subordinated in the manner traditional to ~~industrial~~ industrial production, so the technicians are separated from their opportunistic affiliations with capital and side with manual labour against capital.

22. The development of separated ~~tasks~~ tasks requiring the conscious application of science in capitalism, or, as Marx put it, the development of science as an independent productive force in capitalism, provides the material basis for the development of a new class in capitalism, a historically specific class, with its own interests, & ideology. It is a new working class, but a class distinct from the manual working class. Its basis is not simple labour but complex labour, and this complex labour, embodying as it does an independent force of production, becomes the material element whose monopoly control by a small minority paves the way for the development of a new mode of production.

23. The new mode of production we call collectivism. We see it bursting through in Eastern Europe. It has its own distinct forms, of exploitation, of commensuration, though not of thought. Its foundation is the destruction of the power of independent capitals. Capital (the ownership of ~~alienable~~ alienable means of production) stands against technical labour as against all labour. It exploits technicians as it does manual ~~workers~~ workers, through the wage form. It constantly seeks to control technical labour in the interests of profit: real subordination in the labour process, a studied indifference to the use values produced, a disregard for the potentialities of ~~science~~ science to provide for the patent absences of capitalism: food, kidney machines, employment, clean air, perhaps even free time. As the ~~conscious~~ conscious object of this exploitation, technical labour identifies with manual labour, in spite of their contradictory roles in the labour process, and in spite of ~~differences~~ differences in wages, ideology and life styles. An alliance is forged to destroy capital as an independent force, to eradicate this barrier to the planned organisation of society in the interests of labour in general. For

technical labour capital is as parasitic as were the landlords to the early capitalists. Capital, like the earlier landed property, stands as a barrier to the development of the productive forces. The rational development of the productive forces: this is the cry of the new class. And their chosen instrument for progress is the state.

24. In capitalism the technicians are the ~~maxbxbhx~~ social base for the extension of statism. The state as it grows at the behest of capital is required to provide use values whose production is the production of the head. New technical workers are drawn into the state apparatus. The state is required among other things to plan consciously for capital: but in planning consciously for capital the state labourers realise that they can also plan consciously for themselves. And intellectuals outside ~~xxxxxx~~ immediate production - the dreamers of the revolution - now have an institution onto which they can pin their dreams. The state - the institutional representation of the universal plans of the head.

25. The state is not neutral. Technical labour sees the state subordinated to the interests of capital. The demand is to subordinate to the interests of labour, as defined by technical labour. Hence the demands of the parties of technical labour to centralise power in the state, to replace capital by the state, to make public all that was private in the sphere of production. Revolution is ~~xxxxxbxxx~~ ~~xxxxxbxxx~~ defined in terms of the seizure of state power - that after all is nothing new to revolutions ushering new ~~xxxxbxzszzzbzbbz~~ modes of ~~xxxx~~ class exploitation. What is striking is the entire subordination of strategy and ~~xxxxbx~~ organisational form to this hoped for end. Whereas capital built itself up independently under the umbrella of feudal protection, demanding only autonomy from the state (franchises and rising up against feudalism because it was impossible any longer to develop autonomously under the feudal state, technical labour has no such autonomous practises because it is a socialised proletariat, and because its class position can only be secured through large organisations.

26. In Eastern Europe these revolutions have been forged by the new class in alliance with the ~~xxxxxbxxx~~ manual working class. Initially in Russia the manual workers, mostly skilled, imposed their version of statism in the new society, but they had no basis for reproducing themselves. For the system they built was a system founded on the division of head and hand, in which the tasks for the ~~xxxx~~ collective head multiplied with the particular course of economic development. The doctrine of improving the productive forces - espoused by Lenin, Trotsky as well as Stalin - ~~xxxxbxxx~~ when married to the ~~xxxxxxxnxxxx~~ policy of Fordism in ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxxbxxx~~ all ranges of labour processes, meant the consolidation of technical labour against manual. As the revolution progressed the presence - the material political presence of technical labour - grew stronger. It found itself consolidated as a faction in Soviet Russia against the rude centralised strength of the manual workers tradition: Kosygin against Breznev. It found itself in power in the most industrialised (at the time) of Eastern European countries, Czekoslovakia in 1968. In China

7.

it has conducted its own revolution against the Boalst forces, and re-asserted its mode of production via control of the state.

27. In ~~Russia~~ all the Soviet type societies, the initial collectivist revolution has been followed by a new form of Bonapartism. Once capital has been reduced, once the state has consolidated its power over the means of production, the new social forces have yet to adjust ~~themselves~~ and develop themselves and in the meantime shelter behind the power of a dictator who defends the revolution as a revolution against capital and for the state.

28. However, just as capital in France was consolidated, so the new class in Eastern Europe realises itself as an independent class, and pits itself against the ~~new Bonaparts~~ new Bonaparts from ~~within~~ its bases within the state.

29. If the above is correct, then it explains why Stalin took the middle course rather than that of the ~~NEP~~ men in 1928. For to resurrect private capital is to resurrect the barrier the new class wishes to overcome, (as though capital was to resurrect landed property rights in feudal form). In the same way the ~~reform movements~~ reform movements of the last 20 years in Eastern Europe do not seek to restore private capital accumulation, but to realise the social order of the new class.

30. What is this social order? It is based on the class monopoly of science and technology, of ~~knowledge~~ information and the means of its communication. Of the forces challenging this monopoly, capital has been eradicated as a national political force through the abolition of private property, and manual labour is subordinated via its exclusion from the head, and the social means of communications. Since the head is in its very essence universal, ~~it~~ it is organised as a single unit at the national level, ~~xxxxvixvx~~ Unplanned autonomous units with private property contradict the universality of the head. Its institutional form is the state.

31. ~~To call~~ To call a social couche a class it is not enough to point to ideology, or life styles, or income differentials. ^{potential} There must be an objective material basis for their existence as a class, and a subjective organisation for their historical consolidation as a class. The objective base is the ~~development~~ ^{development} of science and technology as independent productive forces. The subjective consolidation takes the form under capitalism of white collar unionism, and statist socialist parties. Under 'socialism as it actually exists' they are consolidated in ~~the very process~~ the very process of their productive activities - i.e. in the organisation, planning and development of the statist ~~society.~~ society.

32. This is the basis for the new mode of production. In Eastern Europe the ~~low level~~ low level of the forces of production were such as to make the new class

initially weak vis à vis other class forces, notably manual labour. But the extraordinary development of science and technology, and the forces of production, led to the strengthening of the material basis for the new mode of production. Like any new mode - particularly where it is introduced into dominance in countries which are behind in terms of the old mode, - there is a problem in establishing new institutions, new forms, new relations of production which allow the forces of production to develop more rapidly than they did before the revolution. These periods are truly those of transition. In these periods capitalism could have been reintroduced into Russia. Now the pressures against Stalinism (or Soviet Bonarpartism) are not those for the reintroduction of capitalism, but those for the full realisation of collectivism.

33. Collectivism has its own distinct mode of appropriation. In feudalism the ruling class appropriated the surplus product through direct levy, either of labour or taxes. In capitalism appropriation is through exchange, buying labour power at its value and selling the output at ~~the~~ a value level determined by the labour extracted from the labour capacity. In collectivism the mechanism is that of direct distribution. All workers, technical and manual, are paid a wage or salary. No one privately owns the means of production. The profit that arises from production - which is expressed in money form - ~~is~~ formally ~~the~~ accrues to the collective labourer. Part is re-invested as ~~public~~ funds for accumulation. Part is distributed to the workers, either as higher wages, or as a declared bonus. The crucial mechanisms are the setting of the level of wages, and (in societies where there is rationing other than through price) the determination of access to ~~the~~ use values.

34. It is these mechanisms which technical labour controls. They control it because they dominate the key points of production and administration through their monopoly of knowledge. The form achieves its purest expression in Yugoslavia, in the practise of ~~the~~ workers' self-management. The corporate technocrats are not subject to continual subordination ~~to~~ to a centralised Bonarpartism. There is a relative autonomy for the enterprise. The dominance which technical labour has over manual can then be given its expression through the democratisation of the enterprise. This democratisation is based on free elections, i.e. competition. And as is true for all competition, those who are initially strongest are favoured by such freedom. We know from studies of Yugoslav self-management in practise that there is a pre-ponderance of technical labour elected onto the controlling committees. We know too that the 'management' appointed by the democratic bodies from the ranks of technical labour is only minimally hindered by the demands of manual labour. Indeed the incorporation of manual labour into the decision making bodies on which they are necessarily at a disadvantage weakens manual labour as a whole from standing apart from the new class and countering the latter's interests with those of manual labour - seen as a class. ~~the~~

35. The results of the domination are: i) control over internal distribution within the collective labourer; ~~the~~ technical labour awards itself with higher wages and

salaries, it appropriates privileges for itself, it secures its jobs; ii) ~~it~~ reproduces the division of head and hand within the factory, favouring those forms of economy which confirm the division, seeking (like capital before it) technology which will allow it to subordinate ~~labor~~ manual labour in the labour process, to increase the unit's profit, and therefore the income ~~available~~ available for distribution. (note: in the more successful enterprises in Yugoslavia, ^{than technical labour in less successful units} are the technical labourers paid more, and do the ex post distributions of profit - as against the ex ante distributions in the form of differential wages - favour the technical labourers, by being pegged to wages differentials.)

36. From the actual division of head and hand, the inequality of distribution appears justified. The ~~guiding~~ guiding words for technical labour are: to each according to his ability.

37. The determination of distribution on these principles demands a system against which ability (or contribution) can be measured. Much technical labour is in its essence not directly related to immediate production. It is socialised. The measure of performance must necessarily be collective therefore, and the key indicator becomes profit. Profit sharing is not ^{so much} ~~an~~ an inducement to manual labour under collectivism. It is a device to legitimate the privileged position of the technical workers. As such it is important that profit should not be arbitrary - determined for example by an accounting price fixed on the ~~output~~ output by a central planning authority. If possible the profit should reflect the 'efficiency' of the collective labour of an enterprise: hence the demands for the restoration of markets, and a free price system.

38. Much of the confusion about collectivism has resulted from ~~transferring~~ transferring to this new mode categories applicable to capitalism. Hence, since capital exploits labour through the wage, it appears a contradiction in terms for one wage earner to exploit another wage earner. This is true for capitalism. Suggestions that the workers in developed countries exploit those in underdeveloped countries through differential wages (cf. for instance the theorems of Unequal exchange) misspecify the nature of exploitation under capitalism. They locate exploitation in *exchange, without relating it to control in production.*

In collectivism there is a different mode of exploitation. It takes place directly in distribution, and results, as in all modes, from a class monopoly over the key means of production.

