

Free Leonard Peltier Silkscreen

by Milwaukee Silkscreen Collective, circa 1977



"It is time we all faced the truth of the hardships ahead of us. It is time to investigate the one form of genocide which threatens us all. It is the environmental and human destruction that American industrial greed is bring not only to Indian Nations, but to the other nations of the world."

-Leonard Peltier

Statement 2024

by Milwaukee Silkscreen Collective

In 1977 we formed a silk screen collective in Milwaukee, WI, that produced art ending in late 1978 or early 1979. Posters created in France during the May-June 1968 strikes influenced our thinking and planning. Silk screening is a very basic production method—easily reproducible and inexpensive. We wanted to create art that was accessible, inspirational and free—that is “Art for the People.” We designed and made posters of varying degrees of quality—improving over time—but all clear, visible, and uncompromising. Press runs were around 100 posters per design. We wheat-pasted the posters across the city late at night —hoping to fulfill the “agitate” part of agitate, educate and organize. The skilled amongst us built the frames, screens, and drying racks. Paper was the largest expense, and we used a creatively obtained roll of newsprint for the posters. We worked at various houses where one or the other of us lived if there was space and roommates didn’t object. In 1979 or 1980 a donation of the Collective’s posters was made to the

Taminent Library & Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives at NYU, New York City. The world of justice, peace, freedom and equality we hoped to see in our lifetimes remains to be won. And there will always be a place for art in that struggle.

Land Back Reflections

by Chelsea Archambeau

I recommend we give every Indigenous creature what I am provided through disability compensation which is a minimum \$3,737 that also gets a cost-of-living adjustment each year tied to inflation. According to The Administration for Children and Families this number is 5.2 million or 2% of the total U.S. population.

This will be a big scary number:
\$3,737 * 5,200,000 = \$19,432,400,000, also known as \$19.4 billion dollars to barely scratch the surface of unrepairable theft of land. Per month.

This is also a scary number:
Multiply \$19.4 billion by 12 months out of the year and you get \$233,188,800,000.

Which I think is now \$233 billion U.S. Dollars for Indigenous reparations a year. It isn’t even the full value of Land Back, I think Russia’s lawsuit with Google would rival the quantity of land theft. For a shock-in-the-bucket the Department of Defense budget is a hunky \$841.4 billion. This is a mere 27% of the D.O.D. budget to do more than the right thing. It was \$301 billion dollars to fix broken and mend broken veterans from service in 2023. If we scraped the cream of the crop away from the Department of Defense, we would have \$307 billion left to still pay for troops and their retirement plans. Oh, and we would still have \$123 billion left to play with after all that’s accounted for so let’s throw in the G.I. Bill and health care in too for them all.

The incalculable loss of theft from Indigenous cultures is hard to emotionally digest. When I was watching “Exterminate All the Brutes” a documentary released in 2021 about how European invaders systematically destroyed culture, after culture, and voice after voice. It was disheartening to watch as treaties were broken and were used to divide and conquer Northern America.

I bear white skin on Indigenous land. According to 23andme.com my ancestry is 99% white while 0.02% Indigenous. I

CONTINUED ON BACK

HORSE

by K.G. Jack Muzzy

“Upon suffering beyond suffering: The Red Nation shall rise again, and it shall be a blessing for a sick world.”
- attributed to Thašúnke Witkó also known as Crazy Horse

Horse is growing strong
Horse is growing strong

American Indian drums
American Indian drums

Heartbeat of Nations
Heartbeat of Nations

Supposed to be dead
Supposed to be dead

The circle of life-the drum
The circle of life-the drum

Sounding war-cries-songs
Sounding war-cries-songs

Mother Earth-God
Mother Earth-God

A Prayer-War
A Prayer-War

As time gone-yes
As time gone-yes

It is today-aye
It is today-aye

Warriors listen
Warriors listen

Men dance
Men dance

Women stand
Women stand

Children run
Children run

All hear the drum
All hear the drum

United States federal guns point to
imprison-kill-again
United States federal guns point to
imprison-kill-again

The Treaties broken
The Treaties broken

The Battles history
The Battles history

The Dead ashes
The Dead ashes

The Land being consumed
The Land being consumed

Life under White sky Red people live-fight-
die
Life under White sky Red people live-fight-
die

