

© Kojin Karatani, 2001. All rights reserved. For Use at Princeton Symposium "Authenticities East and West" Only. Do not circulate, cite and/or quote without the permission of the author.

The Principles of New Associationist Movement (NAM)

Kojin Karatani

A Preface

B The Program

C The Organization

D Explanation of the Program

E Current Problems Concerning the Form of NAM

A Preface

In the summer of the year 2000, we in Japan began a new associationist movement aimed at abolishing capitalism, nation, and state or their amalgamation (capitalism=nation=state). We call it NAM. As a consequence of the decisive failure of Bolshevism, social democracy—in any of its guises—has become dominant in the world today. In it we cannot find any hope for a real change; it is the way capitalism=nation=state has adapted itself for its own survival. At the same time, anarchism (or associationism) has been reemerging, and it might be that our NAM movement is part of this tendency. However, our starting point is a thorough scrutiny of associationism itself—why it has thus far been so ineffectual. NAM intends to be transnational. Thus we address the principles of our movement to the people of the world who struggle in various situations with the intention to abolish capitalism=nation=state, for a transnational solidarity and association.

The history of movements that have aimed at the abolition of capitalism and state stretches over nearly two centuries. They have gone under the names of utopian socialism, communism, or anarchism. Reviewing this history at the end of the 20th century we have to admit that the movements have failed miserably. However, so long as capitalism and state endure—no matter what their ideologues claim to the contrary—counter-movements against them will

continue to appear and reappear. And for the movement to be young and fresh and functional, a fundamental reflection of the previous movements is a *sine qua non*.

Capital and state are two separate things in their *modus operandi*. Capital belongs to a principle of exchange, while state belongs to the principle of plunder and redistribution. Historically speaking, it was in the stage of the absolutist monarchical state that they were combined. The state necessitated the development of the capitalist economy in order to survive and strengthen itself; while the capitalist economy has had to rely on the state, because it has not been able to affect *all* productions to make them part of it, and what is more, it continues to be dependent even upon un-capitalized productions such as the reproduction of humans and nature. Thus, after the rise of industrial capitalism and bourgeois revolution of state, they two joined together and came to form an inseparable amalgamation, yet at the same time as sustaining their own autonomies.

So it is that we have to consider counter acts against capitalism and state as one and the same movement. Marxists after Engels sought to overcome capitalism by resorting to state authority (i.e., parliamentary revolution), rather than by means of violent revolution. Which does not mean, however, that this last was non-violent. Inasmuch as they were relying on state power, the revolution by violence and that by parliament were equally *violent*. They were insensitive to *and* dependent upon the *power* inherent in the state. On the other hand, utopian socialists and anarchists were sensitive *par excellence* to the power of the state, but insensitive to the power of capitalism. They held that if only the state would disappear, a society of association would form itself by the spontaneous potency of the mass. Marxism sought to counter the power of capitalism by way of state power, and consequently transformed itself into a state power. But how can we counter capital without resorting to state? Anarchists have not answered this aporia, while rebuking Marxism for its centralization of power and, in many cases, they only daydream about the coming of utopia in an aesthetic transcendence. Insofar as keeping such a stance, anarchism will continue to tacitly or paradoxically affirm capitalism.

It is certain that anarchism has been innocent and pure with respect to the ideal of socialism. But this was because it was powerless. This powerlessness cannot be ascribed to the tyranny of Marxism. There must be self-examination of its powerlessness; so much so that our

associationism derived from utopianism and anarchism, the self-examination and critique are necessary. Still, the logic of the counter act against capitalism and state can be found only by examining the conjunctures of the age when Marx and Bakunin lived, since there is no possibility in the social democracy that was established in the 19th century after their deaths.

What is dominant today, after the collapse of Marxism in the late 1980s, is the tendency bundled generally under the term of social democracy, that is, the stance to leave the capitalist market economy intact, and solve the inequality and contradictions caused by it by way of state regulation and redistribution via the parliamentary democracy. Obviously this totally lacks the idea of abolishing capitalism and state—it is simply a reiteration of what Eduard Bernstein advocated in the late 19th century. Furthermore, as clearly exemplified by World War One, being social democratic within a nation-state is not contradictory to being statist and hegemonic toward foreign countries. Today's worldwide tendency of social democracy will tread the same path if it continues to omit a self-examination of its tragic past. We cannot see a recovery in the movement to abolish capitalism and state. The popularity and permeation of social democracy prove the fact that it is the best means for the survival of capital/state amalgamation.

Meanwhile, certain states have been promoting non-profit organizations and local currencies, as well as liberalizing their educational systems. These acts appear to support the tendency toward associationism, but they do not. In the first place, states do these things only because they want to free themselves from the charges of local economy, social welfare, and education—which are becoming heavier and heavier because of the globalization of capital—by leaving them to non-governmental businesses. Therefore, the expectation that these non-capitalist organizations would expand and replace capitalism is only illusory. Neither can they weaken capitalism. They appear increasingly as the means for capitalism and state to elongate and eternalize themselves. Nonetheless, we can also employ the tendency as a means to counter capitalism and state.

In addition, there has been an increase in the reflexive movements to protect national and local economies and culture against the globalization of capitalism. They have anti-capitalist motivations, yet are different from what we consider as counter-acts. The trap in which those who

intend counter-acts against capitalism and state tend to be caught is a return to an enclosed community. Only those individuals who have once been cut off from traditional communities can form true associations. Thus counter-acts against capitalism and state must include counter-acts against traditional communities as well.

Under this light, we have to reconsider the logic of the counter-act against capitalism and state. After the occurrences of 1968, antisystemic movements (Wallerstein) of students, women, minorities, and consumers have replaced the hierarchical revolutionary movements centered on vanguard party and workers. In one aspect, these are a regeneration of anarchism (associationism), and sustain the same weakness—avoiding the centralization of power, they can only be too dispersed and fragmentary to render an effective counter-act. We consider the tasks of minorities, feminism, and environmental concerns as fatally important, but stress that they lack a recognition of the relation of production delivered by capitalism, and the relation of production between the advanced and the third world countries. The points of these antisystemic movements are already supported by the idea of bourgeois revolution, and modern states cannot negate them. That is to say that even after they are realized, the relation of production in the capitalist economy will remain intact. In actuality, these movements have achieved a certain success as they have gradually lost impact and been subsumed into social democracy. What is at stake now is still how to achieve a clear prospect about the abolition of capitalism and state, and how to combine these dispersed movements into one. This is the task of the New Associationist Movement.

B The Program

The New Associationist Movement (NAM) begins based upon a scrutiny of the historical experience of all socialist movements beginning in the 19th century. The program can be quite simply summarized in the following five articles. Inasmuch as one agrees with them, s/he can develop his/her acts dependent upon individual situations and creativities.

(1) NAM is an economic-ethical movement. In reference to Kant's term, we might say, "economic policy without ethics is blind, while ethical intervention without economic concerns is empty."

(2) NAM organizes a counter-act against capital and state. This is a transnational *worker as consumer* movement. This is practiced, figuratively speaking, *within* and *without* the capitalist economy. But, of course, it is impossible in the strict sense to stand outside the capitalist economy. The struggle *without* aims at organizing an association of non-capitalist production and consumption; the struggle *within* is centered on boycotting in the process of circulation (consumption).