39. We should always expect to find the protection of this monopoly to be the cornerstone of ideology in any mode of production. In feudalism, loyalty. In capitalism, private property. In collectivism, the division of head and hand embodied in the ~~new~~ concept of technology. The new ruling class are above all economic. They have an interest in technical progress, since information/knowledge as an ~~object~~ object of class monopoly must be constantly re-created for it is by its nature difficult to monopolise.

10.

It has a way of getting out. Hence the concern for expanding the forces of production, for growth.

40. This dynamic must not be confused with that of capital. For capital the demand is, "accumulate, accumulate," since it must self-expand in order to survive. Its concern is to expand its control on surplus labour in money form which is re-invested in means of production, so reproducing the monopoly against labour. This need not take the form of increased technology, though in practise it does so. But while control of technology, and the division of head and hand are crucial for capitalist accumulation in the modern age, they are means to an end. Marx's theorems on technology have always been separate from ~~his~~ those on the value form. The development of technology, the very separation of science as an independent productive force is the way in which capital realises itself as self-expanding value. But in collectivism, the reproduction of control against manual labour becomes an end in itself. It is no longer disciplined by the law of value, by the fact that new technology must earn a profit. Rather the direction of growth is at all times conditioned by this central concern to monopolise and continue to monopolise technology/information and the ~~apparatuses~~ organisational apparatuses which go with it

41. We have touched here on the law of motion. Let us draw, too, the parallel between collectivism and capitalism in the spheres of the labour process. Collectivism reproduces all capital's modern devices for the control of labour: piece rates, ~~the~~, fragmentation of jobs, hierarchy, deskilling: all, in short, that we associate with Taylorism and modern scientific management. Within the factory these devices are clearly seen as a means of controlling labour, but they are justified on the grounds not of the rights of the owner of private property, but on those of increasing efficiency, output, and thus surplus product for growth and distribution.

42. In both these respects, the tendency to expand technology in order to reproduce control over manual labour, and the justification of dictatorship in the factory on grounds of growth/expanding cake rather than the rights of private property, we ~~see~~ see strong similarities between capitalism and collectivism. This is because in capitalism the new class are themselves strengthening as a class, using the same means to reproduce their class dominance over manual labour as do their counterparts in the Soviet societies. But it is quite wrong to speak of convergence in some continuous way. What we witness is the growth of the new class in the womb of the old mode of production, whose ruling class-capital, have to develop this new ^{technical} class in order to reproduce the old mode. In capitalism the new class is still subordinate. They face capital which, in the form of the law of value, tries to control the direction of technical change. Above all it preserves the institutions of decentralised private property over the means of production, leading to the so-called contradictions of capitalism, crisis, hunger in the midst of plenty, waste and so on. The new technical class will only be liberated

as a class when they have ~~subordinated~~ destroyed capital as an independent force. If any convergence is occurring it is towards a revolution of the new technocrats against private capital under the banner of state socialism.

43. The central problem for the new collectivism is not the subordination of manual labour. Here it has the experience of capital to rely on. It is how to commensurate labour in the absence of competing capitals and the free market. Planning, the quintessence of the technocratic mind, is a material task which Soviet society confronted head on before capital. The mathematical techniques developed in ~~the~~ the Soviet Union were in some cases copied by Western capitalist firms when they, too, in the era of system failure, were forced to commensurate labour directly, outside the market. And, of course, planning is not merely a matter of techniques: since it is the conscious planning of society, there is the issue of controlling the planners, controlling the state. Under Stalin, the rude forces of Bonapartism constantly swamped the rationality of technocracy. Bonapartist dictatorship - with no countervailing ~~sway~~ from growing, decentralised capital (as happened with the original Bonapart) consolidated and centralised rule by terror. It could not wipe out the technocrats. It relied on them and expanded ~~much~~ much of the economy in accordance with their dictates. But it did this to strengthen its centralised control, its regime of terror, ~~springing~~ ^{springing} from the roots of the manual working class. In this ~~it~~ it was profoundly contradictory: While in some sense Stalinism stood against untrammelled technocracy on behalf of the manual working class, the ~~character~~ character of the regime ~~particular~~ stood at odds with ~~the~~ manual labour. With the development of technology in the base of skilled manual labour was weakened, and that of technocracy strengthened. Stalinism became a husk, surviving on terror, even more evidently in the Eastern European dictatorships where the manual working class were subject to Soviet imperialism in all its forms on top of the product dictatorship of the new technocracy.

44. The goal of the technocrats has been to develop a system of national planning without the anomalies of centralised Stalinism, which can allow the reproduction of technocratic domination in a decentralised form, while commensurating labour directly in broader economic spheres. Dubcek's regime in Czechoslovakia, represented the vision and was accomplished by an alliance between the new technocrats and the Czek manual working class against Soviet imperialism. ~~and~~ In Yugoslavia, free of Soviet domination at an earlier date, ~~collectivism~~ collectivism has developed even more markedly. In both these cases, as in China since 1976, the concern is not to re-introduce capitalism, but to bring in capitalist methods of economic decentralisation through the market, and capitalist technology to strengthen the class position, of the technocrats vis a vis manual labour. Neither the market, nor the wage form, nor the division of head and hand in the labour process ~~are~~ nor the impulsion for technological growth, are enough to substantiate a claim that these societies are nothing more than state capitalism. For all of them flow from the key relations of a new

mode of production whose ruling class stands at core in contradictory opposition to capital, and who steadfastly refuse to allow the institutions of private capital accumulation to be reintroduced by itsx nationals. Hence the only private firms encouraged are those of foreign capital. Wealth cannot be inherited. Increases in wealth must be earned directly through the priveleged position in production and administration rather than through the parastic holding of assets, whether land, money or shares. And for this reason, the dynamics of these societies, their political and economic forms, and the contours of their class relations are quite distinct from capitalism. While capitalism has exhibited these forms, while it has witnessed the strengthening of the new class, the decisive point is that private capital still controls the state, and that allows it to reproduce its dominance over technocratic labour. (note: does the manner of technoxxxiological production differ in the East from under capitalism. Is there the same tendency to deskilling, hierarchisation et al in the process of intellectual production; in Yugoslavia for instance, xx)

45. What is necessary for this new mode is not the inheritance of private wealth, but the inheritance of privileged education. In education the labour is implanted (by teacher and pupil) which will eventually provide the complex labourer with the means on which the power of his class is based. Part of the technocratic ideology is free competition within the production process. This applies both to free elections for control of the collective labourer, and to free access to the educational system which will train the necessarily separate head. Increasingly, existing members of the technical class are able to ensure that their children have priveleged education, both by access to the best schools, and by home tutoring. Knowledge and skill have in this sense tended to become heritary.

46. We may always divine technocratic ideology by its economism, emphasis on forces of production, upholding of the division between head and hand, insistence on competition, and payment by abilities, hostility to capital in contrast toxx statex planning and technical rationality (~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ nature of use values and their distribution, defining relations of production in terms of use values circulated, rather than social relations within the process of production, consumption, and social control). In China this coherent class position was attacked by Mao as revisionism, and rolled back during the cultural revolution. Asx yet, however, the material basis in China was not strong enough to counter the raposte of the new class. In the West, the growing ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ economic irrationality of capital, the expansion of the new class and their proletarianisation as a class, the destruction of traditional skilled manual ~~xxxxxxxx~~ jobs, have all put the demands of the leading cadres and ideologists of the new class into the centre of the political stage. In Europe the most developed exponents are represented by Europommunism - the Dubceks of the Common Market. Their chosen language is that of Marxism. In those countries as in Britain, ~~the~~ our task must be to reclaim ~~the~~ intellectual and historical tradition ~~for~~ the class who developed it, the men and women of the manual working class. RM.14.11.78.

Collective Mode of Production.

Brief notes from 25.5.79.

Main issues arising from original paper:

1. Issue of how to analyse a mode of production

- circulation. plan/market.
- labour process.
- reproduction as well as production. (technical requirements and political reproduction.)

note: ~~is~~^{are} the plan/market/wages all aspects of circulation. (no:AA) if so how do we analyse relations of production which go beyond the labour process (see Balibar discussion of MoP which amounts to an analysis of labour process)

note distinction of relations of production in production and relations of production in exchange,

how can we tackle the reproduction of relations between labour processes. Why is it that: capitalist forms of commensuration (exchange on the market) plus capitalist forms of labour process do not equal capitalism.

- different forms of distribution (direct).
- different relations between generations. (inheritance)
- different means of advancement in society (political/education not accumulation of capital)
- different pervasiveness of market. back to commensuration.
- different dynamics (necessity or not of accumulation)
- different relations of labour to ruling class. (unfree)

Other points to keep in mind:

- is USSR progressive/is it liberating forces of production.
- many modes of production have the market as commensurator.
- how does the law of value operate in capitalism (market, mobility of capital and labour, independent prices etc. cf Marx on dvlpt of law of value in historical transformation discussion)
- can we distinguish state capitalism of the Afrikaans variety, with the anti-private capital "state capitalism" in USSR.
- consider the market and private property as an insulator against centralisation (feudalism, Spanish Peru.) i.e. start from various forms of centralisation: capital centralised.

2. Concepts of property (cf Balibar). Property/possession/holding.

Is private property more than a legal form.

Chavance: abolish many capitals - does this mean abolishing capital in general.

3. Technocrats.

- variegated body: relations of prod. within technocracy.
- diffuse class
- do not aspire to power.
- always been bureaucracies who are servile to real ruling class.
- rationalisation. This is a bourgeois attribute. not distinctive of the bureaucracy.
- where is the class struggle. working class against state and party (technocrats plus Bonarpartists?) or between technocrats and Bonarpartists. e.g. Cultural Revolution.

in CR working class divided (Tissier): mvt. against established working class. Other characterisation: temporary workers + radical displaced intellectuals.

what about Czechoslovakia.

but between whom is the struggle over centralisation.
what is the specificity of the struggle.