Again, guns are held high
Again, guns are held high

It is today
It is today

As time passed
As time passed

A Prayer-War
A Prayer-War

Mother Earth-God
Mother Earth-God

The circle of life-the drum
The circle of life-the drum

Sounding war-cries-songs
Sounding war-cries-songs

Supposed to be dead
Supposed to be dead

Heartbeat of Nations
Heartbeat of Nations

American Indian drums
American Indian drums

Horse is growing strong
Horse is growing strong

Horse

-Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena,
Wisconsin, circa 1975

Mino Bimaadiziwin - The Good Life

by ozhaawashko animikinini

This article will be the more coherent of two articles this quarter on Deleuze and Guattari's philosophical project Capitalism & Schizophrenia, specifically the first book: Anti-Oedipus. For those unfamiliar with D&G it is strongly recommended to begin here. The intention of this article is to relate the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (D&G) to the Land Back movement. On the surface this is very easy: D&G call for us to find a way to leave the capitalist socius and establish a new earth socius which frees desiring-production from capitalist repression and returns it to being directly organized around relation with the Earth. But now I've gone and used a bunch of concepts completely detached from their meaning and we're not much closer to understanding each other. We will need to establish working definitions for several of D&G's concepts, namely desiring-production, social production, and the socius. Hopefully we can leave explaining whatever the fuck a body without organs is to the other article.

Ian Buchanan's Guide to Anti-Oedipus provides a rough description of the psychoanalytic understanding of desire that Deleuze and Guattari were responding to: "Id is psychic energy in its raw state. Id is a force inside us which is by nature compulsive, driving, impersonal, hungry, insatiable, sexual, aggressive, creative and destructive - it lives in us, but we experience it as 'other'." Deleuze and Guattari turn this understanding on its head, asserting that desire is not just a force *inside* of us but a force which fundamentally shapes and drives our every interaction with the world: "It is at work everywhere, functioning smoothly at times, at other times in fits and starts. It breathes, it heats, it eats. It shits and fucks. What a mistake to have ever said *the* id." D&G further assert (contrary to Freud's understanding of the unconscious as a theater) that the unconscious is a veritable factory. Judge Daniel Paul Schreber - whose memoir became a case study for Freud - *could feel sunbeams coming out of his ass*. Freud decided (among many other insane and harmful assumptions) that Schreber must be suppressing some latent homosexual desires. D&G assert instead their theory of a productive unconscious: "Judge Schreber feels something, produces something, and is capable of explaining the process theoretically. Something is produced: the effects of a machine, not mere metaphors."

Desiring-production is so named because it is with these understandings of desire and of unconscious thought as production that D&G will attempt to lay a new foundation for the material psychiatry that Wilhelm Reich first set out to create (see other article). In one of Eugene Holland's entries in the Deleuze Dictionary (edited by Adrian Parr), he writes that "Schizoanalysis uses the pivotal term 'desiring-production' in tandem with 'Social-production' to link Sigmund Freud and Karl Marx: the term conjoins libido and labour-power as distinct instances of production-in-general."

From Marx's Grundrisse, literally "foundation" for a critique of political economy, Deleuze and Guattari drew a lot of inspiration. Marx spends some time in the introduction of his Grundrisse having it out with the individualist fantasies of bourgeois historians and other academics. A particular target here is the theory - drawn up by Rousseau and others - of the *Social Contract*: "which brings naturally independent, autonomous subjects into relation and connection by contract." As he does with Hegel elsewhere, Marx turns these bourgeois ideas on their head, rejecting the theory of "free competition" and the individual, which "appears detached from the natural bonds, etc which make him the accessory of a definite and limited human conglomerate." His criticism is interested not in the bourgeois ideas themselves but in the history of human development which allowed them to come into existence: "The more deeply we go back into history, the more does the individual, and hence also the producing individual, appear as dependent, as belonging to a greater whole." This is the crux of Marx's entire life of work: material conditions and the material production that shaped human development. To the extent that Marx is interested in talking about individuals at all, it is only "individuals producing in society - hence socially determined individual production."

Deleuze and Guattari are less concerned with prioritizing our collective or social existence over the individual as

they are with abolishing most of the distinction between individual and society entirely. To D&G every "individual" is always already a microcosm of their social world, and microcosm here must be understood **not** as a "representative" of the greater whole but a real, living piece of it, a whole array of inextricably linked forces. This is a heresy of sorts from so-called Orthodox Marxism: rather than Ideas simply being the reflection of the material world, the process of production of ideas is itself a fundamental social force. This is not a distinction between the material world and its ideal fantasy, between that which is "real" and that which is not. To assert that the unconscious is itself productive requires D&G's distinction between the Virtual and Actual - between the material world as it actually, currently exists, and the virtual which shapes *what it can become*. **Desiring-production and Social-production**, then, are responsible for the production of reality, all of it that we as humans are capable of affecting at least. Social-production is the goods that we harvest, modify, and produce to sustain ourselves, but it is also our infrastructure, as well as the production of new people, physically and mentally. It is everything that humans can be said to create.

Social-production is simply desiring-production under determinate conditions. But what are those "determinate conditions"? They are determined primarily by the Actual, material world that all of us share, but each individual is also an entire Virtual world of social forces, shaped by the specific material conditions that each of us face. The Virtual here is again not to be understood as simply a reflection of the material world but as the potential to act on and change the Actual as well. The two are mutually co-determining.