(3) NAM is non-violent. It not only denies violent revolution, but also negates any use of state power by parliamentary means. This is because what NAM intends is an abolition of the capitalist currency economy—that which state power can never abolish—and also the abolition of state power itself.

(4) NAM's organization and movement themselves embody what it intends to realize. Namely, by way of introducing the lottery into the election process (I will explain this later), it prevents a bureaucratic fixation while at the same time guaranteeing a participatory democracy.

(5) NAM is a realistic movement that abolishes real contradictions; it is born out of realistically existing premises. In other words, it is a movement to overcome the social contradictions caused by the development of capitalism (that has reached the stage of information capitalism) by way of employing the social potencies produced by the same development.

C The Organization

1. If there are certain amount of participants, the group can be a unit of NAM, and call itself ** NAM. The unit is organizationally and economically an independent entity. In order to be a member/participant, however, the individual has to belong to at least three categories: (1) region

—where one lives; (2) social class according to one's occupation—student, office worker, homemaker, owner of small business, writer, etc; (3) the thematic of one's interest—as exemplified below.

Each of the categories is considered as an autonomous association, yet every member belongs to multiple categories at the same time. Multi-dimensional participation is necessary to protect the categories from being enclosed and exclusive (especially according to region and class). Many civil acts are constituted and enclosed by their own themes and targets. Certainly, it is necessary for them to be autonomous. They would lose their inherent characteristics should they add other dimensions unconditionally, or belong to other principles. Nonetheless, individuals can get out of the enclosure by belonging to other dimensions. For instance, region has to be acknowledged as a unit of life circumstance, but an individual has to get beyond it by belonging to other dimensions.

The categories of class as well as thematic interest can be, for that matter, considered as regions of a phase space, if not of a physical space. In the place of orchestrating such a slogan as “Think Globally, Act Locally,” NAM realizes it as an organizational principle. NAM began in Japan, but it intends to be a transnational movement, going beyond the borders of Japan. Even when NAM becomes a global association, the above principle will be consistent—at that time Japan will be deemed a region. Every individual belongs to a region, while s/he belongs to a global domain in terms of his/her thematic interest as well as class/occupational position. NAM is a rhizomatic association, consisting of multiple regionalities. It is different from the “International,” that had nation-state as its unit, as well as from just an international network between individuals.

The following list presents the categories of thematic interests. They can be roughly divided between the counter-movements immanent in the capitalist economy and that which is exscendent to capitalist economy. They are just examples, and can be changed according to the members' own interests.

a) Immanent Counter Acts

Environment

Labor

Consumer

Racial Minority

Sexual Minority

Welfare

Publication

Media

Feminism

b) Excendent Counter Acts

Cooperatives

LETS (Local Exchange Trading System)

Non Profit Organizations

Free Schools

Aid to The Third World

2. Each category/region has a representative and a secretariat—this not only the physical region but also the class/occupation and thematic interest. A representative of a category/region cannot hold the post of another. Among the representatives of all categories is the center—the representative council--which is, as it were, the association of associations. Within the center, again, representatives are elected. In each level, first, three candidates are elected by a secret vote (in a plural ballot system), and finally, the representative is chosen by lottery; the rest are vice representatives. The term of office is a year, but if there is a recall, it is terminated.

The central representative council holds a central secretariat. The secretary general is chosen by and among the members of the central representative council. At the same time, the

central representative council has an auditors' committee, which inspects the accounting and management of the center and reports to all members. This committee also rules the contradictions between the units and recall actions. The members of the auditors' committee are chosen among those who have experience as representatives or secretary-generals.

Aside from members, NAM has associate members. They can participate in conventions and speak as they wish, but cannot participate in decision-making, such as the election of representatives.

There are no secrets in NAM; all the issues and arguments are reported to all members. For this purpose, all members are required to have a computer or be accessible. For that matter, each unit can have an independent homepage or rather must have one.

3. Within NAM, local currency in the sense of the local exchange trading system (LETS), designed by Michael Linton in 1982, is used. For members' or associate members' labor, donation, and service, NAM pays with the currency called *nam*. This makes volunteer activities not one-sided gifts or self-sacrificial services, but subjective, open, and reciprocal exchanges. NAM is an immanently economic-ethical activity in this sense. Employing LETS is also important in order to spread this as a regional currency of thematic interest, not limited to the physical regional currency.

D Explanation of the Program

(1) NAM is an economic-ethical movement. In reference to Kant's term, we might say, "economic policy without ethics is blind, while ethical intervention without economic concerns is empty."

Socialism was ethical at its outset. This was not just to pursue economic equality. Being ethical is different from and even opposite to the morality that state and community impose. It is, as Kant stated, to be a free subject and treat others not only as means but also as free agents. This is only possible by abolishing the capitalist market economy that treats people only as means. Thus socialism appeared necessarily as an ethical intervention. Of course, the ethical motivation cannot

by itself overcome capitalism. But it is because Marxists have omitted it that we must stress it now.

In the preface of *Capital*, Marx clarified his stance as follows:

To prevent possible misunderstandings, let me say this. I do not by any means depict the capitalist and landowner in rosy colors. But individuals are dealt with here only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, the bearers [*Träger*] of particular class-relations and interests. My standpoint, from which the development of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he remains, socially speaking, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them.¹

Marx never accused capitalism or capitalists from a simple-minded moral viewpoint. His ethics existed in his decision to abolish the relational structure of capitalism; it was never in the morality that behaves as if it went beyond the relational structures subjectively. It is precisely in this decision that Marx's ethics existed. The natural historical structure—like the relation between capital and wage labor—can never be abolished if it is left alone. If not for our ethical intervention, the capitalist economy will endure permanently. Socialism is not a natural historical necessity, but an ethical intervention.

The people—or the others—who we have to take into consideration must include not only the living but also the dead as well as the unborn (the future others). If the present capitalist economy endures as it is, a global crisis will undoubtedly hit humanity. Sacrificing 'future others' for the sake of our present happiness by public consensus—is to treat the others as only means, not as free agents. Being ethical is possible only by terminating capital's unrestricted accumulation. Thus our movement is politico-economic.

¹ *Capital*, p. 92.

NAM is an association of individuals, and based upon the ethics of individuals. Or rather, ethics is an individual problem in essence. Not to mention the state, any organization—even anti-state society or class assembly—does not contain an immanent ethical nature. In their daily lives, individuals belong to various organizations—government offices, corporations, unions, civic organizations, political parties, village communities, and so on—while NAM is not another organization that stands side by side with others. To participate in NAM does not require breaking-away from others. NAM is an association of those individuals who intend to be ethical while belonging to the other existing organizations. After all, the movement of NAM associates people who are enclosed within organizations.

Furthermore, it is not correct to say that NAM begins a new movement. Within the real development of the capitalist economy, many counter movements have already arisen. The role of NAM is to become a mediator that associates various movements that are isolated or even in conflict. Which does not mean, however, that NAM rules them. For instance, suppose there is an organization all of whose members belong to NAM, but it is considered independent from NAM. Or suppose there is an organization that is unrelated to NAM yet whose practices are NAM-like, we welcome and appreciate it. What we intend is finally not an expansion of NAM, but an expansion of a NAM-like tendency.