- no connection between knowledge and power.
- need to define in relation to production. some 'technocrats' in the party (cf use of computers etc. party politics as production); many party officials in production. Hence wrong to equate technocrats with production and Bonarpartist party with political direction. (Remember notion of politics as production and non privileging of material production sphere SY)

Bonarpartists. army and party. what is their position in political systems of the Soviet type. The party is central. (cf aspirants to USSR succession. party bosses of various kind. power in the party has to be explained however. why are they party bosses. what do they represent. Some army and KGB. But then this reduces to pure power analysis without analysing nature of relations of production and this totally insufficient. What about Czech. Economists or planning ministries.) Do we not have to come to terms with the party first and foremost in this new system of production. (notion of decentralisation exceptional may be helpful here - for then we are dealing with forms of centralisation. cf also notion of how unity is achieved. market/capitalist state/centralised party/~~democratic~~ ^{voluntary} ~~negotiable~~ relations between ruled and rulers - e.g. guerilla struggle, or between independent states, which guarantees right of exit)

4. Can we speak of a new mode of production in our current categories. e.g. is notion of forces of production compatible with socialism.
5. Constantly remember to consider the question of socialism at the world level and not as a closed system. Socialism revolution in areas of globe where bourgeoisie weakest, ~~and~~ where international intellectuals/strongest, ^{rather} and where material condition of life and production most severe. Thus very different conditions for the succession to capitalism than envisaged in an a-spatial system. So state power seized first in backward areas, with least development of the material basis for the new class. What is the crucial form of control and for how long can it be reproduced. Pure force and civil organisation via the party to preserve against re-assertion of capitalism on the one hand and reproducing these regimes on the other. But there must be a material basis for this in the long term. Cannot go on reproducing mop on strength of control of army. Who controls army and why. Leads us back to the analysis of the economy, and its development under collectivism. See collectivism as in necessarily dialectical reltn with capitalism. Just as we should talk of many feudalisms and not feudalism in general (save as established through warfare) ~~is~~ and just as the feudal mop inconceivable without the market, so we should speak only of many socialisms and socialism in relation to the market (less internal than external). We can only understand these societies in reltn to capitalism at this particular epoch: on one hand having created conditions whereby a proletariat and displaced peasantry plus radical intelligensia exists (all, particularly one and three presupposing capital); on the other furnishing of supply of means of prod. and means of control for the new ruling class.
6. Basis of Trotsky's analysis of USSR is distinction of production (nationalisation) and circulation (deformed workers state).
7. Associated mode of production. No essence. Tensions. Social arrangements. 8.6.79.

Collective Mode of Production.

Statism and the control of circulation.

Further notes from 8.6.79.

1. Danger of using concept of mode of production at all. Structuralist. Certain features or structures which characterise a mode of production. Relations of production/forces of production. Limits established. Political question then is how to transcend those limits. How to break down the structures. But not theory of this breakdown because theory is not one of process but of essence

2. Rather says AA start like Marx from class. What classes exist what are their relations with other classes and what are the tendencies of the struggle between classes. Marx concerned not with aggregating a series of relations of production of a micro nature (control of means of production for ex.) but rather starts with the general issue of how class relations between labour and capital are reproduced and what are the contradictions between them. The market, wages, separation of workers from means of production, labour process, and production and circulation of capital et al. are introduced in order to explain how class relations are reproduced. This is a very different way into the analysis than taking a particular relation (e.g. the wage relation) and seeing whether that particular relation exists in other societies which are not immediately evident as capitalist.

3. With Soviet societies we could then ask how is the working class reproduced as an oppressed class. In capitalism Marx argued that the reproduction of labour power as a commodity had two features: a) it was cut off from its means of subsistence; b) it received its subsistence in return for subordinating itself and working for capital. But note: quite inadequate theory of reproduction of labour power. May be that there are a number of ways in which labour power can be reproduced within a capitalist mode of production. In socialism what happens? First workers are likewise cut off from their means of subsistence (save for peasants with private plots). Second they receive the bulk of their subsistence in the form of a wage, and purchase use values on the market. They relate to ^{other} workers via the market. In this sense akin to capitalism. AA raised the possibility of breaking the connection between subsistence and labour. CM commented that it was perfectly possible (with socialism as it should exist) to have workers paid wages in their workplace but have democratic control over those who allocated the wages.

4. The question ~~how~~ says AA when we consider the wage for example not so much whether the existence of a wage denotes that the Soviet societies are capitalist, but whether the wage is a progressive form. What is its relation to class struggle? Could be progressive (e.g. in Africa) or regressive or both. Lenin would have argued that NEP was progressive in as much as it was necessary to reproduce the revolution. Others (perhaps in the tradition of Mao) might see the wage relation not instrumentally as the previous view implies, but as carrying with it capitalist relations which themselves threaten the development of socialism in the post revolutionary society. Sometimes wages may serve to constitute a class; at other times to decompose it.

5. Or consider another aspect of the wage-capital relation: socialising consumption. This is a development in the forms under which labour power is reproduced. Individual wages are paid to individual workers whose families are reproduced individually.

With the development of collective consumption there is a challenge to this tie. Education is compulsory, regardless of one's parents contribution to social labour. What unemployed ~~man~~ person cannot ride their bike along a public highway? Of course there are attempts to drag social consumption back into the work-subsistence bind: charging for services; linking unemployment and old age payments to work and the wage. But at the end there are still the 50% of the unemployed who receive supplementary benefits; ~~and~~ the elderly too. So in capitalism this contradiction for capital is present (consider group bonuses also, or profit sharing). What about Soviet type societies? The social wage is a larger proportion of subsistence than most capitalist countries (evidence?). Much consumption is more socialised (e.g. collective living in some socialist countries, collective eating, crèches,). But the wage remains a payment to individuals in relation to work. (see material vs moral incentives as an issue about the degree ~~of~~ to which work has been disjoined from subsistence.) (Prison and conscripted armies as example of what capital of the free labour market is not: is there a similar contrast between the camp economies of the USSR and the ~~the~~ labour relation outside.)

6. Looked at from the point of view of labour, many similarities of class relation to that obtaining in capitalism in terms of: forms of control, aims of control, legitimation of control, control seen as necessity. Or put another way: similarities in the way workers are separated from means of subsistence, separated from means of production, and ~~linked~~ tied to means of production through promise of subsistence. We have to ask: what are the contradictions, the tendencies.

7. Against this tendency to see the parallels between labour relation to the ruling class in capitalist and socialist societies and to stress the continuities of capitalism and socialism (e.g. tendency to concentration in industry, increasing socialisation of labour) I would raise the question of analysing discontinuity/interruption. Is this all the revolution produced: a new version of capitalism? That it should come to this. In answering this question Abou says we should start from class struggle, from classes in motion, not structures at rest. But if we are to analyse ~~the~~ classes in motion in any other than a conjunctural and ad hoc way, then we must have some idea of the movement of the system as a whole ~~in~~ which generates and is generated by class struggle. We must have an idea of structures in motion. For instance: if Lenin says NEP is progressive, we have no way of criticising this project of treating the market instrumentally. Does the development of commodity relations, and the wage relation (see the development of unemployment and wage differentials in the early 20's, the expulsion of women from the wage labour force, and failure to employ the youth) carry with it reactionary tendencies which the state will be limited by. Will the ~~the~~ instrument become the master? Can the state be separated from relations of production in production and exchange, guaranteeing the revolution against the restoration of capitalist relations of production, merely through the reproduction of state power ~~and~~ not in hands of private capital. The political importance of some answer about what is going on, about how to characterise a society, is evident in any of these societies since all sides will argue that their policies will further

3.

socialism, that there is a temporary necessity to have piece work, or to centralise control of the state in a progressive army.

8. Abov's points I see not as a substitute for the analysis of modes of production, but as demanding ~~xx~~ such an analysis for the answer to his questions, and in doing so demand an analysis of modes of production in motion rather than at rest. How to go about it? First by a critique of ways of understanding these societies. Then by an analysis of how classes are reproduced, and this requires both a definition of classes, and an understanding of the material basis through which the ruling class can reproduce itself.

9. Thus we are drawn into the discussion of whether the existence of commodity and wage relations are sufficient to justify a characterisation of the USSR as state capitalist. We must consider what are the necessary conditions for the law of value to operate (mobile capital, mobile labour, commodity production), and what happens when these conditions are not met. We must consider which aspects of the wage under capitalism are present and which are not (wage as sign, as transferer of real resources from capital to labour, as instrument of control within the factory). And on the basis of such answers we can then hopefully understand the differentia specifica of Soviet societies, the crucial areas of control, the contradictions between different layers of labour, and between labour and the ruling political bureaucracy, the laws of motion, the relation of these systems to Western capitalism. We will also have a basis for considering ~~xxxx~~ how a socialist society could be otherwise.

10. For example, ~~the~~ how can we tackle the central control of the party. On the one hand it appears necessary for making the revolution; ~~and for defending it.~~ and for defending it. On the other it acts to stamp out all opposition both in making and defending. In the previous minutes I raised the question about the condition necessary for the reproduction of centralised power through the medium of the control of armed force, ~~xxx~~ social information, and communications. In capitalism the basis for decentralisation is private property, ~~xxx~~ the mobility of capital, and the soldiering of the proletariat. In feudalism it was the market, and problems ~~xxxxxx~~ associated with the low levels of the productive forces in force, communications and information, (cf Domesday Book as exception that proves the rule). In Inca empire control over the division of labour and circulation of necessities (not nec. the process of production: but what was produced and ~~xxxxxx~~ by whom it was circulated). Hence the Soviet-promorphic Inca planning system. In Soviet societies the key facts are: i) the destruction of private capital as an autonomous basis for resistance to centralisation; ii) the abolition of decentralised decision making over the allocation of both capital and labour (i.e. the immediate controllers of surplus product did not have the freedom to decide how to use it, and certainly not to transfer it abroad) nor did labour have freedom to allocate itself; iii) the necessary replacement of these decentralised decisions synthesised socially by the market by direct social synthesis by the central organs of the state controlled by the party. i.e. planning, of forces of production in information and communication in the economic sphere some decentralisation now allowed for enterprises, but not so as to threaten as an external necessity the centralised

4.

determination of the allocation of labour in the USSR and the nature of use values produced; note, however, that the pressure for decentralisation felt as a necessity because of power of either enterprise managers, or ~~man~~ workers, not to produce adequately ~~in~~ with fully centralised system at this point iv) unified political control, which is constantly used to direct the organisation of economy, against some of the tendencies manifest in the state economic bureaucracy and ~~in~~ among enterprise managers.