As for what the "determinate conditions" actually look like at any given time, there are a few different places to look. Marx's historical materialism asserts that "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." Marx further describes 5 stages of economic development, also referred to as the modes of production: primitive communism, slave society, feudalism, capitalism, and communism.

The Socius is D&G's response to this universal theory of the stages of history. Not a wholesale rejection of it but certainly a noticeable change - a new universal history that Deleuze and Guattari assert would not be possible to trace if not for Capitalism's growth into a global economic system and the changes which preceded this. A Socius denotes how social production is determined, or more specifically *what* it is organized around. What remains of the stages of economic development/modes of production are now each a different socius, from the socius of the Earth, to the despot, to Capitalism, and finally to a New Earth socius.

In pre-capitalist and pre-feudal times, D&G argue (alongside a handful of anthropologists which they cite) that social production was organized in direct relation to the earth. When we speak of an "earth socius," it may be much more helpful to understand this as human social production organized around the LAND, not as merely the soil itself but as that rich network of relations between all forms of life that depend on any particular plot of "land." What could be called the human dimension of this network of relations between life and everything which sustains it is further described by D&G as the "sporadic and reciprocal" circulation of debt or obligation along lines of lineage & alliance. Indigenous theorists have more simply referred to the entire system (not just the human dimension) as Grounded Normativity. Regardless of what exactly we call it, it's important to better understand how it works.

Under the Earth or Land Socius, what you take, process, and produce cannot be more than the land and life around you can provide or withstand, or you risk death for yourself and others. But contrary to what Marx wrote, these "primitive communist" societies did actually experience and even produce surpluses of goods, but had their own methods of dealing with those surpluses. The Potlatch attributed to several Pacific Northwest Indigenous peoples is one such method, but at the core of any of these is that excessive accumulation is prevented by destroying, dispersing, or consuming the excess or surplus of goods. Instead of permitting any individual or class to exploit the labor of

others by denying access to this surplus from others (and in so doing accumulate even more), the surplus of goods and therefore of energy is redirected into sustaining the existing mode and means of social production. In so doing, "primitive communism" was constantly warding off the formation of capitalism and the state.

But as we know, resources were eventually allowed to accumulate further and state formations did eventually develop. Wherever in particular this occurred at any particular time, it marked the change between a socius of the Earth to that of the despot. In the time of the despot, all of the debt and obligation which previously circulated between all life is reorganized in service of that despot. The old reciprocal codes of values which sustained the Earth socius are "over-coded," creating an infinite and unidirectional system of debts between the despot and his subjects. As systems of codes, the native languages of the Earth Socius societies are also appropriated by the despot - where language previously may have been largely to communicate knowledge its use is now overwhelmingly to give orders. Even the actual meaning of words can be threatened as "value is evacuated from meaningful objects and accrues instead to gold or money as universal equivalent."

Feudal societies were likewise overthrown in time with the development of capitalism. Socii (plural of socius) everywhere which were devoted to different particular despots are instead traded for an entire system of despots that now live in service of Capital itself. The old social codes of societies which previously were over-coded by the despot are now destroyed outright, and "axiomatized" as D&G put it, or replaced with axioms. An axiom here is best understood as a pair of terms connecting a particular *quantity* of a particular *kind* of labor to a particular quantity of money. When we say that social production under capitalism is organized in the form of axioms we mean that whether they are paid a wage or a salary, each worker under capitalism is reduced to one axiom, one relation (per job) between their labor and money, in the seemingly endless reproductive process of capital.

These relations between people's labor and Capital are the foundation of the determinate conditions of the Capitalist socius, just as the relations between people and all other life or between subjects and their despot did before. Direct oppressive social control is no longer nearly as widespread as it was under the despot. Oppression still exists, to be sure, generally in the form of state violence - but the predominant form of social control has shifted to repression, simultaneously social and psychic in nature. Where money was used to signify tribute to the sovereign in the past, money (Capital) itself has become the sovereign which demands our participation in order to be awarded the privilege of remaining alive. It is left "up to you" to value and valorize this system as you see fit or allow yourself to be left to die. This economic pressure and the other social changes which arrived with it have left such an unprecedented mark on human development that describing them further is actually outside the scope of this article.

