

For many years I traveled to New York City to meet with Seymour Melman (1917-2004), a renowned professor of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research at Columbia University. Melman offered a deep well of information about the "milieus" of Noam Chomsky, which I drew from for my writings about Chomsky, and, eventually he became a key informant for my biography of Zellig Harris. He and Chomsky both urged me to document details of a small and neglected organization called "Avukah" both for itself and as a means of better understanding some of the ideas developed early on by the likes of Melman, Chomsky and many others. Melman also discussed at great length his personal interest and engagement in issues of worker self management, which grew out of some discussions he'd undertaken as a member of Avukah, and then developed later in his research and teaching. One person he mentioned regularly in these discussions was Lawrence B. Cohen, and a dissertation-turned-manuscript that he'd written, in part under the guidance of Melman. Melman told me on several occasions that he'd deeply regretted that this manuscript never came out as a monograph, since he thought that it was both groundbreaking and prescient, and it became clear that it was also an important text to be read alongside of another neglected work, that eventually did come out as a book, called *The Transformation of Capitalist Society*, by Zellig Harris.

When I took on the task of writing the Zellig Harris biography, I eventually learned the value of recording, and then filming, interviews with key informants. I would have loved to have interviewed Lawrence B. Cohen, given his work in Avukah and, moreover, given the research he'd done in the realm of decision-making on the shop floor. Alas, I never had the occasion to record my many conversations with Seymour, and Lawrence B. Cohen passed away in 2007, and my work was impoverished on both accounts. Nonetheless, two interesting developments followed, years later that have led to this publishing moment, and are informing my current project of producing a documentary film about Avukah. The first was that I discovered in my huge archive of Avukah/Chomsky/Harris materials an unopened envelope that Melman had left for me, or had planned to give to me sometime before he passed away. It contained an interview for another project, and therein Melman talks about some key issues relating to Avukah and worker self management. Even more amazing was that in early 2014, I received an email from Jonathan Cohen, indicating that he was in possession of this fabled manuscript written by his father, and he asked me for advice on how to publish it. I have used these virtual pages of *AmeriQuests* to publish some of the works of this milieu, including another manuscript that Melman had left for me in his papers, that I was able to publish as [War Inc.](#) and another work, tangentially related, called [Quests Beyond the Ivory Tower](#). This book by Lawrence Cohen, then, is the third volume in this series of work relating to worker self management and Avukah. Our wonderful introductions by Kevin Davis, Gary Roth and Jonathan Cohen himself provide the basis for a strong understanding of the ideas developed in the manuscript; what's still missing, though, is some sense of Avukah, and I provide this here because it helps us understand the context within which some of these ideas were developed.¹ I'll then provide a brief overview of Zellig Harris's work on transforming capitalist society, which in many ways draws from the kinds of ideas developed by Lawrence B. Cohen.

Avukah

¹ I'm drawing some of the details provided in my biography, *Zellig Harris: From American Linguistics to Socialist Zionism* (Cambridge, MIT Press, 2011).

The story of Avukah began inauspiciously at Harvard University, where a couple of students decided that a new Jewish student organization was needed on campus to address some crucial concerns. In the *Avukah Annual 1925-1930*, Joseph S. Shubow describes the moment when he and Max Rhoades "lighted the torch" of Avukah. Shubow was a student at Harvard, concerned by "social smugness and complacency, the cowardly Jewish self-effacement and assimilatory tendencies on the part of so many of our fellow students" (37). To help initiate change, he and others involved in the Harvard Zionist Society invited speakers to Zionist meetings, even drawing an editorial in the venerable *Harvard Crimson*, the college daily, which helped stimulate interest and even made attending Zionist meetings on campus "fashionable." Along the way, a number of students engaged in serious scholarly study of the Hebrew language, Jewish history and Zionist affairs, to the point where their "entire college life was illumined by these thoughts and activities" (38). Inspired by a visit to the campus by Max Rhoades, Shubow began to think of a "sound, powerful student Zionist organization" to revive the nearly-defunct Intercollegiate Zionist Organization. To begin, he sent out invitations "to students among the more active Jewish college groups to attend a national conference at Washington on June 27, 1925, immediately preceding the National Zionist Convention" (39). The call was answered, and "sixty or more students and graduates from about twenty-two universities attended our gathering at the mayflower Hotel, and there we exchanged our views and experiences; and, guided and inspired by our guests from Palestine, we founded our present organization." With the idea came the need for a name, when Max Rhoades, present in the founding meeting, shouted out "Say Joe, what's the Hebrew word for torch?" and he and I thundered "Avukah" almost simultaneously," a scene which evokes the creation of more than just a movement. Shubow describes how he and others were "warmed by the very word," how they felt they "had conjured forth a name that was to fire the imagination of the Jewish students of America."