11. Issue: at this stage of the development of the productive forces and relations of production, what is the crucial thing to control labour, land, means of production, knowledge, or the ~~xxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ mechanism of the economic nexus itself. From the history of the USSR it appears the last of these. Many theorems of the new ruling class are based on their control over economic planning. Is this sufficient? How can that control be reproduced; how can workers be prevented from struggling against this control; how can technocrats be prevented from asserting their power as direct agents of production in terms of the structure of the economy, types of use values produced, structure of distribution, and relations with basic producers. Or looked at another way, who do the new rulers represent? The answer must be sought in terms of relations of production not just relations of power (since the latter quickly leads to tautology, elite theories etc). Control of the direct mechanism of social synthesis (economic nexus) is a control over the mechanism of circulation. (we call it circulation, since it is circulation via the market which effects that synthesis in capitalism). Could it be that in these systems circulation can dominate production. That relations of production can be determined by relations of circulation! And will there not be a tension between those who have power over ~~xxxx~~ circulation and those who have power in production (technocrats). In the case of the latter we can depict how such a class would reproduce themselves as class, their interests, their antagonism to manual labour and so on. But of the former, what?

12. First the reproduction of their power will depend on their relations to world capitalism; (their system must not lag behind). There is an antagonism between the systems for capitalism sets a limit to collectivism. Collectivism always trying to reduce the spheres of capitalism (cf Africa). Second, the reproduction of their power will depend on the effectiveness of their direct organisation of the commensurating mechanism- the plan. Problems here are: technical, economic, political. Thirdly, problem of relations to the direct producers. Is cutting off their freedom of mobility enough. What of soldiering. Crucial role of the party: both as controller and ladder of perfection. Accumulation of power in the party equivalent to accumulation of capital. Dependent on adherence to law of political value, i.e. ~~xxxx~~ pursuit of reproduction of centralised power. Crisis takes place when the centralised power not only failing to deliver internally, and by comparison with capitalism, but when it is clearly under the control of another ~~xxxx~~ socialist system (e.g. Russia). Then the ladder leads not to perfection but subservience. And other ladders are erected. Class interests come to the fore: here for decentralisation and technocratic rule (Czek in 1968) there for economic increases (or non decreases) in wages (oland).

13. We would lodge then the basis for the current ruling class's power in the control of circulation. Their political power (over the army, KGB etc) derives from this. System of pure force impossible. Must have some relation to production. Certainly in the long term. Question: how does control of circulation relate to power over working class. a) new ruling class can only enforce their power of circulation by reducing freedom of movement of workers; b) the centralised control over circulation as the basis of a relation of production precludes the development of directly productive classes from forming themselves as a class. Both would wish to assert ~~the~~ the dominance of production over circulation (freedom of ~~allocation~~ ^{allocation} of capital and labour). Hence undercut the material basis of planners power. Hence constant decomposition of the distinct and consolidated power of producers, and incorporation of productive labour into the direct mechanism of political control - the very skeleton of the new class - the party. The lower ranking members of the party like the servants of the aristocracy or capitalists: they are apparatchiks, who do not themselves play the direct economic ~~role~~ which gives the ruling class their power. The party is therefore not a relation of production: but a relation of circulation; it reproduces the monopoly power of the central administration over the economic nexus.

14. Clearly possible - if the above holds true - to invite in foreign capital, both to provide technology (which the local technocracy effectively withhold through soldiering) and, where necessary, management. No threat to the collectivists because: i) production can be decentralised as long as circulation is centralised; b) the foreign capitalists do not themselves form ~~an~~ an alternative internal political class. In fact being used to suppress the power in opposition of both technocrats and workers. What ~~is~~ of Yugoslavia. Have the central planners lost control of circulation having followed principle of decentralised control of production, and the invitation to foreign capital to a limit. What happens however: not the restoration of private capital; some autonomous power of technocrats because of planners weakening control on circulation? In other ~~circumstances~~ circumstances, the new Bonapartists establish control of political power internally before considering how to reproduce this power via control on economic nexus. Hence nationalisation of private property, and suppression of alternative political forces (expansion of Taylorism of everyday life) but not yet control over circulation. Why: because power in production directly suppressed politically, and allowed to operate in decentralised way while reign of terror ensured power for the new rulers.

15. ~~So~~ This would all introduce a further complication into our general picture. Anti-capitalist revolution would now offer three alternative paths: statism, collectivism or associationism. The Eurocommunists represent the second. The old new left tradition the third. And the revolutionary groups as they actually exist the first.

16. Bettelheim's discussion now can be seen in a new light. Wages and commodity relations perhaps should be our point of entry: but understood in terms of a new relation of production established through control over circulation. Wages then are a key index to the way in which class power is being reproduced.

6.

Statism certainly does not wish wages to be a sign, nor allow labour to be mobile because of differential wages. Its ruling class wishes to have direct control over the allocation of labour. Hence the relatively narrow wage differentials. The large social wage. Technocrats might be in favour of increasing labour mobility and restoring the significance of wages as signs; allowing wage differentials, and using wages as an instrument of control in the labour process. Associationism would attempt to break the narrow individual relation between work and subsistence via the wage: associating workers in work and in consumption, without a necessary overlap. Wages were paid for ~~work~~ work, could, as Abou suggests, be paid collectively. (cf. book club tendering plans in this regard).

17. In USSR technocrats have been allowed to develop wages as instruments of control in the factory but not to use wages as a sign. This reflects the course of the revolution. After the revolution there was an initial period of Bonapartism under Stalin: this represented a defense of the revolution against the restoration of private capital, and the political reduction of all opposition. In this period the planners developed with the party as the adequate form to buttress ~~control~~ control over circulation. Khrushchev represented the consolidation of statism after the initial Bonapartist stage. Only in Czechoslovakia has this been challenged by the new layer of technocrats. (What of the workers movements, particularly in Poland, what have been their demands beyond those of wages; mobility of labour?)

18. One of the points of posing the question in this way is that it may allow us to consider the necessary conditions for associationism in a different way. One feature of this we seem to agree is democratic control: but what we must ask is the basis for this control. In capitalism the basis is private property. Votes were linked to property until ~~1832~~ 1832 (for men). The Married Women's Property Act preceded the victory of votes for women. For the English proletariat in general, property ~~was~~ came to be defined as property over one's own labour (lowering the voting age to that at which people start work), property over other people (marriage and voting - cf. significance of 16 for marriage; adulthood, time when one can own property in one's own right; then voting after two year ~~apprenticeship~~ apprenticeship in property owning); and property over one's living quarters. (movement for owner occupation ~~encouraged~~ encouraged from 1910's i.e. after English working class had the vote - here the chronology runs in a different direction.)

19. In feudalism democracy (Magna Carta et al) was secured by the inadequacy of centralised power from a technical point of view (couldn't collect taxes directly, raises levies, discipline subordinates adequately) and possibility of stewards selling the ~~surplus~~ surplus product on the market. Thus twin conditions: not property, but low level of productive forces and high level of development of decentralised circulation. Thus feudal relations as we know them developed with the rise of the market (say mid 11th century) and declined into absolutism with the development of forces of production (and destruction) by capitalism and conversion ~~of~~ of surplus product from kind to money.

7.

20. In democratic guerilla movements we have centralised control but daily dependence on voluntary recruitment to the army, and voluntary donation of subsistence goods by productive (civilian) labour.

21. In discussions of democratic socialist forms we have ~~ix~~ ~~xxxx~~ the abolition of the problem of power (the anarchist vision of ~~xxxxxx~~ serialised collective, (or perhaps we should call it possessive collective) individualism. Private property is abolished but reconstituted as collective property with relations to other collectives via free negotiations where there are any relations at all.)

ii) the establishment of formal structures of delegated democracy democratic centralism for example. of rights of instant recall, mandation et al. The problem with this is there is no material basis for the reproduction of this system. Why should a central committee, in centralised control of the army and information networks, agree to be subject to mandation and instant recall? In pre revolutionary periods the power of the rank and file is lodged largely in the voluntary adherence to the group. This enforces a discipline on the leadership; but after the capture of state power and the nationalising of force and control this form of discipline fades away.

iii) Maoist tradition places an emphasiss on criticism and self-criticism, lodging democratic power in the force of social opinion. But again the problem is: how can this be reproduced; no ruling class likes to hear what the ~~xxxxxxx~~ oppressed ~~ix~~ classes think of it; all ruling classes both block their ears, or fold 'public opinion' into some control system of 'opinion management'.

22. What ~~xxxxxxx~~ irreducible institutions could be developed to prevent usurpation of a centralised ~~xxxxxxx~~ system by those in power. Capitalism after all was founded on circulation ~~xxx~~ and private property. It could not abolish it even at moments of acute crisis and dictatorship. (see Fascist experience: here it was labour's ~~xxxxxxx~~ 'property' that was destroyed: freedom of movement et al.) ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ In primitive communism we must imagine there to be no ~~xxxx~~ lasting surplus product (hunters and gatherers had to consume immediately). role of salt in development of class society). The vision of the kingdom of plenty also abolishes the problem; but is not pertinent to us now. We are dealing with societies (our societies) with scarce and durable surplus products which are monopolisable by ruling classes.

23. Possibilities:

- no taxation or conscription.
- maintain the market as connection between collectives; note here the market as insulator against centralism.
- universal arming of the population (people's militia): and other universalisations (abolition of ~~xxxxxxx~~ secret government information; ~~xxxxxxx~~ rights of intercommunication via electronic media). Basis of this line of thinking is to abolish all the privileged elements in a government's quiver of power by universalising them. Again meets with the problem of a government controlling things which are privatisable: a nuclear bomb/a TV network/etc).

Collective Mode (cont).

brief notes from 15.6.79

Commensuration and synthesis.

1. Issue once more of unity, synthesising, commensuration. How is this done. First there is a quantitative way, reducing qualities to quantities: either through money, or the vote, or simple labour time. In each case the people remain individualised, and either express preferences as individuals, or are accounted as individuals (labour time planning). Contrast this to the Yenan forms of unity. Here there are discussions of alternative outcomes (e.g. strategy for land reform, course of the war etc). These outcomes are not seen as individual expressions of preference but individual expressions of possibilities for the collective. Certainly appears to be the case in Eritrea. People speak from the point of view of the general will rather than the will of all. (Imagine buying from this point of view: I buy not what I want to consume but what I think would be best for the overall society: boycotting S. African fruit is an example of this: a form of protest through the market; or positively, the Chartist approved shops. Interesting channel to reclaim, and giving a new twist to the consumer movement. In as much as we all 'vote with money' in the high street, let us vote politically in purchasing means of subsistence. The political consumer). Secondly, discussion may continue until all are agreed: or, there may be a vote but a vote among only those who have been discussing and who are setting up the issue to vote upon. (contrast to referendum). Agreement on the issue to be voted on.