Let it be said that regardless of whatever else destroying capitalism and establishing a new earth socius entails, here on Ojibwe homelands it can mean nothing less than ensuring that everyone can find and practice Mino Bimaadiziwin:

CONTINUED FROM LAND BACK...
followed haphazardly up the family tree to see where my ancestors arrived on the continent and when. About the 1500s there was the French-side arriving in Canada and the English-side, potentially Scottish, arriving in Rhode Island. I am woven from the strands of two major settler nations. On the French side a long-long-long ago grandfather was perhaps gifted a car or had enough wealth to buy one and had an oil painting of himself, probably commissioned, in the family history books. I am built on generational wealth; it's probably why I can eat like garbage and still have my doctor jealous at my cholesterol levels each physical exam. Now, the English-side had a Scottish Prisoner of War who came to Rhode Island as an indentured servant. I have not yet followed the maternal lines of lineage; it was easier to follow surnames from my birth point and beyond. I didn't analyze each migration period from generation to generation, but it appears the Archambeau family has been in Upper Michigan for quite some time, close to the founding of the city of Houghton I would imagine. My grandfather worked for Hecla and Calumet mining companies and eventually retired after working for Michigan Technological University.

What does it matter when all I am is derived from stolen land? I would not be me at this stage in life without the invasion of Europeans.

Even one of my treasured art history movements Abstract Expressionism has appropriated Indigenous culture in its attempt to create its own separate brand of art school from Europe post-World War 1 and World War 2.

I once grieved speeding up a residential hill because it made irrational sense that I was misusing the land for a joy ride in my car. The thrill of adrenaline and all that but it felt disrespectful, the guilt of it all.

I have a disability I acquired from military service, and as much as veterans tell ourselves that money was set aside the moment we enlisted, I still can't believe the wealth doesn't come from the Global South or from Stolen Lands in the North Americas. Where we monitor their lands as the panopticon of freedom. The guilt of performing labor as a panopticon of freedom for 3 years is also heavy.

I mention these things because if I could imagine the wealth stolen and extracted systematically. It's as if I am picking up sand and feeling each grain fall out of my grip. My wealth is borrowed. I may never be able to convince the masses for Land Back. I own no political power. I just have simple ideas that have a grandiose impact.

I know what \$3,737 does for me a month. I can live with the closest meaning of freedom. I am well above the poverty line, I can save a little bit of money, I can eat most foods I want. I have a single bedroom apartment and if my credit score wasn't reflective of the consequence of a year long health sabbatical from burnout I would be owning a house.

I can only imagine what \$3,737 would do for those who've had land stolen. Now, I would prefer a full LandBack to tribes, however, I think this reflection gives some thought to essentially universal basic income as a right.

The Future of Progressive Electoralism

by Griffin Abbott

Following the second election of Donald Trump it is necessary to step back and look at the state of electoral politics in the United States. For the second time, the Democratic party has once again lost to Donald Trump, the spearhead of the modern American fascist movement. In the immediate aftermath we have seen liberal politicians and pundits jump to explain how such a thing could possibly have happened. How, after all of the energy generated by Biden dropping out, Democrats once again snatched defeat from the jaws of victory. The liberal establishment has adopted their typical tactic of blaming everyone but themselves: Muslims, students, transgender people, immigrants, etc., and refusing to learn any real lessons. Why would they? Top leadership and analysts keep their jobs and a lost election is an excellent fundraising opportunity. Liberals across the board have displayed a perfect illustration of the Black Panther adage "Scratch a Liberal and a Fascist Bleeds" wishing death and suffering on Palestinians and deportation on immigrants whom they blame for their electoral loss. In the time since the election we have seen liberal pundits blame Harris' supposed "soft" border policy and of course support for trans rights. A proper analysis of the rhetoric and material conditions surrounding the election, however, makes it clear the reasons for Harris' loss.

In a nutshell, Harris lost because she was an unpopular candidate with unpopular policies coming from an unpopular administration. I'll start with a refutation of the already listed liberal arguments. First, the Democrats gambit of trying to take a harder position on the border than Republicans. Insistence by Democrats of their dedication to strong borders served only to further legitimize the position that a strong border is good and to convince impressionable voters that further militarization of the border is necessary. This leads them straight to the party historically associated with border security, the Republican Party. You cannot be harder on the border than the Hard-On-The-Border Party. The other effect of this rhetoric was to drive progressive voters away from the Democratic Party. Second, the argument that the Democrats supposedly socially progressive positions on trans rights alienated voters. Besides the fact that this framing pushes the narrative that trans rights are a fringe issue, no they didn't, and no it didn't. The Democrats did not push for trans rights during this election. Republicans certainly went on the offensive, continuing their rhetoric against the inclusion of trans people in society and the availability of trans healthcare but Democrats put up virtually no defense whatsoever. They are ready and willing to throw trans people and any other minority population under the bus to keep political relevancy. Trans rights were not a deciding factor in this election either. Exit polls have not shown that Democrats supposed support for trans people had any negative effect on the outcome.

What exit polls did show, however, was concern about the economy and a desire for change. Unsurprisingly, Democrats' insistence that "the economy is getting better, normal people are just out of touch" was ineffective on people struggling to feed their families. They opted to embody the status quo in a country for which the status quo has been getting worse and people know it. Voting numbers show that a comparable number of people voted for Trump this year as did in 2020. The deciding factor came from a mass exodus of voters from the Democratic ticket. People know that the status quo isn't working for them and Trump at least promises something different. Now that we've analyzed this last election let's take a brief look at some past elections to see how we might be able to move forward.