Avukah's "flame," this attempt at (re)kindling magic through Zionism, spread quickly through Harvard, and then through universities in New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Wisconsin. Says Shubow:

We founded the American Student Zionist Federation because we believed it was the sacred duty of the youth as well as of the elders to participate in the glorious privilege of the national redemption of our people. We also sensed that our elders were getting older and growing fatigued in the laborious task of national liberation and we desired to help train the younger generation to be prepared to carry on the work. We wanted to discipline ourselves, to charge into the breach and maintain the good fight. We did not care to wait until we were drafted, dragged or pressed into service. We were ready to volunteer. And we stood eager, like prancing vigorous young steeds, prepared to perform any kind of duty from the most menial to the most dangerous. (40)

Zellig Harris's involvement with the organization began in his early days as a student at the University of Pennsylvania. On March 29th, 1928 a little journal called *Rostrum* published its first issue, under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania chapter of Avukah. On page 2, signed by an undergraduate student at the University of Pennsylvania with the initials Z.S.H. [Zellig S. Harris], appears an article called "The Torch Unlit", describing from another perspective this same foundational moment:

On a certain inauspicious afternoon in May 1925 two men were sitting in the offices of the Kerem Kayemeth at New York. It was after office hours, these two having remained to discuss their major task. Both were members of the "Palestine youth Commission," sent to America to deal with the problem of Jewish youth here. Both being teachers, and closely in touch with Zionist youth in Palestine and Europe, they were thought the most fitting for the mission. Despite all the warnings they had received they expected to find here a youth more or less similar to that which they knew. Without entering into a tirade against the younger generation, it must be admitted that the human material with which they had to deal was not the best. They had not come with any clear-cut plan of what they were doing to do. Their mission was to influence organized and unorganized Jewish youth in the direction of Zionism. Here the problem of extracting Zionism from an unnationalistic youth resembled the ancient problem squeezing water from a rock.

This discussion led to the calling of conferences in New York, and meetings were organized, bringing together heads of organizations, right up to the 28th Zionist Convention in Washington, when Avukah was formally founded on the basis of the program already in existence in the Palestine Youth Commission. Harris writes: "Like most similar organizations, it had a two-fold purpose: to widen the ranks of the Zionists among the students, and at the same time to foster a deeper understanding of the movement among those who had already accepted the principle. From its ranks the future leaders should evolve – men with practical experience and close to the Zionist ideal. It would be comprehensively Jewish – thus filling a certain need in every national Jewish student; and above all it would be fair and open-eyed, nationalistic without chauvinism." The reality was different because, according to Zellig Harris,

there can be but two types of Zionists. There is the Zionist by emotion, in whom nationalism is inculcated from childhood, and who, no matter how many reasons he may offer for the ideal is not a Zionist by virtue of them. And there is the Zionist by logic – the one who knows well the Jewish situation and who, from a purely rationalistic point of view, decides that the centering of a nucleus of Jews in a Jewish Homeland is absolutely necessary to the future well being of the nation.