2. Clearly the latter method which is establishing a collective position qualitatively rather than quantitatively faces limits of size and time. How can a hierarchy of such qualitative forms develop: cf. the practise in guerilla movements rather than presenting abstract answers. In the most successful, same emphasis at each meeting, even when composed of delegates. How could we contrast these processes as ~~with~~ concrete synthesising rather than abstract. Mao suggests that any expression of ~~xxxxxx~~ collective 'preference' is abstract, but it seems to me that the process is concrete. Some quantitative units may be referred to: numbers of people, labour time. But these are not the means by which synthesising takes place. Given a certain number of people in the military unit, they can be deployed in a variety of ways. These quantitative possibilities are part of the object of decision rather than the process of collective decision itself. Towards a concrete politics, a qualitative practise.

3. Note that central planning via ^{simple}labour times merely involves the quantitative organisation of production: it is not inherently democratic. It may be inherently undemocratic. (the notion of simple labour time, and then the composition of complex labour from the simple units is a ~~phantasm~~ device associated with neo-Ricardianism). It is a variant of control from above, which (whatever the inequalities of the market or liberal voting systems) is in contrast to liberal capitalism, as a process of commensuration.

4. Contrast centralisation and decentralisation in various spheres.

- centralised economies and ~~decentralised~~ politics. *minimising the administrative apparatus, the work in each area is essential*
centralised economic activities, national committees, etc. Trotskyism.

2.

- decentralised economies and centralised politics. Fascism. further distinction nec here. a) the extent to which a ~~xxxxx~~ conscious collective decision is arrived at; b) the way in which this decision is made. Using ~~hbzbnbxk~~ centralisation in first sense, then Fascism effected a centralised politics with the economy still~~xk~~ located in ~~hhnds~~ hands of much private capital commensurated through internal market.
- decentralised economy and decentralised politics. Capitalism. It appears that capitalism has a centralised politics in the state. But capital is international and as long as there is international mobility of capital, the nation states are so many decentralised organs of authority, where commensuration between them is established at the political level by diplomacy and war.

Another version is the anarchist principle. Decentralisation in economy and politics ~~through~~ under conscious control, and abolishing ~~alxbzbrbsbnbxk~~ the problem of synthesis.

5. In each~~xk~~ case we have different versions of centralisation and decentralisation. Thus Trotskyists accept a double centralisation (meaningfull because of lack of mobility of capital in Soviet type societies) but insist that the political centralisation be democratic. The ~~Xuzbszhtvshabzbnbxk~~ ~~stnkbzixbZbszbnbnbxk~~ ~~Stalinism~~ is ~~effectively~~ undemocratic centralisation in both. Eastern European reformers wish to have a more decentralised economy, but with undemocratic decentralised units. Yugoslavia wish to have decentralisation but with a greater measure of local democracy in the factory. In both case the market is given a greater place in the process of economic synthesis. The social democratic paradigm is centralised politics of a formally democratic kind (abstract, quantitative synthesis) and a completely decentralised and undemocratic system of economic units with what they would call a ^{basic} democratic form of synthesis. (note here: we distinguish the ~~conscious~~ units and their form of synthesis) and the way in which synthesis is established between them, i.e. hierarchies of synthesis. Capitalism, great areas of direct ^{autocratic} socialisation of labour synthesised by the market. In some liberal versions (Vanek) great democratic direct socialisation of labour synthesised by the market. In social democratic versions the indirect synthesis of the market, and the power of property, controlled by the democratic political synthesis.)

6. We keep on returning to this question of unity and how it is effected. Seen always from the point of view of labour. (The age old subject of liberal political ~~sbdenzbx~~ theory. ~~is~~ ~~social~~ contract). Is there a danger of an individualist ontology. Should we not start from the class. This has been the tradition in Marxist thought. Many of our remarks are questioning this as adequate. From where do we start.

7. Note on money. In as much as money is the material object through which labour is made commensurable, the control of this object is central for a ruling class. ~~xxxx~~ the monetarists

in the West hold that control of money is the only instrument which the state requires for economic policy, since money enters into all rivulets of economic life. ~~Then there~~ is the German historical school tradition, best exemplified in Knapp's state theory of money. Here the argument is that money is a product of the state and the foundation of a state's economic power. ~~Rejects~~ Marxist notion of money as the universal commodity: a state taken. see more recently Rudi Bloch. Hilferding also sees money at a certain stage as being under the control of the state rather than controlling. Key issue here is international money. In as much as political power in capitalism is decentralised (in nation states) then the international law of value disciplines national states. Only way in which discipline can be resisted is by the most stringent financial ~~autarchy~~ (including rigid exchange controls, monopoly of foreign trade etc). Thus we should consider Nazi economic policy based on bilateral deals with areas that they attempted to bring within their orbit of political power. We can then consider the more general question: under what conditions does control of money (as one aspect of the control of circulation) become sufficient to establish class rule, or does it in itself ~~imply~~ a market exchange which makes a centralised/monopolised circulation impossible. Query: how long can a monopoly of ~~market~~ forms of circulation allow effective control in an underdeveloped capitalist economy: of third world governments and relations to petty commodity producers. Clearly we must ~~always~~ specify the relation of a particular form of circulation to particular forms of production: the two are by no means necessarily correspondent.

8. Note on circulation/production. What is the frontier between them. Remember Marx's remarks: all circulation is production, and all production circulation. (cf volume II for instance). What is the frontier? Abou suggests reproduction. Circulation is the moment of realisation: and in capitalist society there is no realisation other than goods sold to workers. This is the main sphere where commodity relations and ~~is~~ relatively free exchange still rule in Soviet type societies. How does this affect our argument about statism. Can one find a theoretical analysis (distinction for example of statism and collectivism) on the distinction between production and circulation.

Tex should here re-consider the early note on wages in Soviet type societies, and the question of wages as form.

9. This question underpins our discussion on relation of bureaucracy and technocracy. To what extent does the bureaucracy depend on the technocracy as the controllers of production: to what extent is there a congruence of interests which makes them effectively fractions of the ruling class. Could one exist without the other. Similar perhaps to the relations between industrial and finance capital (see interpretations of French history - and ~~versions~~ of English history - in terms of ~~relations~~ relations between industrial and finance capital.) Can a class basing its power on control of circulation ever constitute itself as a distinct class if nec. agst those who have economic power in production. In one sense capital could be said to have ~~no direct~~

4.

power in production. They have established a monopoly (over means of production - through their property claims) and they then organise the majority of the population to work for them - the latter having the real power in production. The key mechanism for reproducing capitalist power is the market and the circulation of capital, plus the apparatus of dictatorship within the factory and in the state as a whole. (the latter however is common to many class societies and cannot be taken as a differentia specifica when it is analysed solely as 'force').

That of the bureaucracy in Soviet style societies. They are far from indifferent to what happens in production. They are concerned with reproducing hierarchical relations in production, and to increasing productivity. They are concerned in short with the productive efficiency of the system. And this is one interpretation of the reform measures in Eastern Europe since 1956. Thus Khrushchev introduced reforms in technical education which would strengthen the technocracy (cf technical education in particular). Decentralisation of economic administration to regions. The same in Hungary. 1956 seen as compromise between bureaucrats and technocrats. The technocrats (and technocratic intelligentsia) given greater freedom in economic management and intellectual discussion, but bureaucrats insisted on exclusive control over international economic and political policy. (memorandum: we must look into the controversies about the meaning of 1956, 1968, 1965, 1971 etc). Now one view (the liberal view in the West) sees the reforms as an attempt to make a technically inefficient system more workable: emphasis on no. of items that can be handled by one computer for centralised planning, problems about reactions of decentralised economic managers in 'reading' instructions from the centre - in short, treatment of the problems of Soviet type societies as a branch of Operations Research/Systems theory. On the other, see these technical issues reflecting class struggle: the technocrats organising as they do - soldiering, making cross decisions - because they see themselves as oppressed by 'the system' (the latter is the fetishism peculiar to statism). Reforms which increase decentralisation then recognise the power in production of technocrats and workers.

The key part of the argument is the resistance to a restructuring of the economy which would undermine the material basis for the reproduction of statism as a mode of production. A clash here. Technocrats for a system of circulation which allows them to realise their power in production. Bureaucrats not. Now there are ways in which a bureaucracy would aim to accommodate or manage technocrats without giving way on the key structures. Thus: offers of advance into the bureaucracy. Privileges on wages. Stress on political necessity of bureaucracy against the working class and against capital. The extent to which these prove sufficient will depend on the development of the technocracy itself (forces of production), the international relations with other Soviet-type societies, the particular conjuncture.

Some who have argued for the identity of the two as components of a ruling class say that the technocracy is dependent on the bureaucracy for class power over labour. But that is true of all ruling classes based on production. They require a state for this purpose, but they will struggle to

5.

make that state conform to their general class interest. The same response goes to those who say the state(bureaucracy) depend on technocrats economically. Certainly, but they will then assert their version of the economic ~~system~~ system against that of the technocracy. In both cases the two classes are not mutually exclusive. They are interdependent. The question is: which rules.

10. If we define class from the point of view of labour, then we ask: a) do the different groups have interests which sharply diverge with respect to the conditions of labour; b) what are their relative strengths as a class; c) what are the tendencies, which is progressive. Now some argue that statism is progressive: in the sense that Stalin was consistently favouring the proletariat by: insisting on full employment, and no redundancies; improving workers living standards and reducing differentials; expanding the sphere of social consumption; resisting the re-introduction of capital and all that goes with it. Under the last heading would go ~~xxx~~ current resistance by post Stalinists statist to the ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ full market reforms advocated in E. Europe. From this perspective we would expect a coalition between working class and statist against technocrats and capital. In E. Europe however, the statist are clearly subordinate to the Soviet statist (this has economic implications in the deindustrialisation of Czechoslovakia - is this correct?) and the alliance breaks down. Certainly the working class supported Dubcek. (Soviet tanks flown into Prague because unsafe for them to go by land). 2/3 of the party expelled - down to 700,000.