(2) NAM organizes a counter-act against capital and state. This is a transnational worker as consumer movement. This is practiced, figuratively speaking, within and without the capitalist economy. But, of course, it is impossible to stand outside the capitalist economy. The struggle without aims at organizing an association of non-capitalist production and consumption; the struggle within is centered on the boycotting in the process of circulation (consumption).

The term “market economy” is often used in order to conceal the fact that what is going on is the act of capital. Capital is the movement M (Money)— C (Commodity)— M ,’ yet in the reverse, it consists of the exchanges $C—M$ and $M'—C$. When it is said that the market economy is efficient in terms of the adjustment of price, veiled behind it is the movement of capital. To be precise, the

capitalist market economy and market economy in general should be distinguished. The abolition of the capitalist market economy is not equal to the abolition of the market economy or money. The global network of consumers/producers cooperatives that we envision is not a return to a self-sufficient community, but a market economy open to all the free, independent producers. According to our vision, in this exchange, currency would not engender surplus value; it would be something like LETS, which does not turn into capital.

However, this is not a fantasy to be realized at the stage when we seize state power. It is to grow within and against the capitalist economy. Karl Polanyi likened capitalism (the market economy) to cancer.² Coming into existence in the interstice between agrarian communities and feudal states, capitalism invaded the internal cells and transformed their predispositions according to its own physiology. If so, NAM is a culture of anti-cancer cells, as it were. It dogs capitalism, and gradually encroaches upon it.

The drive of capitalism is that of an auto-reproduction toward its perpetuation. Capitalism is thus interminable. No matter how futile and harmful it is, it does not end. Even if our thought changes, or the state regulates it, it does not end. Capitalism is not a product of our desire, but our desire is the product of capitalism. Notwithstanding this power, however, if and only if it fails to capture surplus value, it will die out. NAM won't 'overthrow' capitalism; it will just make it die out quietly.

Marxists in general basically saw capitalism as a deceptive version of feudal domination. That is to say, they saw that it cheated surplus labor from workers. This was the idea of the Ricardian Socialists (the Chartist Movement) before Marx, but not of Marx. Marx, on the other hand, attached importance to the fact that capital's essence was in the form of merchant capital—attaining surplus value from spatial difference. Meanwhile, industrial capital attains surplus value (relative surplus value in particular) by incessantly producing new value systems *temporally*—that is, with compulsive technological innovation. This categorical division does not prevent industrial capital from attaining surplus value from the activity of merchant capital. Capital constantly travels the world over, looking for cheaper labor power. And finally, the surplus value (for industrial

² See Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.

capital) is attained as the difference in the process through which workers in sum buy back what they in sum have produced. For this reason precisely, surplus value cannot be taken into consideration within the limited realm of individual enterprises or nation-states. It should be grasped only as the total surplus value in world capitalism. Within these limited domains, what we know empirically is only profit. Surplus value is always invisible, like a thing in a black box.

The relationship between capitalist and worker is essentially different from that between master and slave. This is the relationship between those individuals who are placed in the money form (general equivalent form) and in the commodity form (relative value form). Capital exists only in the movement Money—Commodity—Money; only by the incessant metamorphosis (or transubstantiation) can it self-reproduce. In this movement, capital is definitely the one that is subjective. But at the end of the cycle, capital, too, has to stand in the position of the relative form of value (selling), and it is precisely at this moment and this moment only that workers are in the subjective position. This is the place where the commodities of capitalist production are sold—the place of *consumption*. This is the only place where workers in totality with purchasing power are in the buying position. Marx articulated this: “What precisely distinguishes capital from the master-slave relation is that the *worker* confronts him as consumer and possessor of exchange values, and that in the form of the *possessor of money*, in the form of money he becomes a simple center of circulation—one of its infinitely many centers, in which his specificity as worker is extinguished.”³ For capital, consumption is the place where surplus value is finally realized, and for this objective precisely, the only place where it is subordinated to the will of consumers/workers.

In the monetary economy, buying and selling as well as production and consumption are separated. This introduces a split in the workers’ subject: as workers (the sellers of labor-power commodity) and consumers (the buyers of capitalist commodities). In consequence, it comes to appear as if corporations and consumers were the only subjects of economic activities. It also segregates the labor and consumers’ movements. In recent history, while labor movements have

³ Marx, *Grundrisse*, Notebook IV, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, p. 420-421.

been in a deadlock, consumers' movements have flourished, often incorporating issues of environmental protection, feminism, and minorities. Generally, they take the form of *civil action*, and are not connected to, or are sometimes even antagonistic to, the labor movement. After all, though, consumers' movements are laborers' movements in *transposition*, and are important only inasmuch as they are so. Conversely, the labor movement could go beyond the bounds of its 'specificity' and become universal inasmuch as it self-consciously acts the consumers' movement. For, in fact, the process of consumption as a reproduction of labor-power commodity covers a whole range of fronts of our life-world, including child-care, education, leisure, and community activities. But what is at stake here is obviously related to, yet clearly different from, the process of reproduction in the sense of Gramsci—the cultural ideological apparatus such as family, school, church, etc. In our context, it is first and foremost the process of the reproduction of labor-power as a topos of ordeal for capital's self-realization, and hence the position in which workers can finally be the subject.

Marxists failed to grasp the class relationship between capitalist and wage-worker particular to the capitalist economy. They believed that what had been evident in the feudal system came to be veiled under the capitalist commodity economy; therefore, the workers were supposed to stand up and overthrow the capitalist system according to the dialectic of master and slave. But in reality, workers do not stand up at all, because, *Marxists believe*, the workers' consciousness is reified by the commodity economy, and *Marxists'* task, as the vanguard, is to awaken workers from the daydream. *Marxists believe* that the reification is caused by the seduction of consumerist society and/or manipulation by cultural hegemony. Thus, to begin with, what *Marxists* should and can do is to critically elucidate the mechanism. Or to say it outright, that is the only business left for *Marxists* today. What Fredric Jameson calls "the cultural turn" is a form of 'despair' inherent in the Marxist practice. But lurking in its core is a production-process-centrist hope. Then, what is the shortcoming of civil acts? In keeping a distance from labor movements, they lack a penetrating stance toward the capitalist relation of production. They tend to be absorbed into the social democracy that, approving the market economy, seeks to correct its contradictions through state regulations as well as the redistribution of wealth.

Finally, there are two ways to stop the perpetual movement of the capitalist economy. One is the struggle immanent in the capitalist economy. This is centered on boycott movements. Another struggle is to expand the non-capitalist market economy (producers/consumers cooperative and local currency). We call the latter an *exscendent* struggle. In the process M—C—M', there are two critical moments that capital has to confront: buying labor-power commodity and selling products to workers. Failure in either moment disables capital from achieving surplus value. In other words, it fails to be capital. That is to say that in these moments, workers can counter capital. The first moment is, in Antonio Negri's phrase, "Don't Work!" This really signifies, in our context, "Don't Sell Your Labor-Power Commodity!" or "Don't Work as a Wage Laborer!" The second moment says, like Mahatma Gandhi, "Don't Buy Capitalist Products!" Both of them can occur in the position in which workers can be the subject. But in order for workers/consumers to be able 'not to work' and 'not to buy', there must be a safety net whereupon they can still work and buy to live. This is the very *exscendent* struggle involving the producers/consumers cooperatives. The struggle *within* inexorably requires these cooperatives and the formation of LETS (Local Exchange Trading System). Furthermore, the *exscendent* struggle can accelerate the reorganization of the capitalist corporation into cooperative entity. NAM intends to organize the interaction between the one *immanent in* and *the one exscendent to* the capitalist mode of production/consumption.

