Lukács, G. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Marx, K. 1963. "Critique of Hegel's Dialectic and General Philosophy." In *Karl Marx: Early Writings*, ed. T. B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill.
McLennan, G.; Molina, V.; and Peters, R. 1978. "Althusser's Theory of Ideology." In *On Ideology*, ed. B. Schwarz et al. London: Hutchinson.
Mills, C. W. 1967. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
O'Kane, J. 1999a. "Jameson and Method: Postmodern Negative Dialectics." *Socialist Review*.
———. 1999b. "Antitheses of Cultural Marxism." *Left Curve* 23 (Spring).
Pfister, J. 1991. "The Americanization of Cultural Studies." *Yale Journal of Criticism* 4 (2).
Resnick, S. and Wolff, R. 1989. *Knowledge and Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sartre, J.-P. 1968. *Search for a Method*. New York: Vintage Books.
———. 1990. *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. London: Verso.
Shumway, D. 1989. "Jameson, Hermeneutics, Postmodernism." In *Postmodernism, Jameson, Critique*, ed. D. Kellner. Washington: D.C.: Maisonneuve Press.
Williams, R. 1978. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wise, C. 1993. "Jameson's Dialectical Aesthetics." *Rethinking Marxism* 6 (Winter): 66–86.
Zuidervaart, L. 1989. "Realism, Modernism, and the Empty Chair." In *Postmodernism, Jameson, Critique*, ed. D. Kellner. Washington, D.C.: Maisonneuve Press.

Rethinking MARXISM Volume 10, Number 4 (Winter 1998)

Bridging the Gap between New Social Movement Theory and Class

Stephen Philion

The stance of new social movement theory toward class has often been one of suspicion, if not outright rejection (Scott 1990). New social movements emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s, and appeared to be replacing labor as the subject of history, thereby simultaneously refuting and offering an alternative to Marxist class analysis. In the United States, new social movements were most visible in the form of civil rights and anti–Vietnam War protests during the 1960s and feminist, black power, gay rights, antinuclear, environmental, and welfare-rights protests during the 1970s and 1980s. The apparent strength of these movements seemed to confirm postwar mainstream (and often critical) social science's theoretical postulates that class conflict was no longer the (or even a) central factor in explicating social conflict and that capitalism had developed the capacity to resolve its inner contradictions without the mediating variable of working class–based social revolution (Meszaros 1989).

What I seek to accomplish in this article are the following: (1) a critical examination of how and why new social movement theory departed from Marxist class analysis, (2) a focus on and critique of three objections to the latter commonly found in the new social movement paradigm, and (3) to demonstrate how an alternative conceptual framework that employs the language of class makes it possible to bridge the gaps between the two.

New Social Movement Theory

Despite the contemporary paradigm of unfettered global capitalism and the renewed elucidation of class polarization, mainstream and even left critical theorists still find it difficult to conceive of working class–based organization and resistance as the critical agent of social change in the future. If anything, the likelihood seems to be all the more minimized by virtue of the collapse of state socialism in Eastern Europe. At the same time, in light of the incapacity of new social movements to transform social relations without labor's active participation (Navarro 1988; 1991, 54–6; Miliband 1989, 109–12), social movement theorists have been pushed to reconsider the relationship of class to social movements, in both theory and praxis. However, despite occasional rethinking about class and social movements that appears in new social movement theory, there remains nonetheless a resistance to the Marxist focus on working-class agency. This ambivalence toward class, as it has been conceptualized by Marxist class analysis, can be tracked to new social movement theory's ties to Frankfurt School theory. In this respect, three prominent new social movement theorists—Antonio Melucci (1989), Klaus Eder (1993), and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1987)—are worth reviewing.