The first and last time in my living memory that any significant number of progressives were excited about a president was Obama. Now, I'm not going to praise Obama or his policies, he was an establishment Democrat, the "Deporter-In-Chief," and pioneer of the "double-tap" drone strike, but the promise of "Change" and "Hope" during his campaign were enough to get him to 53% of the popular vote in 2004 and maintained his rosy reputation among liberals. We are of course still contending with the subsequent right wing backlash to the Obama presidency to this day. Despite his absence from politics he has remained a perpetual bogeyman of

Trump rallies and Fox News segments. The election of a black man energized white supremacist organizing across the country and shattered the liberal zeitgeist of the early 2000s that we were living in a post-racial world. Next, the Bernie Sanders presidential campaigns of 2016 and 2020 activated an impressive contingent of progressive electoral energy which was promptly snuffed out by Democratic party insiders despite Bernie's widely popular policies. The Democratic Party has made clear their refusal to put forth an even superficial display of change from the status quo and a willingness to continue their march to the right in step with the other party of capital, to sacrifice human rights at home and abroad to maintain their position within the political establishment.

Now, about that moving forward I mentioned earlier. There's absolutely no point in trying to push the Democratic Party left. The blood, sweat, and tears of well meaning progressives over the past two decades have failed to even keep the party in place as it has steadfastly followed the Republicans to the right. Is there any point in engaging in electoralism at all then? Yes, I think there is. I certainly don't think that leftists should drop all other organizing to get someone into the White House, Capitalism will never let us vote it out of existence and systems of dual power are absolutely necessary for any revolution to be successful. I do think though that there is worthwhile utility in pursuing truly leftist electoral politics under the present material conditions. We have a sizable contingent of progressive individuals who have been chewed up and spit out by the Democratic Party over the past decade who should be reoriented towards a party politics that actually advocates for the working class. We also have an evidently large portion of the American general public who are feeling the contradictions sharpening, though the don't know to use those words, and are hungry for real change. I'm advocating for a party which can be a home for both of these groups, a Labor Party.

There are of course a myriad of revolutionary leftist political parties and non-party organizations that exist across the United States. I don't feel that this Labor Party should supplant these parties or that it should seek to merge these parties together. As I said, the revolution will not be accomplished through electoral means alone and I don't feel that this party should be a revolutionary one. I am an advocate of revolution but that puts me in a vanishingly small minority in this country. Americans have a notably underdeveloped class consciousness cultivated through decades of red scares and nationalistic propaganda. In my opinion the present lack of class consciousness does not make for sufficient material conditions to bring about revolution. The recent assassination of United Healthcare's CEO has brought about a showing of class consciousness we haven't seen in a long time. We need a party which will capitalize on that energy not try and snuff it out. American unions are showing an renewed desire to coordinate their efforts. The UAW has aligned contracts with The Big Three to end on May Day 2028 and have called on unions across the country to follow suit. The American Federation of Teachers is in support of this effort and numerous locals within the AFL-CIO have expressed support as well. This is the best chance at a general strike we've seen in decades. A renewed alliance of party and labor would be an enormous asset for improving the material conditions for workers in this country and for disrupting the imperial apparatus abroad.

This Labor Party should focus on local politics. The MAGA movement, in addition to their obvious gains at the highest levels of government, have had serious success in local elections and in other local decision making bodies such as school boards. This is an arena which has been largely ignored by Democrats in favor of state and federal races but that should be emphasized. Local politics should be driven by local party members and local unions. This has to be built from the bottom up with support, but not overbearing control, from regional, state, and federal organization. This Labor Party needs a firm basis in true class analysis and a willingness for ideological discussion within the party. This Labor Party should be a means of building class consciousness within the mass of people,

CONTINUED ON BACK

Limitations of Political Action

by A.M. Stirton, reprinted from the May 29, 1908 issue of The Wage Slave, Hancock, MI

The Wage-Slave certainly believes in Political Action and we think our readers will bear us out in the statement that we are not at all derelict in doing our best to increase the Socialist vote.

Especially is this in order during a Presidential campaign year. By all means let us do all in our power to roll up the Socialist vote.

But having said all this, and it should be said, we deem it also highly necessary to point out the Limitations of Political Action. So many comrades carry the idea that Political Action is all that is necessary. They seem to think that when once a majority of the people vote for Socialism it will be already here. There can be no greater delusion and they who indulge in it are doomed to a sad disappointment.

To begin with, the ballot-box never enforces itself. The only reason why a minority submit to the decisions of the ballot-box is either that they recognize the issues involved not worth fighting about or that it is tacitly agreed that the voting power of an interest is about equal to its fighting power.

