

# Preliminary Materials for the Constitution of Library Biskaabiiyaang

by ozhaawashko animikii

*"The reasonable man adapts himself to the world: the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore all progress depends on the unreasonable man."*  
– George Bernard Shaw

## BRICOLAGE

all creative work is also destructive, but bricolage is maybe a little more explicit about the destruction than most. pictures, furniture, some articles or a book, a pile of old shit in a forlorn corner of your house: no matter what it is, the point of bricolage is that you are going to break it down into parts and destroy it to create something completely new. what follows is a bricolage, constructed from materials found at hand and designed to serve two purposes:

1. to white folks it is a list of demands. if you consider yourself an ally to racial justice and want to become involved in Library Biskaabiiyaang, this is a starting point for the kind of politics the Library will expect of you and your work.

2. to BIPOC interested in helping shape the future of this writer's society, this is a first attempt at putting together some of the guiding principles and philosophy that will go into our founding documents.

the largest share of materials that went into this document comes from the Red Deal, and much of its structure is formed by the 20 areas of struggle that the Red Nation laid out there, split into 3 categories: END THE OCCUPATION, HEAL OUR BODIES, and HEAL OUR PLANET.

*(also from the Red Deal)*  
Four Principles:  
1. what creates crisis cannot solve it  
2. change from below and to the left  
3. politicians can't do what only mass movement can do  
4. from theory to action

from the preamble to the Red Nation's Principles of Unity:

*"We seek to not just challenge power, but to build power. We are not simply a negation of the nightmarish colonial present - colonialism, capitalism, heteropatriarchy, imperialism, and white supremacy - we are the embodiment and affirmation of a coming Indigenous future, a future in which many worlds fit."*

## END THE OCCUPATION

1. Abolish the police, ICE/CBP, and CPS  
all this brings us back to the following "impossible" question:  
what happens when one takes Indigenous thought seriously?

2. End Bordertown Violence  
*"the function of a bordertown is to exploit the identity, labor, and death of Indigenous people"*  
when the anthropologist's goal ceases to be its explanation, interpretation, contextualization, or rationalization and shifts to using it, drawing out its consequences, and verifying the effects it can produce in our own thought?

3. Abolish Incarceration  
neither a form of doxa nor a figure of logic (neither an opinion nor a proposition), Indigenous thought should be taken - if we truly want to take it seriously - as a practice of sense

4. End Occupation Everywhere (including the atmosphere)  
as a self-reflexive apparatus for the

production of concepts, of "symbols that represent themselves"

5. Abolish Imperial Borders (US must pay reparations for war and climate debt)  
if there is something that de jure belongs to anthropology,it is not the task of explaining the world of the other but that of multiplying our world...for we cannot think \*like\* Indians; at most we can think \*with\* them

*"every understanding of another culture is an experiment with one's own"*  
- Roy Wagner

This is like the barest minimum possible of what's necessary for America to ever stop being synonymous with genocide, and yet there are no shortage of people who laugh at the very mention of Land Back because it's just "not reasonable" or "not possible". Those who are only willing to fight for what is possible within our current systems or for what is "reasonable" have no business leading anyone, nor representing anyone.  
what the hell does a writer's society do anyways? are we gonna end up hosting like professional development workshops? I already got the ick

## HEAL OUR BODIES

Reinvest in our Common Humanity

1. Citizenship & Equal Rights (for all immigrants, but especially climate immigrants)  
we live today in the age of partial objects, bricks that have been shattered to bits, and leftovers.

2. Free & Sustainable Housing  
we no longer believe in the myth of the existence of fragments that, like pieces of an antique statue, are merely waiting for the last one to be turned up, so that they may all be glued back together to create a unity that is precisely the same as the original unity.

3. Free & Accessible Education  
we no longer believe in a primordial totality that once existed, or in a final totality that awaits us at some future date.

4. Free & Adequate Healthcare  
we no longer believe in the dull gray outlines of a dreary, colorless dialectic of evolution, aimed at forming a harmonious whole out of heterogeneous bits by rounding off their rough edges.