To repeat, it has been widely believed among Marxists that the struggle against capitalism should be centered on the seizure of power by workers by means of strikes. In contradistinction to this, we stress the importance of the struggle of workers as consumers; and this is not because of the fact that the labor movement has historically declined. This is because of the nature of the way surplus value is exploited by capital—within a vast domain of circulation that is like a black box. If so, the struggle against capitalism should be done within the black box. This principle is pertinent not only to the present/future, but also to the past.

In the late 19th century, when the parliamentarianism of Bernstein and Kautsky was on the rise, Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin denied it and proposed a strategy centered on workers' general strike and political uprising. Neither of them could even prevent the imperialist war. The

truth is that if workers had had the power to prevent the war of state, it could have been much more advanced and powerful as a social revolution than the political revolution (the Russian Revolution) that actually occurred, thanks to the turmoil of defeat. And if I can continue the subjunctive mode further: what if the workers of the time had conducted the movement that I propose—boycotting capitalist products while working and living normally—in the place of the strikes that jeopardized their lives? What if the *general boycott* had been done worldwide under the leadership of the Second International. I believe that the capitals and states could not have countered it. Summarizing the Marxist movement since the 19th century, we can conclude that its main mistake was due to its ignorance of the relation between the capitalist economy and the state. Only by acknowledging this experience, can the new associationist movement begin.

Gramsci spoke of revolutionary movements using figures of military tactics: the war of maneuver (frontal attack) and the war of position. The war of maneuver signifies a confrontational and direct fight with the state government, while the war of position indicates a struggle within and against the hegemonic apparatuses of civil society, residing behind the state governmental apparatus. In this context, he clearly stated that what had worked in the Russian Revolution would not work for Western civil societies. “In Russia, the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West, there was a proper relation between State and civil society, and when the State trembled a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed. The State was only an outer ditch, behind which there stood a powerful system of fortresses and earthworks . . .”⁴ This stress of the war of position in civil society residing behind the state offers the basis for those who focus on the critique of culture today. Yet Gramsci's war of position cannot simply mean the struggle over the cultural hegemony. It shows in the passage of Gramsci vis-à-vis Gandhi. “Gandhi's passive resistance is a war of position, which at certain moments becomes a war of movement, and at others underground warfare. Boycotts are a form of war of position,

⁴ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, International Publishers, New York, 1971, P. 283.

strikes of war of movement, the secret preparation of weapons and combat troops belongs to underground warfare.”⁵ He evidently sought the crux of the war of position in boycott movement.

(3) NAM is non-violent. It not only denies violent revolution, but also negates any use of state power by parliamentary means. This is because what NAM intends is an abolition of capitalist currency economy—that which state power can never abolish—and also the abolition of state power itself.

Marxists held that the economic domain was a base structure, while state and nation were super structure. Furthermore, they restated that the super structure nevertheless was relatively autonomous to, though determined by, the economic base. First of all, the very notion that the capitalist economy is base or infrastructure is itself questionable. The world organized by money and credit is rather one of illusion, with a peculiarly religious nature. Saying this from the opposite view, even though state and nation are composed by communal illusion, precisely like capitalism, they inevitably exist thanks to their realistic grounds. So it is that we cannot dissolve them by saying that they are illusory.

In the *Outline of the Critique of Political Economy (Grundrisse)* are the expressions: base and superstructure. Yet Marx never emphasized them as a formulation. These concepts are not so crucial as compared with those in *Capital*. Furthermore, historical materialism was the stance that Engels developed before Marx; but, because Engels said, otherwise, that Marx formulated it first after Marx’s death, it came to be believed that Marx coined it. If historical materialism were equal to Marxism, it could have always existed without Marx. Meanwhile, a work such as *Capital* could not have existed without Marx. Historical materialism seeks to understand the history that culminates in the capitalist economy from the vantage point of capitalism, retrospectively. Marx expresses this, as ‘the anatomy of human is useful for the anatomy of apes’. That is to say, capitalist society makes it possible for us to see the previous societies from the economic viewpoint, but it is impossible to understand capitalist society the other way around.

⁵ *ibid.*, pp 229-230.

In the place of base and superstructure scheme, we should think that capital, state, and nation are based upon different principles of exchange. The view to see them separately is lost because in the bourgeois modern state they form a perfect trinity. Let us separate them into three different categories.

The Marx of *Capital* stresses that commerce began in-between communities. “The exchange of commodities begins where communities have their boundaries, at their points of contact with other communities, or with members of the latter. However, as soon as products have become commodities in the external relations of a community, they also, by reaction, become commodities in the internal life of the community.”⁶ The commodity exchange is a peculiar form of exchange among other exchanges. And nation and state are those very two other preceding types of exchange. First, there is exchange within a community—reciprocity of gift and return. Though based upon mutual aid, it also imposes community’s code—if one does not return, s/he will be ostracized—and exclusivity. Second, the original exchange between communities is plunder. And rather it is this plunder that is the basis for other exchanges: Other exchanges begin only at the point where mutual plunder is given up. In this sense, plunder is deemed a type of exchange. For instance, in order to plunder continuously, it is necessary to protect the victims from other plunderers, and even nurture economic-industrial growth. This is the prototype of the state. In order to keep on robbing, and robbing more and more, the state guarantees the protection of land and the reproduction of labor-power by redistribution. It also promotes agricultural production by public undertakings such as regulating water distribution through public water works. It follows that the state does not appear to be abetting a system of robbery: farmers think of paying tax as a return (duty) for the protection of the lord; merchants pay tax as a return for the protection of their exchange and commerce. Finally, the state is represented as a supra-class entity of reason.

The third form is what Marx calls the commodity exchange between communities. This exchange occurs only where there is a mutual consent; and it is where state and legal system already exist. As I said elsewhere, this exchange engenders surplus value or capital. The surplus

⁶ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 182.

value (for both merchant capital and industrial capital) is earned by exploitation; it is similar to, yet different from the plunder by feudal state. The exchange (commerce) is rendered ostensibly by an equal exchange (between spatially as well as temporally differentiated systems), but definitely results in an unequal exchange and the unequal creation of wealth.