11. Property. Much of the argument starts from property: does the abolition of private property signal the end of capitalism and the beginning of socialism (~~xxxxxx~~ specifically when it is married to the control by the workers party). First point: there are many different forms of private property and collective property. Private property. Usually implies right to use and right to sell. Greater restrictions on use of house which is rented and house which is owned. see ^{labour from this} point of view. Right to sell, and to ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{control ourselves} outside production. But in production ~~the~~ capital has the right to use. Hence the importance of affirmation of right to 'use' ourselves outside production. The dual of contemporary capitalism: inside/outside production. Most socialist thought has concentrated on one or the other but not the dialectic between the two. Suspect that same ~~xxxxxx~~ binary opposition in Soviet type societies: cf. rumours that toothbrushes would be nationalised and concern to build ones own house. Trace the history of private property: rights over fields for example. Rights over houses. Rights in factories and outside. Notably right to socialise and on whose terms. 'licensing' et al, and EAS's work on the development of 'public' is concerned centrally with this. Estate duties, and gift taxes also pertinent re-rights to pass over property, and taxes relevant on rights of sale.

Collective property: through various forms of co-operatives, difft forms of state property, Yugoslav social property, solkhoz/kolkhoz etc. Thus arrive nearer a continuum than distinct categories. Property means 'owned' as against 'othered': tendency to think of this individually but of course

6.

can equally be collective. Thus a ruling class may encourage a form of property which means that it 'owns' it collectively to the exclusion of others. Alternatively, private property may be the vehicle for class domination - not only in production, but also in consumption. Example: private houses & the terrains for reproduction of patriarchy (C's Hungarian film). We cannot divine the nature of the society from its forms of property alone.

In capitalism: private property rights gradually modified by the state, and indeed significantly transformed (cf also sexual property and changing rights for women and children)k. In contemporary capitalism even recognition that new forms of property quite compatible with capital: co-ops (Robert Oakshott), state property, even socialist society (Ethiopia and attitude of Meenemara). It all depends on the relations of these forms of property to capital or more generally to the ruling class.

12. Guarantees. Further remarks:

- elective affinity/collective experience/momentum/ways in which with made.
- rights of horizontal relations by decentres rather than via the centre. This politically: but can we imagine such links economically without a market.
- surplus consciousness (Bahro). State cannot appropriate creativity.
- technological ascetism ((Bahro again)
- regional and ethnic guarantees (anarchists). Bakunin's natural groupings).
- opposition (another form of anarchism: put them in and bash 'em
- there can be no guarantees for associationism.

Associationism and pre-figurative forms.

Notes from 22.6.79.

1. Modes of production once more. Are there contending modes (or ways) of producing in each society, or can we characterise societies as predominantly one mode, e.g. capitalism. Theorists of 'transition' argue that we have contending modes. 2 lines. Petty commodity production, primitive capital, feudal forms. (Mandel on Transition for example). Structuralist concept of social formation a static ~~way~~ (not nec) way of ~~xbkhhghbxbhnt~~ putting this. Combination of modes which are 'articulated' one with another. One dominant. Significance of revolution is that there is a rupture, ~~and~~ interruption, a change in structural dominance.
2. One tradition which sees history as a succession of stages. Primitive communism, ~~xxxxxxx~~, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, communism. The sharp distinctions emphasise the significance of the ruptures. Stalin.
3. A & S argued against stages, against structural analysis, and against the emphasis on rupture, and a hierarchy of breaks. (if anything a matrix rather than a vector of breaks). We need a history of the theory of revolution: a critique.
4. How do we characterise 1640, 1789, let alone 1917 $\frac{1}{2}$. Or 1848. 1640 important politically but not economically (but surely the two are closely connected). Quantity/quality. Importance of revolution is the change in state power: this does not mean that we go from zero to double the boiling point in one revolution, from 99 to 101 degrees. The latter, however, is a decisive and qualitative change in terms of relative social relations. Destruction of economic power of some classes, consolidation of others, and now new pregnancies, new contentions of alternative forms.
5. Dangers always of a chemical image. That we have in capitalism are a variety of modes of production (ways of producing) which may be dialectically related to each other (unity of opposites), some of which have a future, ~~and~~ some have none. We can then look at the ways Marxists have tried to analyse the quantitative changes that lead up to the qualitative.
6. First tradition sees developments not as pre-figurative but constitutive. That is to say, the developments in capitalism did not prefigure the nature of the post revolutionary society, but could be seen as providing the conditions by ~~xx~~ which the new society would be introduced. Here we have the tradition of developing forces of production, centralisation/concentration, socialisation of labour, increasingly large crises. Osgie produces its own grave diggers. Here is a mixture of material characteristics nec. for new production (centralisation) and political conditions for revolution. Nothing can be achieved before the revolution but the revolution. Two lines of progressiveness: a) further development of the material base; b) instrumental development of the party which is to seize power.
7. Second analysis sees the economy working, and labour related, in ways which do pre-figure socialism. Alfred John-Kethel of first importance here. His theory of time economy suggests that the means of compensating human labour ~~xxxxxx~~ which will characterise

2.

socialism is already being developed by capitalism (of Taylorism and Fordism). It is the form which is pre-figurative: the content remains capitalist because capital still rules production and the state.

8. Thirdly, there ~~xxxx~~ is a tradition that sees the labour movement producing pre-figurative forms in the sphere of political synthesis. That is to say, it is not a question of privileging the forms of economic compensation. It is rather one of analysing political compensation - particularly the way the politics of production is organised. Not how labour is related via a principle (time and timing), but how the use of labour is determined via a process. Marx discussed this in Volume III; ~~xxxxxxx~~ associated labour and co-operative production:

"The co-operative factories of the labourers themselves represent within the old form the first sprouts of the new, although they naturally reproduce and must reproduce everywhere in their actual organisation all the shortcomings of the prevailing system. But the antithesis between capital and labour is overcome within them, if at first only by way of making the associated labourers into their own capitalist, i.e. by enabling them to use the means of production for the employment of their own labour. They show how a new mode of production naturally grows out of the old one, when the development of the material forces of production and of the corresponding forms of social production have reached a particular stage, without the factory system arising out of the capitalist mode of production there could have been no co-operative factories. Nor could these have developed without the credit system arising out of the same mode of production. The credit system is not only the principal basis for the gradual transformation of capitalist private enterprises into capitalist stock companies, but equally offers the means for the gradual extension of cooperative enterprises on a more or less national scale. The capitalist stock companies, as much as the co-operative factories, should be considered as transition forms from the capitalist mode of production to the associated one, with the only distinction that the antagonism is resolved negatively in the one and positively in the other." (III 1962 ed. p.431)

He calls them transitional rather than pre-figurative forms, but the meaning is the same. However he is not saying that the co-ops are themselves modes of production. Associationism in conflict with capitalism. Rather he talks of forms. and they are forms not of the relations of individuals to each other, but of how capital relates to labour, and how labour relates to itself.

Note, too, however Marx's hostility to Owenism, as experiments doomed to failure. He contrasts (in the Communist Manifesto, p.106sq) "gradual spontaneous class organisation of the proletariat to an organisation of society specially contrived by the inventors." After financed by the bgsie. notes also Owenites opposition to Chartism. How does this treatment ~~xxxx~~ distinguish itself from the Vol III work: has Marx changed his position, or are we to distinguish co-op prod. from Owenism; alternatively do we take it that Marx approves of co-operative forms.

5.

9. Fourthly, there is a less developed tradition ~~of~~ concerned with prefigurative forms in political organisation itself (i.e. not the politics of production, but the production of politics). The women's movement, and some streams of libertarian socialism ~~are~~ are important here, together with ~~the~~ the older tradition of the Clarion, and the ILP (see their concern with the form of meetings). Also the Austro-Marxists and the German SPD. Congress of Brunn ~~in 1899~~ in 1899 which organised the party on the basis of nationality, because this would indicate how the national question would be ~~settled~~ settled structurally after the revolution.

10. Thus we can distinguish two issues: first whether pre-figurative forms is a useful concept. Lenin and others against the Clarion/ILP concerns (as were the Webbs). For Lenin a question of instrumental. How capitalism paved the way for its own overthrow. But the new society would be created after the revolution by the party/and the state under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Second, if we could think in terms of pre-figurative forms, what sphere were they most significant: forms of commensuration; forms of economic organisation; forms of political organisation.

11. ~~xxxx~~ Parenthesis. Correlation with feudalism. In late feudalism capitalism developed its own pre-figurative forms. Largely in production (private capital), but also in politics (guilds, city states, and town administration). Were these indeed pre-figurative; they were the actual forms which feudalism encouraged to exist as themselves. They finally coalesced to seize state power not so they could come into being, but in order to remove the barrier of feudal absolutism to the continuing circulation of capital. (land reform, change in levy-bounty system, ~~foreign policy~~ foreign policy). Conditions enabling this was the decentralised character of feudal production, and ~~specifically~~ specifically the existence of the market. ~~Socialism~~ Socialism has traditionally ~~been~~ been seen as not conforming to this earlier history, because it depends on centralised economy and ~~polity~~ polity and therefore is mutually exclusive ~~with~~ capital. But it depends on how we see socialism. If it is based on democratic centralised economics and politics, the forms of democracy can be started prior to the centralisation. Zones of autonomy can be built up, like the liberated zones of Yenan, Mozambique, or Eritrea. I do never saw Yenan as pre-figurative: it was poor and backward, whereas socialism was prosperous and progressive: but that it is to take perhaps too economic a view of the matter.

12. We can then draw out the discussion in two ways. First, by considering other areas of prefiguration besides commensuration the politics of production and the production of politics. For example: ~~collective consumption~~ collective consumption; forms of unification between production and circulation (the latter to include the distribution of goods, of income, and consumption); ~~and so on.~~ and so on.

13. Second, we can consider different ~~versions~~ versions of what is being pre-figured. That is to say ~~that~~ prefigurative forms not only contend and contradict capital (though capital may encourage them because they are necessary) but contend and contradict themselves.

4.

14. One tradition is collectivism. This we see as reflecting developments in the forces of production, particularly those which we have called systemofecture. The clearest exponents are the Webbs, but they are only part of a broader tradition, that of scientific socialism which aimed for state power, positions on local bodies (SDF). In 1897 the Webbs elaborated a constitution for collectivism with three spheres:

- a) the sphere of the citizen. key institution: municipalities.
- b) the sphere of the worker: key institution: Trade Unions.
- c) the sphere of the consumer. key institution: the co-ops.

Here was rational organisation of society, without the sentimentalism of primitive democracy (represented by the Stetson and ILP). They were opposed to producer co-ops. ~~It was no accident that they~~ ^{reorganised} in Stalinist Russia a version of the collectivism to which they saw history tending.