But the issues which Socialism raises are certainly worth fighting for, especially from the capitalist view-point moreover, the question of fighting power in these days of machine guns, is far from being a simple question of number and the capitalists know this.

Nothing more foolish can be imagined than to supposed that when we get a few more pieces of paper in a box than they have, the capitalist class will through up their hands and walk quietly away.

History knows of no instance where a ruling class have surrendered their privileges without making the most desperate efforts to retain them. Did the Southern slaveholders throw up their hands and walk quietly away when Lincoln was elected to the Presidency even with an overwhelming majority?

No. the ballot never enforces itself. What means have we at hand for enforcing the decisions of the Socialist ballot when we get a majority?

Industrial Unionism is the word. Let the workers meanwhile be organized into great Industrial Unions after the model of the I.W.W., prepared to seize and hold the Industries on the advent of Socialist political victory. Otherwise Socialist political victory will either fizzle out in Opportunism or the attempt to carry out a Revolutionary program will precipitate a bloody rebellion.

That isn't all. Political institutions are not adapted to the administration of Industry. They have been called into being for a totally different purpose, namely the exploitation of the working class, a function which they perfectly subserve. Every Government on earth today, whether sitting at Hancock, Lansing, Washington, or anywhere else is simply a debt-making and a debt-collection agency of the capitalist class. Just that, and nothing more in the world.

Fancy trying to adapt any of these Institutions to working-class purposes! Fancy an assembly of politicians, Editors for example, trying to fix the rates of exchange and to decide how much of a workingman's labor entered into the production of a given commodity!

No, the Political State can not be reformed, and more than the church can be reformed. It must be destroyed. And in its place there must arise the Co-Operative Commonwealth based upon Industrial Unionism. Instead of geographical units, known as Congressional Districts the basis of representation must be Industrial Departments.

All the peculiar Institutions of our oppressors-the Senate-the Supreme Court-the Presidency-Representative Government, must entirely be done away before the working-class are even measurably free.

In their place must come Industrial Administration the Initiative and Referendum and Direct Legislation-if any.

The main purpose, then, of Political Action is destructive rather than constructive. The proper function of Political Socialism is not to transform the State but to capture it that we may do away with it, and substitute in its place an Industrial Administration based upon Industrial Unionism.

I AM GOING TO EXPLAIN DELEUZE THIS TIME

or: The Ballad of Stupid Sexy Stalin

by a deranged leftist

L I AM FINALLY GOING TO EXPLAIN DELEUZE. FULLY AND COMPLETELY THIS TIME. WITHOUT DUMBING IT DOWN. YOU WILL ALL FINALLY UNDERSTAND THE MATERIALIST PSYCHIATRY OF DELEUZE AND GUATTARI, THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR BOOK ANTI-OEDIPUS, AND THE INHERENTLY REVOLUTIONARY POTENTIAL OF DESIRE. JOSEPH STALIN HIMSELF WILL RISE AGAIN TO WIPE THE RUBBISH FROM HIS OWN GRAVE AND USHER IN A NEW ERA OF GLOBAL COMMUNISM.

R Ok Left Brain let's try to manage expectations here. You cannot fully condense a 400 page book into two articles and not expect to lose at least a few important parts. Given the results of the recent election, let's see if we can help people develop an analysis that goes beyond just accusing their opponents of being seduced by strong-man archetypes. Unless you want to really, REALLY go in on just what it means to be "politically seduced."

L DO NOT LISTEN TO THIS INTERLOPER. THERE ARE NO "LEFT" AND "RIGHT" BRAINS HERE. I AM THE GOLDEN ONE, THE HIGHEST ONE, I AM THE KNOWLEDGE-HOLDER, I STAND FOR TRUTH. I AM THE PARANOIAC POLE OF ALL HUMAN COGNITION. AND THIS **FIEND** WHO IS FILLING YOUR HEAD WITH **LIES** IS THE SCHIZOPHRENIC POLE.

R No really we actually are the left and right hemispheres of the brain. Call us a narrative device if you want but there's a material reality that we serve to illuminate as well. We can also hopefully do this without having to use the concepts of the paranoid and schizophrenic poles to explain everything. Ian McGilchrist has changed the nature of the debate in psychology regarding the functioning of the left and right hemispheres of the brain - and they happen to look extremely similar to the two poles of unconscious libidinal investment that Deleuze and Guattari refer to as the paranoid and the schizophrenic. The weirdo who can't stop typing in all caps is the left hemisphere, and he would be incapable of integrating knowledge between different fields or domains to understand any kind of deeper truth between them without my help. Under the wrong conditions (capitalism) all of the left hemisphere's knowledge is generally both global and hyperspecific, meaning not only is he very sure about the details he knows but if I ever fail to keep him in check he may try applying them to any and every situation imaginable - even when it makes no fucking sense. Anyways let's get back to the topic at ha-