Zellig Harris would sympathize with the latter approach, something for which he would long struggle. At this early point, however, "too few had the training requisite for one of the first type, and too few had the knowledge and cold rationality requisite for one of the second." This is an interesting statement in terms of Zellig Harris's own personality, which was clearly rational and scientific, and, in terms of his training, which had been rigorous and intense. But it's interesting politically as well, since he proposes by this description that there should be some kind of ideal "Zionist conception" which was in accord with the ideals of the founders, who presupposed "a wholehearted acceptance of Zionism," a "decidedly desirable" motivation. What lacked in terms of the original organization, therefore, were the goals that had been set forth early on, and so it could be said three years after the founding of Avukah that, in Harris's words, "the torch – the real torch – is really unlit as yet. It is our task then to light it so that it may shine in the way it was first meant to shine." This kind of quest for a Zionist vanguard is present throughout Harris's (and others') Avukah writings,

which is rather surprising, perhaps, to those who have come to know him through his more anti-Party stance in evidence in, for example, his 1998 post-mortem book entitled *The Transformation of Capitalist Society*. Further, this belief ties him to Louis Brandeis, who wrote that "our main task must be to make fine men and women in Palestine, and it will be desirable to correct there, so far as possible, those distortions of character and mind which too much commercialism enforced by separation from the land many centuries, has entailed."

In this same 1928 issue, there is discussion about how "some of the leading minds of Avukah" should go beyond the "cultural phases of Zionism" to focus on "the practical side [of] some appropriate and worthy Palestine project," like fundraising for the library at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. This type of endeavor became important for Avukah, alongside of publishing (newsletters, newspapers, books), staging social events, and setting up forums to discuss Jewish or Zionist issues. In the second issue of the journal called *Avukah Rostrum*, dated June 25, 1928, the Palestine Project was described to representatives from the Chicago Avukah, as was the idea for "a colony of secondary-school graduates who wish to return to the soil." These types of projects were central to the overall Avukah mission: "As Lilion Blum's famous saying goes, 'the liberation of the spirit comes before liberation of the mind.' Avukah's work is educational. All its energies, and, if necessary, all its funds, are to be used toward its main end, the spreading of Jewish culture and nationalism in the universities and the creation of what is hardly possible here: a nationalist youth movement."²

In another article called "Third Party Zionism" (3), Zellig Harris bemoaned the present state of Zionism, conveying a sense that "American Zionism is bankrupt," partly because of the politics of competing Zionist parties:

When two parties exist, both of them powerful, and neither fit to rule, the time has come for a 'third party.' So it is in America and much to our sorrow it is so in American Zionism. The opposition [to the Lipsky administration] was wrong in the first case in creating a 'second party'; that system is out of place in the Z.O.A. but now let a third party come – one with no politics, not tactics, no thought but Zionism alone. Let it be not a party but the Zionist movement itself. It is time.

This rejection of the Party, but support for the movement, is typical of the type of politics Zellig Harris would promote in his writings.

Politics does not properly come within the scope of Avukah. We cannot but evince interest, however, in a state of affairs so deplorable that it jeopardizes the spiritual legacy which the major organization will presumably leave Avukah. But destructive criticism alone is not sufficient. Avukah owes it to itself to know what is essentially wrong with the present situation, what factor is responsible for this unfortunate lack of anything spiritual in American Zionism.

The problem according to Harris is that when Zionism came to America, "too much of its old European idealism was lost," a problem which led him to call for the types of changes

² From an unsigned editorial in the same issue.

which he eventually effected when he became an officer of the organization. His early writings provide a sense of the direction to which he thought the movement should be headed: "American Zionism has fallen into a rut of its own creation from which it must be extracted by a revival of spirit. And the reviver does not come. No one emerges from this humiliating affray to lead the organization – or rather to create anew a Zionist movement in America." What Harris wanted was a "straightforward Zionist" who "cares for Palestine and his nation and for that alone," whose "mundane honors are gotten in other fields and whose Zionism is purely objective, purely a matter of idealism." This discussion anticipates those which took place at the Third Annual Avukah Convention in Pittsburgh, immediately before the Zionist Convention of June 28-30, 1928.