Aside from these three, there is the fourth exchange, what we call association or LETS. It is based upon different principles. This engenders exchanges that are not exploitative like those of the nation-state, and reciprocity that is spontaneous and inclusive unlike that of the agrarian community.

a plunder and redistribution	b reciprocity of gift and return
c exchange by money	d association

a feudal state	b agrarian community
c city	d association

a state	b nation
c capital (market economy)	d association

a equality	b fraternity
c liberty	d association

In his famous book, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson said that the nation-state is a marriage between nation and state that are originally different in kind. This was certainly an important suggestion. Yet it should not be forgotten that there was previously another marriage between two entities which were totally heterogeneous—that between state and capital. In the feudal ages, state, capital, and nation were clearly separated. They existed distinctively as feudal states (lords, kings, and emperors), cities, and agrarian communities, all based upon different principles of exchange. States were based upon the principles of plunder and redistribution. The agrarian communities that were mutually disconnected and isolated were dominated by states; but, within themselves, they were autonomous, based upon the principles of mutual aid and reciprocal exchange. Between these communities, markets or cities grew; these were based upon monetary exchange relying on mutual consent. What crumbled the feudal system was the permeation of the capitalist market economy. On the one hand, this engendered absolutist monarchical states that conspired with the merchant class, monopolized the means of violence by toppling feudal lords (aristocracy), and finally abolished feudal domination (extra-economic domination) entirely. This was the story of the wedding between state and capital.

Feudal ground rent became national tax, while bureaucracy and standing army became state apparatuses. Those who had belonged to certain tribes, in certain clans, now became subjects under the absolutist monarchy, grounding what would later be national identity. Protected by the absolutist state, merchant capital (bourgeoisie) grew up and nurtured the identity of the nation for the sake of creating a unified market. Yet this was not all in terms of the formation of the nation. Agrarian communities that were decomposed along with the permeation of market economy and by the urbanized culture of enlightenment always existed on the foundation of the nation. While individual agrarian communities that had been autarkic and autonomous were decomposed by the osmosis of money, their communalities—mutual aid and reciprocity—themselves were recovered *imaginarily* within the nation.

Anderson points out that the nation plays proxy for religion, after it has declined. In this situation, what is important is the fact that religion has existed *as and in* the agrarian community. The decline of religion is equal to the decline of community. In contradistinction from what Hegel

called the state of understanding (lacking spirit), or the Hobbesian state, the nation is grounded upon the empathy of mutual aid descending from agrarian communities. And this emotion is awoken by nationalism: belonging to the same nation and helping each other—the emotion of fraternity. This is the so-called marriage between state and nation.

It was amidst the bourgeois revolution that these three were *officially* married. As in the trinity intoned in the French Revolution—liberty, equality, and fraternity—capital, state, and nation copulated and amalgamated themselves into a force as inseparable ever after. Hence the modern state must be called, *sensu stricto*, the capitalist-nation-state. They were made to be mutually complementary, reinforcing each other. When economic liberty becomes excessive and class conflict is sharpened, the state intervenes to redistribute wealth and regulate the economy, and at the same time, the emotion of national unity (mutual aid) fills up the cracks. When facing this fearless trinity, undermining one or the other does not work. If one attempts to overthrow capitalism alone, one has to adapt statism, or one is engulfed by nationalist empathy. It goes without saying that the former appeared as Stalinism and the latter as fascism.

Among the three principles of exchange, in the modern period, commodity exchange (the **c** type) expanded and overpowered the others. Inasmuch as it operated within the trinity, however, it is impossible that the capitalist commodity exchange could monopolize the whole of human relation. With respect to the reproduction of humans and nature, capital has no choice but to rely on the family and agrarian community; in this sense capital is essentially dependent upon the pre-capitalist mode of production. Herein exists the ground of the nation. On the other hand, while absolutist monarchs disappeared at the hand of bourgeois revolutions, the state itself has remained. The state can never be dissolved and subsumed into the representatives of national sovereignty (=government). For the state, no matter what kind, always exists as the bare sovereign vis-à-vis other states (if not always to its nation); in crises (wars), a powerful leader (the subject of determination) is always called for, as evidenced in Bonapartism and fascism.

We frequently hear today that the nation-state will be gradually decomposed by the globalization of capitalism. This is impossible. When individual national economies are threatened by the global market (neo-liberalism), they demand the protection (redistribution) of the state

and/or bloc economy, at the same time as appealing to national cultural identity. So it is that any counter-act to capital must also be one targeted against the state and nation (community). The capitalist-nation-state is fearless because of its trinity. The denial of one ends up being reabsorbed in the ring of the trinity by the power of the other two. This is because each of them, though appearing to be illusory, is based upon different principle of exchange. It is not erased by any enlightened critique; unless it is replaced by the exchange of association, it will endure.

As I have showed, Gramsci stated that in Russia, the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West, there was a proper relation between State and civil society; thus he suggested that the war of position should replace the war of maneuver (frontal attack). Whether there was a proper relation between State and civil society, that is, whether there was a mature civil society should be restated, in our context, as whether there was a proper copulation/amalgamation between capital/nation/state.

In Italy, fascists smashed the Leninist struggle that was led by Gramsci and centered on the occupation of factories. Its weakness was due to its reliance on nationalism. Meanwhile, in Russia, where the wedding of capital/state/nation had not been completed, wars were fought on behalf of the Tsar himself and not for the nation; therefore, the socialist revolution had been able to, or had to, resort to nationalism. Since then, many socialist revolutions have borne national independence movements; in those regions where state apparatuses and capitals conspired with colonialist powers, it was the socialists who informed and realized nationalism. The success of the revolutions unfortunately does not teach us anything further concerning the struggle where the capital/nation/state trinity is well established.

Bourgeois revolution—*qua* the formation of a democratic nation-state—has always been violent, for this was the deed of robbing the state power of absolutist monarchy. This revolution is still going on world over, especially in developing countries, under various names and by various agents. And it is unfair for the people of advanced nations to condemn the violence. But the revolution after the bourgeois revolution, namely the revolution to abolish capitalism and nation-state, cannot be anything like the bourgeois revolution—seizing state power and transforming the society. So it is that we call NAM not a revolution, but a counter-act.

Marx thought that the socialist revolution would be possible only in the most advanced country, England, because socialism was supposed to be possible only in the stage where bourgeois society was fully ripe, ripe enough to decompose. Nonetheless, in reality it could not have seemed less likely to him that it would occur. In the particular situation where universal suffrage was installed and labor unions strengthened, revolution seemed like it had receded even farther into the distance. What receded, however, was the revolution that was imagined from the vantage point of and as an extension of bourgeois revolution; the fact was that from that juncture on, a different kind of revolution came to be called for. One should not forget that it was under such circumstances that Marx came to grips with the task of writing *Capital*. His recognition that a criticism of capitalism would no longer suffice made him write such a monumental piece. And in this respect, too, Gramsci's shift from the war of maneuver to the war of position is suggestive. According to his analysis, the shift had already begun in the late 19th century. "The problem of the political struggle's transition from a 'war of maneuver' to a 'war of position' certainly needs to be considered at this juncture. In Europe this transition took place after 1848, and was not understood by Mazzini and his followers, as it was on the contrary by certain others: the same transition took place after 1871, etc."⁷ The political struggle's transition from a "war of maneuver" to a "war of position" was conspicuous, more than anywhere, in Britain at the point in time when the Chartist Movement by the Ricardian Socialists ran out. Thus *Capital* must be read as that which provides the logic of the war of position.