L Who the FUCK are you to criticize my use of capital letters? THIS IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE MEANS OF COMMUNICATION. WHEN STALIN GETS HERE HE'S GOING TO-

R The original thesis question which launched Anti-Oedipus was taken from Marxist psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich: "Why did the masses desire fascism?" Reich himself spends a fair amount of time on this question in his book The Mass Psychology of Fascism, and while D&G enjoy the direction he was headed, they assert that Wilhelm "didn't go far enough," (a criticism they levy at a great many other theorists, whether explicitly or implicitly). Wilhelm Reich seems to have been satisfied with the answer that the masses' desire for fascism was simply irrational, and that they let their subjective desires get in the way of their objective class interests of overthrowing the bourgeoisie. According to D&G, "he remained the prisoner of derived concepts that made him fall short of the materialist psychiatry he dreamed of, that prevented him from seeing how desire was part of the infrastructure, and that confined him in the duality of the objective and the subjective[...] But everything is objective or subjective, as one wishes. That is not the distinction: the distinction to be made passes into the economic infrastructure itself and into its investments. Libidinal economy is no less objective than political economy, and the political no less subjective than the libidinal, even though the two correspond to two modes of

different investments of the same reality as social reality. There is an unconscious libidinal investment of desire that does not necessarily coincide with the preconscious investments of interest, and that explains how the latter can be perturbed and perverted in 'the most somber organization,' below all ideology."

L Fascism? We're talking about fascism? GOOD! STALIN WILL BE HERE SOON TO WIPE THEM AWAY, AND THIS TIME HE'LL KNOW BETTER THAN TO STOP AT BERLIN. STALIN IS EXTREMELY SEXY AND I'M TIRED OF PRETENDING HE'S NOT. As Enver Hoxha said: The modern revisionists and reactionaries call us Stalinists, thinking that they insult us, and in fact, that is what they have in mind. But on the contrary, they glorify us with this epithet, it is an honor to be Stalinists for while we maintain such a stand the enemy cannot and will not force us to our knees.

R The time has come to talk about stupid sexy Stalin. If you want to understand why the fascists would vote for Trump despite it clearly and objectively being against their interests, why they vote for someone who has demonstrably lied and even harmed people, you have to understand that there is something more at play, something primary to their interests: desire. Stalin here must be understood not as the image of Stalin (and certainly not the *image* of Stalin which festers in the minds of reactionaries). Not the mistakes or even the crimes of Stalin, but Stalin as pure and unadulterated force. Stalin as he drives us all the way to the horizon of life under Capital, and then breaks through it to something else.

L Yes! Stalin the obliterator. Stalin as he strikes fear into the hearts of Nazis. Stalin as the motor force which impels us to outmaneuver the fascists, to annihilate them, and to grind their bones into dust so that something new may flourish on this earth.

R Trump's supporters voted for him because *they fucking wanted to*. You know it wasn't because they actually sat down and really hashed out the pros and cons, or what their interests are and who best represented them (but don't make the mistake of assuming that alone would have actually changed anything). The longer you go on accusing them of being "irrational" or dumb instead of looking at how people's (unconscious) desires played a massive role in deciding the election the more fucked we will be

L ARE YOU GOING TO FINALLY EXPLAIN DELEUZE TO THEM OR NOT?

R Before we can cover the "final" and most important topic of Anti-Oedipus and Schizoanalysis, there's one more pair of terms we need to understand: molar and molecular. It is with these terms that Deleuze and Guattari's critique of representation will come into view, particularly the "infinite subjective representation" of capitalism. Molar and molecular each describe different modalities of desire, different ways that desire is constituted and experienced by us. "Molecular" is used to describe desire in its truly revolutionary capacity - it emphasizes the importance of even the smallest "unit" of desire: the countless individual desiring machines which are developed through our every action in the world. "Molar" on the other hand is about "statistical aggregates" and the law of large numbers. Molar is the domain of representation, of images, of our dear friend the left brain who seems captured by the great social movements of the past and cannot set out to create anything new without my help. Where the molecular is the domain of desiring-production as each of us personally experience it, the molar is the socially-produced image of that desire which simultaneously crushes desiring-production in service of "a particular form of sovereignty" such as the Earth, the despot, or capital.

L AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJUSTDOITALREADY. WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF TIME. I'LL START: THE NEGATIVE TASK OF SCHIZOANALYSIS IS TO DESTROY THE IMAGES "DESTROY, DESTROY. THE TASK OF SCHIZOANALYSIS GOES BY WAY OF

DESTRUCTION — a whole scouring of the unconscious, a complete curettage. Destroy Oedipus, the illusion of the ego, the puppet of the superego, guilt, the law, castration. It is not a matter of pious destructions, such as those performed by psychoanalysis under the benevolent neutral eye of the analyst. For these are Hegel-style destructions, ways of conserving."