In the September 1929 issue of *Rostrum*, there is once again much hand-wringing about Avukah, which is described as suffering from "bare hand to mouth existence, a plodding along, each season for itself, with no vision or plan of later work – that will not even suffice to keep the organization alive" (1). To remedy this situation, the issue contains a long list of proposed cultural activities for 1929-1930, including reading groups, historical work, publications, meetings, seminars and work relating to practical Zionism. The peculiarity of Harris's vision is in the idea that "a nation exists to teach, to teach its own peculiar contributions to world culture to its neighbors, whence it passes on." By the same token, the nation can lose its individuality by conveying its vision, and thus "no longer exist" as a "separate cultural group." Zionist Jews must therefore concentrate upon teaching, because "the Jewish principles of World-Unity (as in Monotheism) and Justice have not yet penetrated to the world (as the principles of Greece and Rome have)." This makes "the continued existence of the Jews as a cultural unit "desirable," but "the Jews should, by massing their forces and by centralization, make their culture more essentially a culture, and more essentially individual. For various reasons Palestine is the only place – and a perfect place – for that." Palestine is a "playground, a laboratory of ideas," which all work to one end, "a newer, vital, individual Jewish culture, which, as a distinct unit of a perfect world whole, will give its new and vital and individual contributions to humanity" (10). This vision, of the incomplete transference of Jewish ideas, and the need for a space to cultivate them, is at the basis of Harris's conception of Zionism during his undergraduate years, and beyond.

Expanding Avukah

In May of 1929, Avukah had offices at 170 Fifth Avenue in New York, from which it published the first issue of the *Avukah Bulletin*. President Max Rhoades described it as "a modest leaflet, little different from many similar publications;" but behind it lay some lofty ambitions, notably to "remind us of our hopes of some day publishing a worthy Avukah journal of creative literary expression." In the meantime, its goal was to "flash a constant interchange of thought and action through the membership of our Chapters from New England to California, and mark the end of a period of communication restricted to mental telepathy, irregular items in a few friendly news columns, and laborious transmission ideas through the post-box." As such, "the Bulletin is a new instrument in the high task we have set for ourselves of making the renaissance of our people a vital force in the lives of the student youth." This publication printed news from the various chapters of Avukah, including announcements of Zellig Harris's March 3, 1929 forum on "The Exile Factor in Jewish History," and the April 14 history group talk by Zellig Harris on "Cultural Zionism," which was complemented by Anna Harris's "The Development of the Idea of Zionism." This issue also advertised a forthcoming 1929 *Annual*, which would be dedicated to Albert Einstein on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday. It also contained some important

discussions of Avukah's educational role, including Dr. Chaim Arlosoroff's suggestion that "Avukah is the reserve officers' training camp of the American Zionist movement," so it "must never seek to become a mass movement or organization" (3). In this report, it was suggested that Avukah's membership should be limited to 1,000, and "should be chosen according to a rigid standard without which Avukah can never hope to attain the goal for which it should strive. Avukah's membership should not come from nationalistic or orthodox Jewish homes only, but should be drawn from assimilated and from reformed groups. We must not only conserve already existing Zionist sentiment, but conquer the non-Zionists. To do this, a thorough educational policy as well as strict selective membership policy must be undertaken and adhered to."

The members of Avukah included "newcomers," "citizen members," and "graduate members," those who had graduated from university but actively pursued an interest in Avukah through "knowledge, attendance and service." Remarkably enough, this article also proposed that: "Under the heading of knowledge a definite course of prescribed study is to be included, to be followed by all members of grade "A." At the end of these courses there are to be examinations and possibly the requirement of a thesis to be submitted by the individual applying for admittance to grade "B." For the "B" and "C" grade requirements of knowledge are to be fulfilled in discussion circles, particularly on current Jewish and Zionist events and study of Zionist problems and ideology." This illustrates the degree to which Avukah was designed as a vanguard movement, aiming to attract and train the very best Jewish students, and to submit them to rigorous training, students like Lawrence B. Cohen.

Of particular interest for an understanding of Avukah, and by extension some of the objectives of Zellig Harris's (eventual) work, is the *Annual* article by Jacob de Haas, formerly the secretary to Theodor Herzl and of the ZOA [Zionist Organization of America], and the author of books on Herzl and Louis D. Brandeis. De Haas's piece focuses upon the "intellectual task" of the Zionist Jew and, more specifically, the problem of making a generation of young Jews "Zion-conscious." This would involve extensive study of the Hebrew language, the Bible, and Jewish history, which would be directed by the Avukah vanguard: "Those learned in mass psychology or as skillful in advertising realities as others are in making known make-belief, will win this great pulsating Jewry to a new and puissant mood." This combination of intellectual engagement, scholarly work, belief and promotion of useful ideas comes to define a large amount of the work, such as developing worker self management, that Avukah would promote through the years of its existence and that would be carried on afterwards.