How, then, is a true socialist revolution possible in a highly bourgeois society? Marx did not answer this question directly. Yet it is certain that he had already confronted the same question in *Capital*. After Marx's death, the remarkable advance of the German Social Democratic Party encouraged Engels, who then came to think that a revolution was possible by parliamentarianism. This is an extension or a version of bourgeois revolution (violent revolution). Whether it is relying on parliamentarianism or armed force, the use of state power is itself violent. For the state power is grounded upon a monopolization of violence. According to Max Weber, the state is equal to a human community that demands an actual monopolization of the means of

⁷ Gramsci, *ibid.*, p. 110.

executing physical violence within a limited domain. Whether by compulsion or agreement, the execution of might is violent through and through. Therefore, all those who are involved in politics are flirting with the demonic power lurking in violence, it might be said.⁸ In this sense of Weber, social democracy is in the least non-violent, albeit less violent. Social democracy seizes state power by resorting to the majority vote in the parliamentary system, and seeks to redistribute the wealth extorted from capital (as tax) to workers. If so, (as seen from the stance of the radical libertarian Hayek), the difference between Bernstein and Lenin is not as large as it seems. Both of them resort to state power, that is, violence. One is a soft statism, while the other hard statism. From our vantage point, neither seeks the abolition of the labor-power commodity, namely, wage labor.

A disciple of Engels', Eduard Bernstein, totally removed the residue of revolutionary fervor that Engels had harbored. Then, of course, Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg attacked this tendency. Denying the observation that the socialist revolution was possible only in bourgeois society where the capitalist economy was fully developed, they insisted that a jump over the stages was not only possible but also necessary.

This problem should be expressed, however, less as that revolution was possible only in advanced nations than as that in the advanced nations, classical revolution—which inherited the form of bourgeois revolution—had become obsolete. Thus a new idea was required. It was that the revisions of Engels et al were the responses to this situation. In the nations where capitalism was not fully developed, revolutions tended to follow the path of bourgeois revolution. Many of the socialist revolutions of the 20th century sought to establish the modern nation-state itself by way of national liberation or independence; they succeeded because of this objective. Therefore, the problem ever since has been to discern if a jump is really possible.

It was Trotsky who pioneered a keen understanding of the problem. After the Russian Revolution of 1905, he came to think that a jump would be possible since the bourgeois civil

⁸ Max Weber, *Politik als Beruf*, Berlin, Dunker & Humbolt, 1968, p.8. "Heute dagegen werden wir sagen müssen: Staat ist diejenige menschliche Gemeinschaft, welche innerhalb eines bsetimmten Gebietes--dies: das 'Gebiet', gehört zum Merkmal--das Monopol legitimer physischer Gewaltsamkeit für sich (mit Erfolg) beansprucht."

society in Russia was only poorly developed, and the main target was the state power. Yet he also confronted the impossibility of the jump. For the government led by the proletariat class had to itself render the primitive accumulation (namely, the robbing of farmers)—that which capital had previously done—and an absolutist dictatorship was required to do this. He had a conviction in his theory that the aporia could be solved by the permanent revolution. And the real situations subsequently proved his prophecies in both aspects.

Leftists in the advanced nation-states praised, envied, and even mimicked the heroic violence typical of the revolutions in underdeveloped countries, while ignoring the aporia inherent in their own circumstances. They cherished the revolutions of backward nations from the vantage point that they could corner the capitals of advanced nations by blockading markets. In consequence, however, the blockades only cornered the economies of socialist nation-states, and had no power over the development of world capitalism. Furthermore, in the late 1980s, the bourgeois revolution—that which had supposedly been jumped over—finally hit the socialist bloc. After a detour of one full century, the leftists have now returned to the position of Bernstein, of a social democracy; and this has totally lost the objective of abolishing capital and state. Not only has it not been able to prevent the imperialist war, but it has also been involved in the frenzy itself. And it is quite possible that it will repeat the same faux pas in the future. Yet, as all of us know well by now, Leninism cannot replace it. Is there an alternative? I would posit that it is found in *Capital*, the book Marx wrote as he deliberately remained in England where the possibility of revolution was fading away. As I have explained, capital, nation, and state and their trinity are rooted in the necessary forms that human exchange could assume, and therefore, it is nearly impossible to get out of the ring. Marx in *Capital*, however, discovered an exit, the fourth type of exchange—association.

In *The German Ideology*, Marx made an addition to the text written by Engels:

“Communism for us is not a *state of affairs* which is to be established, an *ideal* to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the *real* movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the now existing premise.”⁹ Since that

⁹ Marx and Engels, “The German Ideology,” included in *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p.49.

time, Marx persisted in this stance. In the twenty years after, he discovered the possibility of communism in several “movement[s] which abolish the present state of things”—the cooperatives of producers/consumers. He, for instance, saw stock companies as “the abolition of capital as private property within the confines of the capitalist mode of production itself.”¹⁰ This is because stock companies abolished the previous integrity of capitalists by the separation of capital and management. Yet this is only a passive abolition of the capitalist system. Marx discovered the positive abolition in the producers’ cooperative of which stockholders are workers themselves. In this context, Marx spoke of a new phase of “individual property” as opposed to “private property.”

The capitalist mode of appropriation, which springs from the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labor of its proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a natural process, its own negation. This is the negation of negation. It does not re-establish private property, but it does indeed establish individual property on the basis of the achievements of the capitalist era: namely, co-operation and the possession in common of the land and the means of production produced by labor itself.¹¹

What does this distinction between “private property” and “individual property” mean? Precisely because modern private-ownership was that which was awarded by the absolutist state in exchange for paying taxes, private-ownership is equal to state-ownership. So it is a total fallacy to abolish private property by means of state-ownership. The abolition of private property must be an abolition of the state itself. To Marx, communism came to signify the establishment of a new kind of *individual property*, and this was because he considered communism as being equal to an association of producers’ cooperatives. This is where wage labor (labor-power commodity) is done away with. This notwithstanding, however, producers’ cooperative and/or consumers’

¹⁰ *Capital*, Vol. 3, p. 567.

¹¹ *Capital*, Vol 1, p. 929.

cooperatives have been belittled by those Marxists who believed in communism as being equal to the state owned planned economy. The cooperative movements were originally conceptualized by utopian socialists such as Robert Owen. They actually began to grow in Britain in the 1850s, after innumerable setbacks. Far from denying the cooperative movement, Marx in fact saw communism in it—*the association of free and equal producers*.

In *The Civil War in France* --written as an address to the general council of the international working men's association--Marx wrote: "if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of Capitalist production--what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, 'possible' Communism?"¹² In this sense, communism is a project in attempt to shift the social relation that is realized by the monetary exchange in the capitalist economy into *the association of free and equal producers*, and furthermore, into a global association of associations.

This endeavor is *moral* in essence. In Kant's terms, it demands, "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means."¹³ If not for this commitment, we will achieve only communalism or collectivism instead of communism. The first step of the communist revolution is supposed to be realized by the proletariat's seizure of power, state ownership of private property, and state control of whole production. Certainly this process would "put an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of Capitalist production," but it is far from "the association of free and equal producers."