The Frankfurt School

New social movement theory has its roots in the Frankfurt School's rejection of Marx's class primacy thesis, which stresses the historically structured and strategically pivotal role of the working class in the struggle for social emancipation (Marcuse 1964; Habermas 1975; 1985, 338–55). While the Frankfurt School produced numerous theorists who applied critical theory to diverse fields, Herbert Marcuse and Jürgen Habermas have been most visibly influential on contemporary new social movement theorists (Scott 1990, 80). While both retained the Marxist critique of alienation under capitalism, nonetheless they contended that capitalism underwent a discernible sea change in the postwar era, one that distinguished it from the nineteenth-century industrialism that so much influenced Marx's theorization of capitalism.

These two theorists drew on Daniel Bell's *The End of Ideology* (1965), which proclaimed that capitalism was no longer characterized by class polarization. Instead, the working class was becoming progressively incorporated into middle-class consumer society, with less and less concern about material issues; hence the term "post-material society" (Bell 1973). Through the mechanism of the Fordist "social contract," workers and their unions could be kept satisfied via collectively bargained pay raises and would give up their claim to social revolutionary agency. There was a clear rejection of Marx's historical materialism by the proclaimers of a new, more "complex" postmaterialist capitalism. Since postwar capitalism could, through its own devices, soothe (to one degree or another) class-based antagonisms between labor and capital, workers and their unions acted in their own interests accordingly, namely by *not* resisting (openly)

the Fordist paradigm of production. While perhaps during earlier epics of capitalist development workers had had clear, materially based motivations to organize and oppose capitalism, with the advent of the Fordist American Century, there was little if any reason for workers to oppose the logic of capitalist production. Culture, for the Frankfurt School, became a new and critical site of resistance as middle-class populations began to question the meaning of suburban lifestyles, the organization of urban life, traditional conformist and hierarchical modes of social relations associated with the former productivist-oriented regime of capitalist production, war-making projects, and so forth. Likewise, in lieu of resisting capitalism on the basis of one's relation to the means of life, "individuals" in a postmaterial society mobilized oppositional movements around cultural identity–oriented, single-issue struggles.

For Marcuse, *ideology* was the main impediment to qualitative change of the social relations of production under the regime of postmaterial capitalism. In his view, "To the degree which freedom from want, the concrete substance of all freedom, is becoming a real possibility, the liberties which pertain to a state of lower productivity are losing their former content. Independence of thought, autonomy, and the right to political opposition are being deprived of their basic critical function in a society which seems increasingly capable of satisfying the needs of the individuals through the way it is organized" (1964, 1). While material needs were satisfied by a postmaterial capitalism, other desires for human liberation remained unmet and even more repressed in modern capitalist society. Consciousness of these desires and the role of capitalist production in repressing them would stimulate new forms of social rebellion, which had the potential to overhaul the dehumanizing stultification of the human spirit engendered by technological fetishism and bureaucratic-instrumental rationality in advanced capitalist countries. The agents of rebellion, however, would not be traditional blue-collar workers, since they were largely bought off by capital and accepted all too willingly the need to conform to instrumental forms of rationality in return for their share of the collectively bargained pie. Rather, oppositional agents would consist of those for whom the cultural logic of postmaterial capitalism did not work, namely ethnic/gender/sexual "minorities," youth, and populations of the third world (Marcuse 1969; 1972). Whether these social groups revolted would be determined not so much by material conditions as by their capacity to see through the limits of the rationality of "capitalist abundance" and to fight that logic *despite* their vested material interests in the reproduction of the system. At the core of revolt was, then, the need to break down the multifarious devices of social control available to capital (technology and commodity worship in advertising, media entertainment, meaningless newspeak, anticommunism, etc.) to prevent individuals from recognizing that they were becoming less and less human in the process of unquestioningly going through their life routines in the workplace, becoming what C. Wright Mills called "cheerful robots" (1959, 175).

Jürgen Habermas theorized the types of crises that advanced capitalism faced and asked, "whither is economic crisis displaced?" (1975, 40).