5. Free reliable and accessible public transport and infrastructure  
your ancestors murdered Indigenous peoples just to build a world where you have to pay for the privilege of remaining alive

6. Noncarceral Mental Health Support  
They've cut me apart at each of my joints  
Then sewn me back together, but not the same

7. Healthy, sustainable, and abundant food  
My nerves, my ligaments and tendons, something is wrong

8. Clean Water, Land, and Air  
I try to get up, to move  
But everything's rearranged

9. End Gender, Sexual, and Domestic Violence  
My own body resists, fighting my every command

# Impressions of the Convention

by W.J. Roberts, reprinted from the May 22, 1908 issue of The Wage Slave, Hancock, MI

The significant thing in the Socialist National Convention just close in Chicago, is its demonstration of the fact that the Opportunist or conservative wing of the Party is at present in the saddle, While a motion to endorse Industrial Unionism was lost by a vote of 160 against 48, the Committee on the Platform reported in sixteen “immediate demands” and the Platform so reported was adopted with but little modification. Of course the Party membership are yet to be heard from when the Platform is submitted to referendum.

For the information of any of our readers who might not understand we may state that the Socialist movement as is customary with all movements, has developed two more or less defined wings, a radical wing and a conservative wing.

The difference in the main is this, their respective attitudes on the subject of immediate demands, the conservatives being willing to accept with the complaisance and even strive for almost any little reform which seems to them to have socialistic bearings, while the radicals, impatient of the disappointments and shams of capitalism, are anxious to lead the hosts of labor at once into the Promised Land of the Cooperative Commonwealth.

The Wage-Slave, we may add, belongs emphatically to the radical camp, and the Editor as Delegate so acted in the National Convention.

The conservatives are frequently called Opportunists and they retort by calling the radicals Impossibleists, a term which is certainly misplaced, and which the Wage-Slave, for one would repudiate.

A characteristic point of difference between these two wings of our movement is their respective attitudes toward Labor Organizations. No Socialist is to be taken seriously or is in fact entitled to be called a Socialist at all who does not acknowledge the superiority of the Industrial over the Craft form of Organization.

But the Opportunists is willing to palter and trim for the sake of getting more votes, saying, “It’s the best way and the only way, but the Trade Unions aren’t ready for it yet. Let them alone and say nothing about it and they will evolve. Even the A. F. of L. will evolve into Industrial Organization.”

The Opportunist says. “lo four months and then cometh harvest.” The Revolutionist insists that the fields are white unto the harvest now. The Opportunist is a vote getter; the Revolutionist is an idol smasher.

The Opportunists generally claims the title of Revolutionist also, but that is a bit of unconscious humor.

It is heart-breaking to see our dear comrade the Opportunist playing at what he calls “Constructive Socialist.” His failure to stand squarely for the real constructive program of Socialism, Industrial Unionism, throws him back on a lot of disconnected “immediate demands,” generally desirable enough in themselves, but often incoherent and unsystematic. But the Opportunist won’t be happy till he gets it. Whether it is the reforestation of cut-over woodlands, the “nationalization” of railways, or the ballot in the hands of a woman, it is all “a step toward Socialism.”

The Revolutionist on the other hand, would point out that the place where the laborer is robbed is precisely where he works and that until that place has passed into collective Ownership, nothing has been accomplished. It would say, “Seek ye first the Cooperative Commonwealth and all these things shall be added unto you.”

Well, the Opportunist element was completely in control at the National Convention as the voting and debating clearly showed. There was four propositions which more than any other brought out heated discussion and these were, first the motion to endorse Industrial Unionism, second the motion to confer with the Socialist Labor Parry, with reference to Unity, third the motion to insert a statement that “religion is a private matter with which our movement has no concern” among the “immediate demands” (Think of it!) and fourth a motion to adopt the majority report of the Women’s Committee which provided for special methods of reaching women with our propaganda and contained another “immediate demand” that she be at once enfranchised.

The Editor voted with the minority on the first, second and third questions, and failed to vote on the fourth not being fully decided at the time.