What is crucial here, however, is not merely the fact that Marx saw a possibility of associationism, but that, at the same time, he was aware of its limits and difficulties. Thus his ambiguous stance toward it. In consequence, Marxists in general came to be watchful about consumers'/producers' cooperative movements. The limit of the cooperative movements lies in

¹² "The Civil War in France, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 335.

the fact that they are constantly placed in severe competition with capital. Their options would either remain partially in the area of production where the capitalist mode is hardly developed, become a stock company itself, or be defeated in the competition and go bankrupt. So it is that Marx believed that it was imperative to transfer power from the state to producers themselves. Then, concerning this idea, Bakunin attacked Marx along with Lassallians. "That was Lassalle's program, and it is also the program of the Social-Democratic Party. Strictly speaking, it belongs not to Lassalle but to Marx, who expressed it fully in the famous *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which he and Engels published in 1848 . . . Is it not clear that Lassalle's program is in no way different from that of Marx, whom he acknowledged as his teacher?"¹⁴ It must have been a gross misunderstanding, if not outright slander; Bakunin ignores the deployment of Marx's thought during the 60s and 70s.

Marx was critical of the idea (i.e., of Lassallian Gotha Programme) to have the state protect and foster cooperative production. Marx was clear: "That the workers desire to establish the conditions for co-operative production on a social scale, and first of all on a national scale, in their own country, only means that they are working to transform the present conditions of production, and it has nothing in common with the foundation of co-operative societies with state aid. But as far as the present co-operative societies are concerned, they are of value *only* insofar as they are the independent creations of the workers and not protégés either of the government or of the bourgeois."¹⁵ In other words, Marx is stressing that the association of cooperatives itself must take over the leadership from the state, in the place of state-led-cooperative movements. Whereby capital and state would wither away. And this kind of proposition of principle aside, Marx never said anything in particular about future prospects.

¹³ Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated and edited by Mary Gregor, with an introduction by Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge University Press, 1997, 4:429, p.38

¹⁴ Micheal Bakunin, *Statism and Anarchy*, translated and edited by Marshall S. Shatz, Cambridge University Press, 1990, P. 176.

¹⁵ "Critique of the Gotha Programme," included in *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 93-94.

The controversial thinker Carl Schmitt made an insightful comment on the death of the state vis-à-vis consumers'/producers' cooperative. He stressed the autonomous dimension of state and politics, and his idea that the League of Nations idea could never decompose states; it would only result in hegemony of a strong state or a group of states. "Were a world state to embrace the entire globe and humanity, then it would be no political entity and could only be loosely called a state. If in fact, all humanity and the entire world were to become a unified entity based exclusively on economics and on technically regulating traffic . . . [s]hould that interest group also want to become cultural, ideological, or otherwise more ambitious, and yet remain strictly nonpolitical, then it would be a neutral consumer or producer co-operative moving between the poles of ethics and economics. It would know neither state nor kingdom nor empire, neither republic nor monarchy, neither aristocracy nor democracy, neither protection nor obedience, and would lose its political character."¹⁶ In other words, Schmitt also implies that if it were possible to abolish state (politics), it would only be possible with consumers'/producers' cooperatives. In this situation, though the state remains, it will no longer be a political one. In addition, we might say, though the market economy remains, it will no longer be that which we know as a capitalist market economy. It is not that, as is commonly thought, the abolition of the capitalist market economy is equal to the abolition of the market economy or money in general. For the global network of consumers'/producers' cooperatives is not a return to an enclosed community, but an open market economy.

(4) NAM's organization and movement themselves embody what it intends to realize. Namely, by way of introducing the lottery into the election process, a bureaucratic fixation is prevented while a participatory democracy is guaranteed.

Concerning the concept of 'dictatorship of the proletariat', today's Marxists seem to be uncertain, being silent as they are. In the late 19th century when the German Social Democratic party (SPD)

¹⁶ Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, translated by George Schwab, The University of Chicago Press, 1996, p. 57.

gained power in Parliament, Engels gave up on the idea of the realization of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Later Lenin revived it as a strategic goal, and his communism resulted in the dictatorship of a party, the dictatorship of a bureaucratic system. As a result, parliamentarianism again seems to offer hope. We have to reconsider this back and forth. In principle, the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is a counter concept to 'dictatorship of the bourgeoisie'. The latter signifies a representative (parliamentary) democracy: the democratic parliament that was historically constituted by overthrowing the absolutist monarchy, was equal to a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. If so, the dictatorship of the proletariat in Marx's sense cannot be any retrogression to before the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, such as the feudal system or an absolutist domination.

Marx himself saw a concrete image of a proletariat's dictatorship in the Paris Commune, which was an endeavor of anarchists (Proudhonists), and not of Marxists. But Marx appreciated it with a solid ground—as a corollary of his early theory of state (in his *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* in particular). What he grasped as crucial therein were a distinction between civil society and the governmental state in the modern state, and a separation between private individual and public man. That is to say, individuals are equal as public men, while as private individuals they belong to the class system of the capitalist relation of production. What is more, the right that individuals can have as public men is only a kind of legislative power, namely, the right to vote; and they cannot have any administrative power. The substance of the sovereignty of people is that they only can vote. If we think about it, it is surprising that even in democratic nations, there is no democracy in working circumstances such as corporations as well as government offices. In a sharp contrast, the Paris Commune was both a legislative organ and an administrative organ. It had a system that not only elected but also removed judicial officers as well as administrative bureaucrats. In this sense, it was a double abolition of civil society and governmental state in the context of modern nation-state.

The real difficulty, however, was in maintaining such a system. One idea was to make both election and recall by secret ballot. But it was finally impossible to prevent bureaucratization, namely, the entrenchment of representatives, entirely by this means. As Max Weber said in his

Politik als Beruf (1919), the bureaucratic system is inevitable *and* necessary in those societies where the division of labor is developed; and it cannot be discarded simple-mindedly. According to Marx, in communist society the division of labor is supposed to disappear; but in the transitional period preceding it, the bureaucratic system as a division of labor is indispensable. For instance, the Soviets in the Russian Revolution were similar to the Paris Commune, a huge social experimentation. It eventually came to be dominated by one party (the Bolsheviks) and the bureaucratic system. Why? It will not suffice to point out the failure and betrayal of the Bolshevik leaders. The Paris Commune lasted only two months; it was crushed by government troops supported by the Prussian army. But even if it had lasted longer, it would have resulted in a similar system as Soviet Russia.