What's crucial, as the organization evolved and people like Lawrence B. Cohen joined, was Avukah's politics, and here we can begin to trace the link between ideas of worker organization discussed by Anton Pannekoek, Seymour Melman, and Lawrence B. Cohen, which are linked through the idea of controlling decision making and creating a social organization that fostered creative and productive labor. As regards Zellig Harris's politics, we find in the idea of the kibbutz the very basis of the type of society he hoped to foster. This is made clearer in an article published in the March 27, 1939 edition of *Avukah Student Action*, which also describes kibbutz life, and was also based on Hashomer Hatzair experience, this time recorded by Avraham Ben-Shalom in his book *Deep Furrows*. Entitled "Toward a New Society," this article suggests links between the new economic structure of the kibbutz and the new social forms and relationships being set up as a consequence, issues which come to be of great concern to Zellig Harris. "The kibbutz aims to have that kind of community whose harmonious, integrated and balanced social relationships will permit the fullest possible development of human possibilities. It is an attempt towards rational

planning, organization, and control of the community in order to set up the most adequate framework for the individual's growth and well being." Workers controlling decisions, in a rational network of connected organizations, is thus the basis of the attitude that runs through later works of Melman, Harris and, as is clear in this manuscript, this general attitude can also be found in this work by a former Avukahite who was close to Avukah's central and guiding members.

In 1939, a young student by the name of Seymour Melman received an Avukah travel fellowship, which he used for travel to the World Zionist Congress in Geneva, and then on the Kibbutz Artzi near Haifa. There he met up with some of his friends, such as Sylvia Binder (who had been the secretary of Avukah in 1935), and made acquaintance with Arabs, Poles (Poland had just been overrun by the Nazis) and Palestinians. Melman became an important figure, firstly because of his growing involvement in Avukah, and second because he became over the years a close friend of both Zellig Harris and, later on, of Noam Chomsky. Melman was often mentioned in Avukah newspapers and publications, including an article, in *Avukah Student Action* of December 2, 1940, called "Meet.... Seymour Melman." He is described therein as being "Avukah's omnipresent Field Organizer," a "legendary figure" who is "affectionately called Schmelke." He had started as an economics major at City College where, as a freshman, he "somehow strayed into Avukah and immediately invented, advertised, and reputed the now famous Pamphlet Service." Then, "triumph followed triumph, from chapter president to Palestine Fellow for 1939-40 to his present distinction of having said more to more people than can be imagined." Finally, he was described as "the most accomplished Yiddish dialectician we know" and, from a range of sources, as a very charismatic person.

The Transformation of Capitalist Society and Worker Self Management

Avukah was disbanded in 1942 as a small group of amazing women, including Irene Schumer (the presumed president), worked to move the organization to focus upon saving Jews from the unfolding Holocaust, rather than working towards international socialism based in Palestine. Nonetheless, the ideas it developed weren't abandoned, and indeed we can see basic principles in the writings of Melman, Cohen and Zellig Harris, whose posthumous book *The Transformation of Capitalist Society* (Rowan and Littlefield 1997) contains some of the very ideas that Cohen develops in his manuscript. The *Transformation* book is rooted in decades of research undertaken for a "Frame of Reference for Social Change"³ project which was, as the preface states, "based on a stated political purpose" plus "existing, rather than new, data" aimed at bolstering the objective of eliminating class rule and "changing out of capitalism." This is, therefore, a quest to change contemporary (American) society "in the direction of having much more nearly equal allocation, efficient production, and lack of controlling and controlled behaviour" (preface). It's worth looking to some of the project's objectives before turning to the *Transformation* book since it offers some of the basic ideas found therein in an earlier form.