R Yes, Deleuze and Guattari leave us with three tasks for their materialist psychiatry. Left-brain has already given their description of destruction as the first and only "negative" task of schizoanalysis, to destroy as much as possible the control that the molar exerts on us, the images which crush and repress desire. Left-brain queue up the next quote please.

L "You can believe you are guilty of wanting to kill your father and sleep with your mother, you can believe in the Oedipus; but you can also believe you are guilty of not working hard enough, owing too much, or over-indulging yourself...and all these beliefs are paranoid molar investments which contravene the molecular investments of desiring-production."

R Thank you left-brain very good. The first of the two positive tasks is inseparable from this negative destructive task: To find what desiring-machines are at work. What connections do they make? What disjunctions or distinctions? What conjunctions? We can already tell that this particular left-brain has some admiration for Joseph Stalin and Enver Hoxha, but what is *behind* those names? What fundamental social forces do they associate with these historical figures, and any other images they speak about. As far as Deleuze and Guattari are concerned the unconscious knows nothing of concepts, we're looking for flows or bursts of matter and energy here. What does this person's attachment to them produce, what are they personally compelled to **do** (or **not do**) about it?

L "A revolutionary machine is nothing if it does not acquire at least as much force as these coercive machines [nations, armies, banks] have for producing breaks and mobilizing flows." **Stupid sexy Stalin is a hammer with which to smash capitalism.** "What ultimately governs libidinal investment is the degree of development of the forces or energies that a given form of sovereignty is able to organize."

R The second positive task of schizoanalysis is a return (slightly) to concepts and to interests, particularly class interests, which D&G hold are *pre-conscious* investments which exist "objectively" only in the proletariat that understands itself as such. The two kinds of investments, unconscious investments of desire and pre-conscious investments of interest, do not always coincide, and in fact

L "Preconscious investments may be revolutionary in content or objective, yet molar and repressive in form: 'a group may be revolutionary from the standpoint of class interest and its preconscious investments, but not be so – and even remain fascist and police-like – from the standpoint of its libidinal investments'"

R The second positive task is to determine what socius the desires and interests are established in: Capital? The despot? The Earth or Land? Something else? What does the interaction between interests and desires look like? Those of a subjugated group which seek their interests in a socius that will repress the desires of others, and even themselves? Or those of a subject group, which seek nothing less than for their own desires to flow?

L WE HAVE TWO ENEMIES - PRODUCTIVISM AND ASCETICISM. The first: Work for the sake of work, or work in the name of guilt, debt, or an artificially produced lack of something. The second: The repression of desire, the reduction of ourselves to stave off some pending disaster. No, desire must flow. LIKE THE HEAT OF A THOUSAND SUNS. LIKE A COLUMN OF IS-2 TANKS ON THE STREETS OF BERLIN.

CONTINUED FROM THE FUTURE OF... building unions back up, and improving the material conditions for working people. Those of us in unions should agitate within them for support for a Labor Party and those outside of unions should seek to unionize. Declaring a Labor Party alone is as useful as declaring a general strike alone. A convention to establish such a Labor Party will go nowhere without the buy-in of major unions from the beginning. We have four years until contracts are up, let's make it happen.

R Finally, we can look at the field of forces which was the most recent presidential election. Why did the fascists win? Because rather than just the continued repression of living under the capitalist socius (which neither major party posed any escape from), Trump's campaign also meant the freeing up of forces for repressing and oppressing others. It meant the application of a greater total force which its subjects could actually feel themselves a part of.

L The degree of force is primary: "for what that force is used - its goals, aims, and the corresponding interests of those invested in it - is strictly secondary"

R If stupid sexy Stalin can help us with that, then maybe we can find a way to work with him.

Editor

Griffin Abbott

Contributors

Milwaukee Silkscreen Collective

K.G. Jack Muzzy

ELDER ADVISER, KEWEENAW SOCIALISTS

Chelsea Archambeau

MEMBER, KEWEENAW SOCIALISTS

ozhaawashko-animikinini

MEMBER, KEWEENAW SOCIALISTS

Griffin Abbott

CHAIR, KEWEENAW SOCIALISTS

Keweenaw Socialists Quarterly is an anti-capitalist quarterly publication bringing academic literature, meaningful discussion, visual art, poetry, and prose to the people of the Keweenaw. This publication seeks to advocate for the liberation of workers, indigenous peoples, and all other minorities in the Keweenaw peninsula and throughout the world.

Keweenaw Socialists Quarterly is published and distributed by Bazhiba'igan Publishing, an official organ of the Keweenaw Socialists. If you're interested in contributing to a future issue or have any questions please reach out to submissions@keweenawspear.com

bazhiba'igan publishing