G. H. Lockwood, our Party Secretary in Michigan, and the Editor, also filed with the Secretary of the Convention a joint statement which will appear in the published minutes, recording our attitude on Opportunist measures, and also setting forth the reason why we votes against inserting the statement concerning religion in the Platform to be that we deemed it inappropriate to make any statement whatever on the question.

The only resolution of any consequence which we can now recollect as being unanimously adopted without dissension was one on the Liquor Traffic in which the evil affects of the excessive use of alcoholics was recognized and deplored, and Socialists as individuals argues to be temperate or abstain wholly, recognizing at the same time that the Liquor Traffic is an integral part of the capitalist system and can not be cured by extending the police powers of the Capitalist State.

We feel it our duty to give all these facts to our readers. The Party membership especially are entitled to know all that is going on in the Party as near as we can find it out, not only in prosaic detail but also to be kept in living touch with every drift of thought in our movement, As so we say, the general drift of thought at the Convention was too conservative to suit the Editor of the Wage-Slave.

We deem a note of caution not inappropriate, that while we are rightly anxious to convert the people to Socialism, we must be ware, lest for the sake of a few more votes we convert Socialism to the people.

“Salt is good, but if the salt have last its savor wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth fit got nothing.”

At the same time, it also becomes us of the radical wing to show our more conservative comrades that we are certainly not behind them in Party loyalty and zeal.

Our candidates are nominated and we are in the midst of a Presidential campaign. Into the conflict boys in dead earnest. Let this be the best propaganda year and the best organization year that we have ever seen.

Close up the ranks and move forward on the political works of the common enemy.



CONTINUED FROM PRELIMINARY...

10. End Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls, and Two Spirit Peoples

I scream as loud as I can, but no one will hear my whimpers

Please let me wake up

I am a gift from all of Creation to all of Creation and so are you

HEAL OUR PLANET

reinvest in our common future

1. Clean Sustainable Energy

"I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change, I am changing the things I cannot accept"

- Angela Davis

2. Traditional and Sustainable Agriculture (land return, remediation)

the only thing worse than the fear that things will never get better is to trap ourselves in knowing that it never will

3. Land, Water, Air, and Animal Restorations

why bricolage? why couldn't I just write a normal fucking essay or two that were more coherent?

if I want to encourage other people to fuck around and write something, I should probably do the same. also do you have any idea how hard it is to structure anything coherently with both autism and adhd?

4. Protection and Restoration of Sacred Sites

bricolage is revolutionary

it's up to you what properties, what parts and structure you use to create your work

what you choose to break down

5. Enforcement of Treaty Rights and other agreements

you can use the whole damn buffalo, or take only what you need

whether to maintain or destroy any sense of sanctity or continuity of what came before

the choice is yours

Who am I writing for?

To people who are already committed to building a more equitable world, who want to help, but know they need to keep being wiling to learn

To people who want access to healthcare, education, energy, internet, housing, employment, and social security FOR EVERYONE without every aspect of our lives being put up for sale

to people that have started their healing journey, and are willing to stay vulnerable enough to pull themselves out of that cancerous body we call white supremacy culture

to the people I love

to people who carry a weight, are aware of that weight, but don't know what to do with it, or how to get it out

# A Liberal Professor on Equality

by V.I. Lenin

Liberal Professor Mr. Tugan-Baranovsky is on the war path against socialism. This time he has approached the question, not from the political and economic angle, but from that of an abstract discussion on equality (perhaps the professor thought such an abstract discussion more suitable for the religious and philosophical gatherings which he has addressed?).

"If we take socialism, not as an economic theory, but as a living ideal," Mr. Tugan declared, "then, undoubtedly, it is associated with the ideal of equality, but equality is a concept ... that cannot be deduced from experience and reason."

This is the reasoning of a liberal scholar who repeats the incredibly trite and threadbare argument that experience and reason clearly prove that men are *not* equal, yet socialism bases its ideal on equality. Hence, socialism, if you please, is an absurdity which is contrary to experience and reason, and so forth!

Mr. Tugan repeats the old trick of the reactionaries: first to misinterpret socialism by making it out to be an absurdity, and then to triumphantly refute the absurdity! When we say that experience and reason prove that men are *not* equal, we mean by equality, equality in *abilities* or *similarity* in physical strength and mental ability.