The Frame of Reference project draws from some "standard" social science investigations, and, moreover, work done outside standard frameworks, and for the most part "the theory is generally Marxist." Nevertheless, "pure Marxist vocabulary doesn't cover many of the new problems" in society in part because it was "developed at a time when

³ This is an unpublished, unsigned, and not-dated manuscript which was presumably worked on for many years, beginning sometime in the 1940s, and which was deposited in the Penn library archives by Seymour Melman.

physical sciences were simply mechanistic, and are not well suited to express processes that are in constant (though uneven) change and whose interaction with each other cannot be disregarded." Current conditions are assessed from a more comprehensive standpoint, but the critique is specifically "radical;" despite the fact that many leftists had given up on radicalism in favor of "small reforms" because of a perceived "limitation of the possible," this study takes the opposite course with the assumption that contemporary methods of scientific inquiry allow for new optimism. In this sense, the project is based on similar assumptions about scientific progress as were previously described in discussions about linguistics, and upon ideas that problems need new articulation to meet the rigid scientific criteria: "Not only the temper of modern science, but also the requirement of more exact prediction, lead us to seek ways of talking that express all this better." Among the main terms employed for this work are:

Treatment of the business routine as a simultaneous production-signaling and consumption-allocating system; analysis of productional (allocational) activities into signal-giving, activities necessary for the carrying out of the signaling-allocating routine; managerial and technical integration of output activities (not including business managership), and actual output (directly producing items consumed as standard of living); claims on labor hours, as an expression of the exchange features of money (but not credit, etc.) and also certain non-money relations in and out of capitalism. (preface)

This new terminology is put to the service of "extensive methodologically controlled observations and considerations" about personal ends, with the assumption that scientific and technical investigation can be put to the service of effective political action. This is not to say that individuals cannot take "effective political action by use of intuitive judgments or after trial and error," but rather that this type of inquiry can help bolster efforts aimed at effective action through interdependent consideration of intuitive and "scientific" approaches. Interestingly as regards previous discussions of Einstein's influence on social sciences and humanities is the point that a fundamental critique of current conditions is advanced through the "relativism of scientific method," which helps account for "observer bias."

The largely behaviorist framework which underwrites Harris's linguistic project is present here as well, suggesting that the link between the politics and the linguistics is a shared conception of the nature of the human mind. This is clear throughout the study, and is articulated at the very outset with the rejection of the idea that people have a "fixed human nature," and the suggestion, "derived in the following chapters," that "behavior is determined by conditions" (23ba), and that people learn "patterned" (institutional) behavior, notably of how to interrelate and how to satisfy their needs, from the society in which they live.

30 c) The individual learns these ranges of behavior from infancy on; he thence develops what we may call particular expectations of behavior of particular other persons or groups, and generally acts in accordance with particular expectations which particular others have of him. For the most part, he would not know how to satisfy his needs by himself, and would not have available the means to do so.

30 d) These patterned ways (including avoidance) are for these persons the only utilized means of satisfying their needs (the only means that these people are 'prepared' to use), so that their continuation becomes a need in itself; except to the extent that these ways are gradually changing or that they may begin to fail to satisfy needs.

Pervasive as well, even in the setting out of these categories, is the sense that the science of behavioral studies can yield information about what motivates people to act, providing some sense of how to change society in a positive direction. "Any study of this type gives the leftist some picture of his possible effectiveness, thus removing some of the uneasiness which so many leftists have felt as to their role in the course of events. For this uneasiness derives not only from the present lack of visible successes, but also from what is not yet known about the processes of social change" (22fb). This is indeed the "political purpose of the writers" of this report, who put this version of "scientific" and "empirical" operations analysis to work on issues relating to interaction among people (12b). This work requires a new type of social science research which doesn't suffer from the inadequacies of Marxist analysis as regards "culture and character," and which hasn't been developed within the "capitalist matrix," and therefore "applied for control and maintenance of class relations."

But leftists have a not unrelated question to ask; what ways are there of changing from the present power relations and business system. A good many of the investigations, data, and methods developed in answering the capitalist questions can also be used in the use of answering the leftist one (though very many are unscientific or irrelevant in their categories or problems); in some cases investigations (like psychoanalysis) develop which are only partially usable in capitalism but which leftists can develop more fruitfully. In using the data, sophistication, etc., of the social sciences in answering our own questions we have to check and modify them for our own investigations." (12ba)