Query: in terms of our distinction between collectivism and statism, which side were the Webbs on. Presumably they were agst. private capital and the market. Or were they like Shaw, seeing private capital being limited by the state (notably through tax on rents). Did they discuss planning and control over circulation?

We could no doubt trace traditions in social democrat thought in this country representing: Statism, collectivism and managed capitalism.

see also French socialist party. Rocard very much a collectivist. Unity via the party together with workers control. ~~also: state plus planning plus workers control equals socialism.~~ Italian communist party also?

can we see the social democrats as in some ways preparing the ground for collectivism. They will the end but not the means. At the same time build up the apparatus (encouraging finance capital) which lays the basis for collectivist revolution against capital. The leading edge of collectivism is now the Eurocommunist parties.

(to what extent ~~were~~ were the battles and controversies at the turn of the century ones between collectivists of the Fabian variety and those of the Marxist tradition, and to what extent a battle between collectivism as a whole and associationism. Did the earlier distinction only come to be pertinent (1919) after the defeat of associationism). see S's papers on the struggle over form in: friendly societies, working men's clubs, building societies, mutual insurance.)

15. Another tradition is associationism. Heroes not revolutionaries. Until recently regularly lost the struggle with collectivism. Socialism has been largely captured by collectivism.

(Lenin: Leninism an invention of Stalinism. What is to be done. State and Revolution considered by some an anarchist document. But cf. his concern for translation of the Webbs Industrial Democracy 1897.)

see also Mannakoek and Goethe, and response of Lenin, Trotsky and Rosa L. and current discussions in Eastern Europe, on the one hand, and women's movement on the other.

16. Issue of relation between these contending forms and forces. Collectivism has its material base in a) the technocracy; b) the organisations of the working class. (the latter may be the material basis for statism). What of associationism. What social force does it represent.

17. Certainly the possibility of alliances. Thus we also ask: what are the conditions for associationism to have greater chance of success than Winstanley's project at St Georges Leybridge, in the 1640's. It may be that collectivism paves the way for associationism. We must consider. Generally in revolutionary movements the alliance would be between associationism and statism; whereas in advanced capitalist societies alliance would be more between collectivism and associationism. Thus gloss on stages of revolution. Lenin: bourgeois democratic revltn followed by socialist revltn; Mao & after 1st world war the new democratic revolution first, which was a bourgeois revltn led by the proletariat because bourgeoisie too weak to lead it; then socialist revltn. To this we would add ~~the following comment~~ comment: 1st statist revltn, then collectivism, and finally associationism.

18. Note Khrushchev's non capitalist path. Key features: planning and nationalisation on one hand, and single party on the other. This represents the form of statism though not the substance. Form, because it is expropriating ~~the~~ private capital, and inserting control over circulation (planning). Without substance because the single party may not be a communist party. (Khrushchev/Masser).

19. Now return to question of pre-figuration:

- for social democrats they see the extension of the power of the state as pre-figurative; as well as constitutive. (examine traditions and changes here).
- opponents of socialism have been perhaps the main commentators on collective forms embodying (prefiguring) socialist relations, or as we would ~~collectivist~~ relations. Include here both capitalists, and anarchists/associationists. Exemplification: the armed forces. System of manufacture first develops here on a grand scale. In Soviet Union even more extensive. Great parallels economically and socially between the arms complexes in East and West. cf: conscription; collective consumption; no right of secession; (desertion); single and undisputed hierarchy; no factions; not even forms of election. In wartime these forms tend to extend into ~~many~~ all spheres of capitalist societies (notion of traitor); in USSR military production 25% of national income compared to 6% in USA. (Gary's chapter on USSR to be circulated separately.)
- opponents of associationism: ^{say it is} limited by:
 - * lack of political power.
 - * restrictions by law of value.
 - * restriction by the state.

(only possible in small scale sectors which are ~~backward~~ backward: publishing; shops; shoes; but: consumption?? progressiv
RM. 5.7.79.

Socialism and Mobility.

Minutes of meeting 29.6.79.

1. Starting point was the article in Liberation no 1 on Socialism in Labour. The point made in the article was that we must discuss the question of new modes from the point of view of labour, from the forms of relations between labourers, and not merely the relation between a ruling class and the means of production/circulation/ or whatever. That is to say, we must always consider the question of mode of production not just from the point of view of ~~the ruling class to the exploited classes,~~ the relations of the ruling class to the exploited classes, but ~~how the exploited classes relate among themselves.~~ how the exploited classes relate among themselves. We tend to treat this transhistorically: e.g. that the ruling class will always try and decompose the exploited classes, isolating them from each other, making it difficult for them to constitute themselves politically, ~~or we see it structurally: the ruling class using many devices to reproduce their power.~~ Or we see it structurally: the ruling class using many devices to reproduce their power. In some ~~societies~~ societies ideology plays a central role; in others economic separation; in others a centralised police state which produces a social atomism of the kind from which utilitarian dreams are made. ~~xxxxxx~~

2. The Italian school have made a distinctive contribution in this field. For them the central question is how the working class relates within its own ranks as the result of ~~the~~ its general relation to capital. In their formulation there is a certain hidden political hand at work, recomposing labour through a latent militancy produced by the production process itself. Their argument is that unity is achieved not by bureaucratic structures for labour (large political parties, trade unions etc) but through the consistently hostile acts of labour against capital which force capital to make the ~~changes.~~ changes. See for example Bologna's analysis of the US labour movement in the inter-war period, or Negri view of the state as the creation of ~~negative~~ negative labour. Though Negri still believes a proletarian party is important, the theoretical justification for such a union is not clear vis a vis the remainder of the analysis. Rather the requirement is the organisation of the rank and file underneath the political radar line around concrete issues in the town /workplace. There are strong strains of anarcho-syndicalism in this perspective: ~~confronting~~ confronting the state not with visions of alternative states but with the organisation of labour against any state. What distinguishes them from some currents of anarchism is their optimism about the collective power and ~~the~~ militancy of labour. Have they (other than through Bologna's account of the Bolshevik revolution) extended their perspective to Soviet type societies?

3. Note that the Italians grasp the dialectic of the relation of labour and capital within as well as between themselves via the conceptual scheme of the labour process.

4. Marx of course offered theses ~~from~~ from this perspective also:
 - capitalism as destroying the individual isolation of petty commodity producers and the political subjugation of the serf,
 b) constituting collectives of free wage labourers ever more unified as the result of the centralisation and concentration of capital.

2.

- capitalism as breaking down differences, in place, skill, status and imposing common conditions on 'mass workers' in the period of manufacture. A certain universalism. (cf destruction of the petit bourgeoisie).
- unification of working class through what? The party. associations between producers.
- theory of fetishism; ~~xxxx~~ it was the task of socialist theory to explain how social relations were not how they seemed. Fetishism as a divider of the working class.

5. The liberation article insisted on such a general approach to analysis of socialist societies: how did labourers relate one to another as part of the relation with the means of production and the ruling class. Considered here: the profound impact of individual wages, still largely the form of subsistence ~~xxxxxxxx~~ provision in the USSR. Leads to the fetishism of the individual labourer, being paid according to his or her contribution, when in fact part of collective labour. Alternative suggested, group wages, or group payments (communes and co-operatives?)

6. Second issue: relations of labour to skill/knowledge/technology. Currently this aspect of the collective labour is privatised as the property of the individual worker. Workers are paid more for skill. Individuals therefore encouraged to accumulate skills via apprenticeships, studying, university courses. The individualisation of wage payments ~~xxxxxxxx~~ therefore leads to the privatisation of skill, ~~xxxx~~ to wage differentials, and to a regime where human capital theory rules in daily practise. There is also an accompanying fetishisation of technology and science: individuals by a serial diligence can share in the powers of this ever progressive social force. Indeed we have gone so far as to say that those who ~~xxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxx~~ develop the capacity to produce technology, productive knowledge etc. some to compose a new class, since in order to reproduce their individual monopolies ~~xxxx~~ they develop a common interest vis à vis a) unskilled workers; b) the form of the appropriation of knowledge; c) the relative emphasis on the development of the productive forces; d) a ruling bureaucratic class. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~

7. How can this be countered. i) by collectivising wage payments; ii) by collectivising control on who from the collective is trained in certain skills, and the continuing relation between the newly skilled worker and the collective. Something of this kind took place in the cultural revolution in China. Workers would be designated for courses and would then return to fill the gap that had prompted the collective 'investment'. In the electrical generator factory this led to views on the form of education. On the job training being found to lead to ~~xxxx~~ less hauteur by the trainees in contrast to university education. If the collective has designated who should train, provided the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ subsistence during training, discussed why the training is needed from the point of view of the productivity of ~~xxxxxxxx~~ its own collective labour, and effected the form of education in order to prevent the development of a superior outlook on the part of the trainee, then ~~xxxxxxxx~~ the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ construction of privatised skill will have been firmly countered. It will be seen that ~~xxxx~~ it is a) not the individual but the collective which has made the investment; b) that the individual is merely the bearer of skill;

c) that the skill is then applied ~~xxxx~~ as part of social labour increasing overall productivity in a way which cannot be unambiguously assigned to the individual contribution of the skilled worker alone; d) that the skill should be spread within the production unit. In as much as knowledge / skill has a high marginal productivity (which to repeat is not so say that it alone has raised the productivity) ~~xxxxxbxxxx~~ and is lodged within some individual workers rather than others, there will always be a tendency towards technocracy. This holds true in capitalism as in socialism, and must be linked to the twin institutions of: a) individual wages; b) state rather than collective control of the education process, and individual rather than collective decision making on ~~xxxxxbxxx~~ who shall become the bearers of the technology as a social force.

8. Associationist thought has tended to see the division of labour as the 'radix malorum'. How many of our actions are based on the attempt to recover the 'whole person'. We should all be poets, and all labourers. Of the great divisions in labour that between ~~head and hand~~ domestic work and commodity production has been primary, together with that between head and hand. What others: co-ordinators, co-ordinated (at the basis of Nichels theses); creative/~~uncreative~~ labour; ~~xxxx~~ industrial/agricultural labour; (can we add others). (fighters/non fighters - Eritrea)

9. A constant tendency in our thought is towards a technical determinism. In each of the above the fact of the division of labour determines the relationships between the labourers. Head always dominating over hand, commodity over domestic labour, industrial over agricultural, co-ordinators over co-ordinated. We could no doubt name heretics for each: those who see an iron ~~law~~ ^{himself} founded on the technical divisions - of which Nichels/is a good instance. But do we not hold in general that social relations can dominate the technical, by recognising the forces, the tendencies induced by the technical and then socially mastering them?