The evil of the bureaucratic system lies in its centralization of power. The only way it can be avoided, I believe, is to introduce a pure contingency (i.e., a lottery) into the electoral system. In the concrete, it is to introduce a lottery at the end of the process, in its most crucial and determinant phase, after several candidates have already been chosen by normal voting. The idea is to introduce contingency into the topos where power is always concentrated; entrenchment of power in administrative positions can be avoided by a sudden attack of contingency. If universal suffrage by secret ballot, namely, parliamentary democracy, is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the introduction of a lottery might help to lead it further toward the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In passing, it is believed that the modern representative parliament is a derivative of Athenian direct democracy, and that a direct democracy is possible only in a small community like Athens, certainly not in contemporary nation-states where only a representative system can work. Finally, however, whether direct or indirect cannot be measured in this manner. Greek democracy and modern representative democracy are essentially different. Modern representative parliament began as an assembly of the representatives of different classes; then it was expanded with limited voting, and eventually developed into the universal suffrage, along with the expansion of the bourgeois revolution. Montesquieu said: “. . . the suffrage by lot is natural to democracy, as that by choice is to aristocracy.”¹⁷ That is to say, the parliamentary system is not inherent in

¹⁷ Montesquieu, *Spirit of Law*, translated by T. Nugent, New York: Hafner, 1966

democracy, but in monarchies and the aristocracy. On the other hand, the essence of Athenian democracy existed in the lottery system it employed to choose administrators, and not in the parliamentary system. In the Athenian assembly, secret voting was invented as a means of removing leaders who tended to be dictators. Even in direct democracies, the appearance of dictators could not be totally prevented. The secret vote, rare as it might have been, was actually used at critical junctures. It is said that the crux of modern bourgeois democracy exists in the secret ballot in choosing representatives and the rule of changing regimes by way of this method. But if, as Grecophiles say, the technical origin of the bourgeoisie's dictatorship is Athenian democracy, we could maintain that the technical origin of the proletariat's dictatorship that goes beyond it is traced back also to the Greek political invention—the lottery.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that not everything can be determined by lottery. Even in Athens, lottery was not used everywhere (i.e., in military). And it is significant that today the lottery is commonly used only in choosing unpopular posts. Considering these examples, what is preferable to us would be to choose the most crucial post by lottery: i.e., first choosing three candidates by secret vote (three in one choice) and then finally electing one by lottery. Because the last and most crucial stage is determined by contingency, factional disputes or conflicts over successors would not make sense. As a result, a relatively superior, if not the best, representative would take up the post. Furthermore, the one who is chosen could not parade his/her superiority and power, while those who are not chosen have no reason to refuse collaboration. This kind of political technique would be functional and would go beyond the cliché, “all the power will fall.”

We should not assume that the human nature of willing to power will ever disappear; that the difference of individual abilities will ever disappear. We rather think that these natures cause evil solely because of the institutions or the lack of our understanding in them. The evils of power could be avoided by introducing a contingency (by way of lottery) in the magnetic power center. This is not in the least what is to be realized in the future; it can be fully realized at present in various institutions (corporations and government offices). Many people are troubled by bureaucratic monopolization and fixation, even more than the issues of wage and labor time. This has not been solved even by the union's participation in management. In the former socialist

Yugoslavia, where the self-management of workers was realized, bureaucratization could not be avoided. Meanwhile, even within capitalist corporations as they are, if and only if management is executed by means of suffrage and lottery, can we consider it as a full self-management of workers. This has not been possible, because of the majority domination of stockholders. In contradistinction, in producers' cooperatives, the right of decision making vis-à-vis management is equal among every member, regardless to the amount of stock they hold; and still the monopolization of power will be inevitable if not for the lottery system.

Organization for the counter-act against state and capitalism must introduce within itself the device of introducing contingency in the magnetic power center. If not, it will be like the one it intends to counter. Yet, on the other hand, various civil acts that have begun to negate power-centralist hierarchical organization remain scattered and are yet to be gathered for a collective intervention for the counter-act.

If and only if we introduce the political technique above we will not have to fear centralization. NAM not only has to aim at the realization of participatory democracy, but also has to embody it within its own organization. Therefore, as its organizational principle, NAM adapts the two systems: lottery in the election of representatives and individuals' multiple belongings.

(5) NAM is a realistic movement that abolishes real contradictions; it is born out of realistically existing premises. In other words, it is a movement to overcome the social contradictions caused by the development of capitalism (that has reached the stage of information capitalism) by way of employing the social potencies produced by the same development. Therefore, it needs to scrutinize historical experience as well as challenge the unknown

The capitalist economy is customarily subdivided along historical stages: mercantilism, liberalism, imperialism, and late capitalism. To understand this view in the concrete context, see it from the vantage point of the shift of world commodity. The world commodity in the age of mercantilism was woolen-products, and in the age of liberalism it was cotton products. The capitalist products that supported Great Britain, the empire that had gained supremacy over the world up until the

earlier half of the 19th century, were nothing other than textile industries, which did not require mammoth capital. Later British capitalism declined in the process of introducing heavy industries, in competition with state-supported German heavy industries. (The producers' cooperatives that the Marx of *Capital* considered as a good rival of stock companies, quickly declined also because of the German mammoth state capitalism.) That is to say, in the stage where textile industries were dominant, producers' cooperatives could rival stock companies to a large extent. Later, Engels as well as the German Social Democratic Party rather welcomed the effect of capital becoming mammoth from the vantage point of socializing (having the state own) it—they thought that was socialism. They thus came to belittle the cooperative movement.

The transition to the stage of heavy industry caused chronic depression and unemployment. This fostered imperialism, which fully blossomed in World War One. World War Two occurred as an extension, while, at the same time, a new phenomenon intervened—it was, whether fascism or New Deal, what can be considered as a Keynesian intervention of state into the economic process. In terms of the world commodity, it was the shift to durable goods (cars, electrical products, etc). Since then, the age of mass production/mass consumption (Fordism) has continued, reaching a saturation point in the 1980s. After that, capitalism has tended to achieve surplus value by a compression (digitalization) of communication in the process of circulation, rather than the development in the production process. Thus, the world commodity has been information. The digitalization is delivering radical transformations in the relation of production and industrial composition. It is especially in the domain of guild-like merchant capitals that aims at intermediary exploitation (agencies, wholesale dealers, distributors) where the previous relations of production are being decomposed. Replacing them are the systems where producers and consumers exchange directly. This change will inevitably invite a large amount of unemployment and reorganization of labor.

The transition that we have been observing beginning in the 1990s rivals, both in its radicality and amount, the transition in the 1870s, epitomized by the chronic depression after the world crisis in 1873, the exploration of capital, the shift to imperialism. At the same time, however, the present transition is also deconstructing the contemporary forms of capitalism—i.e., the state

capitalism à la Prussia and corporatism that were formed in the period of the former transition. In this deconstructive sense, the situation called neo-liberalism corresponds to the stage of liberalism under the economic-militaristic domination of Great Britain. While in the 1870s, heavy industries=mammoth capitals came into existence, the present transition to information capitalism is marked by the decomposition of large corporations (aside from transnational corporations) relying on states' corporatism, and the rise of mid-to-small corporations (of venture capital). NAM intends to intervene in this precise tendency to reorganize the mid-to-small corporations by way of (non-capitalist) cooperatives and LETS. In this sense, the present situation is becoming similar to the age when Marx paid attention to the producers' cooperative in Britain.

We are not optimistic about the situation created by the expansion of world capitalism, neither are we pessimistic about it. The osmosis of the capitalist economy is at the same time creating the conditions that abolish it. This dialectic is exemplified by the coming of the Internet. This thing, that was created as a military defense system and used by capitals, is now a necessary means for counter-movements to capitalism and state. The same is true of e-money—an arm for capital and a means to expand LETS globally. NAM could not exist if not for cyberspace. The counter-act against capitalism has nothing to do with romantic nostalgia; it exists amidst the world intercourse engendered by the world capitalism.