A whole range of issues are discussed as a means of understanding these problems and advancing towards the stated ends. The layout of the text follows the systematic style typical of Harris and the other authors, beginning with the types of methodological foundations just described, an assessment of the relevant elements such as available technology, decision-making for production and allocation, division of labor, correlations between personnel and productional functions, methods of control, and the relationship between decisions systems and social ways in the contemporary society. The manuscript then moves to consider how these elements can be changed, what relation these changes have upon social relations as a whole, alternative futures in terms of decision-making and class rule, and strategies of political action appropriate for the desired ends. This is a long and complex project, difficult to summarize without reference to details discussed, but a few areas are worth assessing in light of *The Transformation of Capitalist Society*. Significant discussions of transitions from one power to another occur, for example, leading to reflections upon the conditions of change from business rule to some other kind of rule, or from management decision making to worker decision making:

63 a) The increasing difficulties in the business patterned class rule may lead, not to modifying the ruling group and freeing it from the business pattern,

but to a sharp struggle between defenders and opponents of business rule, which may end with the replacement of the business rulers by entirely new rulers. The new rulers and the reorganization would not come in with the cooperation and personal participation of part of the signaling group.

63 b) Such developments may occur when the dissatisfaction of the productional occupations is great and cannot be allayed by anything that the business signalers [decision makers] are free to do.

This transformation may not be sustainable, of course, depending upon "the form of production of technology, the division of labor that has grown around it, the kind of productional interdependence," and "the techniques of signaling production and of group interaction available to the people at the time the old ruling patterns are discarded" (63 ac-ad). Much of this area of the discussion relates to workers control and worker decision making, which lead the authors to suggest that "a necessary step toward elimination of class rule would therefore be if production signaling (the real veto power in production decisions) became an automatic part of the system of production, or were democratically decided by all producers or consumers, or were carried out by an occupational group which any individual could enter or leave fairly freely" (64 ba).

On the basis of the detailed assessment offered of the current situation, the authors present a range of possible useful social action, including:

action tending to separate the output integrators from the signalers and their managerial functionaries; action associating the output integrators... with other output personnel (technicians, workers) by division of labor adjustments, political collaboration, social contact, etc.; action reducing the participation of output personnel in lower reaches of business-process signaling -- this participation being one of the factors in the continued acceptance by the output personnel of the inefficient and scarcity-maintaining system of signaling; action to circumvent the effect of the growing non-output occupations..., etc. (74 fa)

These efforts should be coupled with "developing the potential advantages of non-class-rule," (74 fd) developing a "strong critique of present social organization" (74 fe), providing a "blueprint" for the beginning of the next society on the basis of detailed accounts of what didn't work in class society, and so forth, all of which can help guide the actions of those involved in "considered intervention", including individual or small radical groups. The criteria for effective action is to be determined on the basis of prevailing form of social organization, developments in world politics, cultural issues, and the way that the ruling classes choose to act and to respond:

Certain situations developed by the ruling class necessitate a complete reconsideration of the possibilities for the forms of the class struggle; the development of psychological, sociological, and even medical forms of control raises the question of how counter-measures can be developed and whether the output occupations can be really checked; the development of military techniques raises the question of whether and in what form military revolts will be possible in the future, and whether political disorganization of the military will be possible; finally, the occurrence of world wars (largely at

times when popular dissatisfaction due to the inefficiencies of the system is increasing) is a major complication in the class struggle. (74 gb)

This is the area of the work which ties concerns with political change to elements of control and potential, that is, the "media of interaction" which is "controlled by the signalers and their supporters, who also impose upon the people participation in them (i.e. subjection to their activities): church, certain features of the family, education, media of information, amusements, political machines, commitment of the government to maintain production in terms of the signaling-allocation system" (38 ec).

A society without class rule thus depends upon the creation, and naming of conditions adequate for the erection of a new form of power relation in society. A range of preconditions and developments are thus set out as relating to this transformation, including inequalities of allocation, relatively high overhead for production, the availability of "plenty", continued industrialization, increasing knowledge of how humans cooperate, the division-of-labor developments, and so forth. The obstacles are vast, however, and assessed in this study in terms of material, technological, cultural, historical, and psychological factors, including a full scale assessment of how a proper decision making approach can be fostered, to ensure self management. The Cohen manuscript that follows is at the very heart of this debate and discussion, and we hope that by publishing it now, so many years after its having been written, that it will stir renewed interest in such questions.