10. There have been a number of ways we have traditionally approached this question of resisting the tyranny of these divisions of labour:

- rotate the tasks. thus division of labour is preserved but not ~~the~~ division of labourers. All must do a portion of manual labour; all must fight three months at the front; all manual labourers must attend classes; all must participate in political meetings; all must take turns in the tasks of the home.
- universalise skills. This may be either a gloss on the rotation of tasks (adequate rotation ~~xxxx~~ requires some re-skilling), or see part of the problem in terms of capacities. Thus if everyone is capable of being a teacher, then teachers (or technicians) will be less liable to impose their versions on others. Reducing the aura.
- design production so as ~~is~~ not to require divisions of labour. e.g. small scale production where production requires the multiple skills of the artisan, or small farmer. In general: roll back the division of labour.

12. One way we could distinguish these forces from the point of view of labour is by saying: a) the technocracy relate to labour as concrete labour; i.e. they have to organise, subordinate, distribute labour specifically according to the material requirements of the production process. b) the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union have tried to relate to labour but can only do so as simple labour. i.e. plans are drawn up with values that are intended to correspond with labour as simple labour; but this is a totally misconceived venture, and the results can only be arbitrary. In fact time and again these experiments have been abandoned in favour of planning by material balances, i.e. relating to labour via the ^{use values} ~~commodities~~ they produce, leaving the relations of concrete labour to the technocrats in the ~~individual~~ enterprises. Some of the reforms attempt to expand the sphere of concrete labour relations at the expense of the simple labour or ~~commodity~~ the use value relation (cf the East German cartelisation movement). Others try and replace the use value relations with commodity relations, and thus transform the relation of the bureaucracy to labour ~~into one of abstract labour~~ into one of abstract labour. Is not the aim of a democratic socialism - an associationism - to relate the spheres of concrete labour concretely, to ~~replace all abstract, simple, or use value relations by relations of concrete labour~~ replace all abstract, simple, or use value relations by relations of concrete labour, to universalise the concrete. I suspect this emphasis on the concrete would give a ^{heavy emphasis on} ~~key socialist~~ discussions of ~~socialist democracy~~ socialist democracy.

13. So the bureaucracy's power rests on a) control over circulation (or the ~~social synthesis of socialism~~ social synthesis of socialism); b) control over political synthesis. In terms of the discussion of the division of labour what ways can we approach the problem of breaking the monopoly of a class over these twin elements of the new society.

a) delegation. contrast this traditional political demand with the ways in which economic divisions of labour have been countered. Consider the ^{idea} ~~concept~~ of delegating skilled labour. Problem is that there are certain necessary conditions for this to operate ~~fully~~ adequately. Knowledge of how the delegate is behaving; knowledge of the issues under discussion; capacity to challenge the delegate; insufficient base for the delegate to confirm his or her power by forms of patronage based on power conferred by position as delegate; relatively greater time spent with the delegators than with other delegates. The provision that delegates should be subject to instant recall and that they should receive the average working wage, is understood, but the question is whether these desiderata are variables, are they themselves the key relations of production. Once the so-called delegates establish a monopoly over socio-economic and political synthesis, then demands for mandation, instant recall, and no privileges and perquisites have less purchase. For, as with capital in its monopoly over the means of production, so the bureaucrats have been set up with a crucial monopoly, and new forms of fetishism will be produced as a result.

b) limited terms/election by lot, etc. this is equivalent to the circulation of tasks. implies generalisation of abstract organising ability.

8.

b) social/sectoral. Key question here is circulation of tasks, and universalisation of capacity which is currently privatised by a class: education. Double movement: a) intellectuals and those with higher training should all engage in manual labour (cf. hardest labour in Cuba, Mozambique etc), fighting, et al). b) those without higher training having opportunity for such. Note Dahro who advocates compulsory education to 23 years of age. (pp 334-5 and 504) for the previous point about white collar workers engaging in blue collar work). "Vertical ~~economic~~ economic migration" may involve "horizontal geographical migration" (or even vertical geographical migration, cf Incas) but not necessarily. (note: change of job we could call horizontal economic migration)

c) political migration.

- horizontal. For system of concrete democracy to work (Eritrean and Mozambique style) personal knowledge of those to be elected required. Eritreans move from group to group: training with one unit, fighting with another and so on. After short time possible to know well (in action) considerable number of people (though clearly limits. (10,000 people in 5 years? - such figures important because will determine political forms.)

- vertical. all political synthesisers must return to base for certain periods of time/limit on period of office holding. Formal recallability not sufficient.

encouragement of direct political synthesis: cf Mao's call to workers to come to Peking directly to voice complaints during the cultural revolution; cheap trains (free?) laid on. Cutting out the political bureaucracy.

dvlpmt of economy so that major decisions can be taken within groups where political synthesis established directly rather than through delegates, or permanent officials.

(two models of political structures: a) where there are a hierarchy of decisions paralleling a hierarchy of decision making bodies (parish councils deciding on a bus shelter) unto the grand political generals who wish to be spared the details); the other where the great decisions are all discussed at the 'lower' more disaggregated levels and ~~general~~ general decisions established through a ~~process~~ process of delegate discussion rather than mechanical voting (referenda).)

16. Most of these forms of mobility or migration involve geographical movement. Rather than treating geographical movement as separate (although it is a distinct dimension) we should treat it as a space which other forms of mobility necessarily take. Note that we have been circling round the three great divisions: head and hand; town and country; workers and peasants; to which we should add a fourth: men and women. The first of

these divisions I have called social; the second is clearly geographic in its form; the third is sectoral; the fourth sexual. A fifth perhaps: party and masses, which is political. In each case we can think through similar solutions:

- designing away the division, by abolishing one or other of the poles of the division.
- circulating people through the divided jobs: so that everyone is successively, intellectual and manual worker, parochial and metropolitan; peasant and industrial worker; ~~sex~~ political synchroniser and rank and filer. The sexual distinction falls outside this solution save through similar circulation through the tasks normally taken on by women and men.
- formal mechanisms of control of the dominant pole in the division (party, town, ind worker, men, technical labour). either through criticism and self criticism, formal rights of recall, egalitarian life styles, et al.

In the discussion of migration we have been concerned with the second of these.

17. But the ~~importance~~ importance of mobility goes beyond this. It is not merely a space on which other imperatives are mapped (students going to the countryside). ~~Thus~~ Mobility has a significance of its own which goes beyond the simple matter of circulating over the divisions. For it relates also to the very character of the ~~collective~~ collective within which the divisions take place. There are at least ~~four~~ ^{three} ways in which geographical mobility ~~has~~ has an independent significance:

a) the right of secession (emigration) is a form of negative democracy, a ~~guarantee~~ popular guarantee, a discipline on the economic and political and economic leadership. Given the difficulties of labour mobility even where there are no legal barriers, ^{usually} secession would ~~often~~ be a last resort. But it is a resort subject to popular not central control, and as such would have to be a constant factor in the minds of any ruling stratum.

this then amounts to a fourth approach to counteracting the great divisions: it allows those underprivileged to opt out of the collective which is divided.

b) mobility to widen number of people one knows well in order to make concrete democracy work better (CSC and discussion of delegates).

this is a gloss on the mechanism of control of the dominant pole in divisions; i.e. there are certain nec. cond tions for such control to be effective; one of which is mobility (another is time, which lin's in to mobility. More time ~~xxxx~~ for these systems of collective decision when people live close together).

c) mobility to encourage experience, perspective, to counter idealism about the unknown, to match the range of experience of the synthesisers, to broaden culture. This could be

10.

interpreted in terms of the beneficial discipline of the synthesisers experiencing the conditions of the synthesised, but the emphasis here is on the capacity for creative thought and culture of the synthesised themselves. we might regard it as part of equalising education.

18. There are four great ages of humanity:

- i) childhood. relative geographical stability perhaps important here; ~~intensive~~ education as the intensive experience of the immediate.
- ii) youth. period of most rapid mobility/migration. Migrant labour as 'the great adventure' (see Jean Rouché on migrants in Senegal). Youth have more in common with youth elsewhere than with elders and younger in their own community.

period then of migrating collectives: through youth services (see the Seychelles model), ~~manual~~ manual labour, training and education courses, military labour, etc.

childhood is traditionally a period when the children are divested of 'rights' (voting, owning property, having sexual relations, being constituted legal subjects other than as having certain immunities and protections - against assault for example). Youth: perhaps this is an intermediate period with choice among collectivities, directed labour. (consider conscription and childhood).

- iii) reproductive period. distinguished by child bearing and responsibility for children. linked in to period of marriage. In as much as relative geographical stability is a desiderata for children then there is a question of relative stability of ~~parents~~ adults responsible for children's care. Traditionally the parents and particularly women. Many possibilities:

- throw off constraint of relative immobility for children.
- institutionalise child care so that different people look after children in same place.
- maintain family links, with parents becoming relatively immobile (linked upto collective child care facilities)

- iv) the fourth age. (in French, le troisieme age). All those beyond the period reproduction. In principle another period of mobility, but depends. Could provide the immobility addressed under iii) above. Or could play leading role in education: a migrant collective memory. 4th age a major challenge for socialism. (old age defined now not by infirmity, but by post reproduction period).

what about a compulsory period of education (re-education) for all those aged 50 or more.

19. The 10 stages of education:

Among these stages we would find:

- infant materialism.
- infant idealism
- primary intellectual synthesis (mathematics, writing, reading)
- primary socio-political synthesis.
- intensive migration (inner journeys, literature, psychology, music)
- extensive migration (the period of youth movement)
- re-education for the fourth age.

Or: expand ages of humanity to five (including as the fifth the period from 0-5 years old) and have the same two elements of education in each stage: inner/outer, materialist/idealist, Notion of migration of course close to that of education (educare meaning to lead out). May be preferable to substitute the concept of migration for that of education given the latter's p/maternalist overtones. Can we think of the 10 migrations. Applying to each age of humanity, and not concentrated on the ~~2ix~~ 0-23 period as in Bahro. Surpass the notion of adulthood. ~~xxx~~ contrast school education in capitalism (however deformed) with the poverty of mass adult culture. All part of the collective migration to ~~xxxx~~ communism.

Next meeting: Naline's house, at 8.00 p.m. on Friday 6th July.