It goes without saying that in this respect men are *not* equal. No sensible person and no socialist forgets this. But *this kind* of equality has *nothing whatever* to do with socialism. If Mr. Tugan is quite unable to *think*, he is at least *able* to read; were lie to Lake the well-known work of one of the founders of scientific socialism, Frederick Engels, directed against Dühring, he would find there a special section explaining the absurdity of imagining that economic equality means anything else than the *abolition of classes*. But when professors set out to refute socialism, one never knows what to wonder at most—their stupidity, their ignorance, or their unscrupulousness.

Since we have Mr. Tugan to deal with, we shall have to start with the rudiments.

By political equality Social-Democrats mean *equal rights*, and by economic equality, as we have already said, they mean the *abolition of classes*. As for establishing human equality in the sense of equality of strength and abilities (physical and mental), socialists do not even think of such things.

Political equality is a demand for equal political rights for *all* citizens of a country who have reached, a certain age and who do not suffer from either ordinary or liberal-professorial feeble-mindedness. This demand was first advanced, not by the socialists, not by the proletariat, but by the *bourgeoisie*. The well-known historical experience of all countries of the world proves this, and Mr. Tugan could easily have discovered this had he not called "experience" to witness solely in order to dupe students and workers, and please the powers that be by "abolishing" socialism.

The bourgeoisie put forward the demand for *equal* rights for all citizens in the struggle against medieval, feudal, serf-owner and caste privileges. In Russia, for example, unlike America,

Switzerland and other countries, the privileges of the nobility are preserved to this day in all spheres of political life, in elections to the Council of State, in elections to the Duma, in municipal administration, in taxation, and many other things.

Even the most dull-witted and ignorant person can grasp the fact that individual members of the nobility are *not* equal in physical and mental abilities any more than are people belonging to the "tax-paying", "base", 'low-born" or "non-privileged" peasant class. But in *rights* all nobles are *equal*, just as all the peasants are equal in their lack of rights.

Does our learned liberal Professor Tugan now under stand the difference between equality in the sense of equal rights, and equality in the sense of equal strength and abilities?

We shall now deal with economic equality. In the United States of America, as in other advanced countries, there are no medieval privileges. All citizens, are equal in political rights. But are they equal as regards their *position in social production*?

No, Mr. Tugan, they are not. Some own land, factories and capital and live on the unpaid labour of the workers; these form an insignificant minority. Others, namely, the vast mass of the population, own no means of production and live only by selling their labour-power; these are proletarians.

In the United States of America there is no aristocracy, and the bourgeoisie and the proletariat enjoy *equal* political rights. But they are *not* equal in *class* status: one class, the capitalists, own the means of production and live on the unpaid labour of the workers. The other class, the wage-workers, the proletariat, own no means of production and live by selling their labour-power in the market.

The abolition of classes means placing *all* citizens on an *equal* footing with regard to the *means of production* belonging to society as a whole. It means giving all citizens *equal* opportunities of working on the publicly-owned means of production, on the publicly-owned land, at the publicly-owned factories, and so forth.

This explanation of socialism has been necessary to enlighten our learned liberal professor, Mr. Tugan, who may, if he tries hard, now grasp the fact that it is absurd to expect *equality* of strength and abilities in socialist society.

In brief, when socialists speak of equality they always mean *social* equality, equality of social status, and not by any means the physical and mental equality of individuals.

The puzzled reader may ask: how could a learned liberal professor have forgotten these elementary axioms familiar to anybody who has read any exposition of the views of socialism? The answer is simple: the *personal* qualities of present-day professors are such that we may find among them even exceptionally stupid people like Tugan. But the *social* status of professors in bourgeois society is such that only those are allowed to hold such posts who sell science to serve the interests of capital, and agree to utter the most fatuous nonsense, the most unscrupulous drivel and twaddle against the socialists. The bourgeoisie will forgive the professors all this as long as they go on "abolishing" socialism.

Editor

Griffin Abbott

Contributors

ozhaawashko animikinini

MEMBER, KEWEENAW SOCIALISTS

V.I. Lenin

SUBMITTED AUTHOR

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