> Modern capitalism faces crises of administration, or legitimacy: Legitimation problems cannot be reduced to problems of capital realization. Because a class compromise has been made the foundation of reproduction, the state apparatus must fulfill its tasks in the economic system under the limiting condition that mass loyalty be simultaneously secured within the framework of a formal democracy and in accord with ruling universalistic value systems. These pressures of delegitimization can be mitigated only through structures of a depoliticized public realm. (58–9)

Habermas and his epigones asserted that while crises under Marx's industrial capitalism were more directly laborer/capitalist in origin, under advanced capitalism the welfare state replaces the capitalist as the object of oppositional activity (O'Connor 1973; Offe 1972). So long as the state is able to avoid crises of legitimation, the reproduction of capitalist accumulation proceeds smoothly. Various non-class-based constituencies replace the working class–based movement of the past as the agent that can and will challenge the alienation created by instrumental rationality.

> In the past decade or two, (new) conflicts have developed in advanced Western societies . . . They no longer flare up in domains of material production . . . Rather, these new conflicts arise in domains of cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization . . . The issue is not primarily one of compensations that the welfare state can provide, but of defending and restoring endangered ways of life . . . [T]he new conflicts are not limited by distribution problems but by questions having to do with the grammar of forms of life. (Habermas 1985, 392)

Alberto Melucci

While Marcuse and Habermas wrote from different angles on similar topics of concern, both shared a certain ideational focus, which emphasized class compromise and the need to locate new social actors who would oppose the logic or, better, the ideologies of capitalist production through struggles that were not based primarily on economic motivation. On this score, Alberto Melucci very much follows suit. As he asserts in his seminal *Nomads of the Present,* "In complex societies material production is increasingly replaced by the production of signs and social relations. Systemic conflicts centre on the ability of groups and individuals to control the conditions of their own action . . . Society's capacity to produce information, communications and sociability depends upon an increasing level of self-reflexiveness and upon the self reproduction of action itself" (1989, 45–6).

Melucci is concerned with social movements as agents of emancipation and the process through which they emerge. He seeks to capture the "network of relationships which constitutes the submerged reality of the movements before, during, and after events" (45). This feature is perhaps the most refreshing part of his work since it rejects the widespread tendency in the social sciences to see a movement only when thousands of people are in the street engaged in some sort of "collective action." Melucci recognizes that movements consist of reflexive social actors who are constantly reflecting on the meaning and strategies of their movement, and that often

these interpretations explain the success or failure of movements. Or, put in another way, after the demonstration effect of an action, the organizing dynamic of a movement continues; unnoticed perhaps, but continuing nonetheless: "Because collective action questions the system's structural logic, it is destined to reproduce itself beyond the forms of mediation that can interpret it." (57)

Melucci contends that, in complex (i.e., advanced industrialized) societies, individuals have increasing amounts of resources available to them, which enable them to "assert and recognize themselves as individuals" (113). These resources include mass education and extended rights of citizenship. With them, individuals have increased capacities and desires to formulate their own sense of identity, one free of external state or corporate coercion. Discussing the ecological movement, Melucci writes, "Ecological problems not only affect individuals in so far as they belong to a group, a class or a nation; they also affect *individuals as such.* The protection of the species that can be assured only by a new equilibrium between individuals and nature is a problem that today affects the lives of everyone" (97).

Klaus Eder

Klaus Eder appears more willing to treat the category of class as yet viable and relevant to social movement struggles and development. In *The New Politics of Class: Social Movements in Advanced Societies,* at first glance he promises an integration of class analysis and new social movement theory.

> Class action has always been seen as mediated by *class consciousness.* This consciousness was . . . seen as determined by class—and thus a circular argumentation emerged. The circularity has been avoided by the two options that were offered within this model: either by the collective consciousness of those acting together, or by the objective togetherness of actors given by their class position. This polarization has characterized Marxist discussions on class—without opening up a way out of the theoretical deadlock. (1993, 8)

Ideally, Eder would offer us a way out of this deadlock. His solution, however, is to highlight and insist on the centrality of the "middle classes" in new social movements who, by virtue of their resources and lifestyle, are opposed to the economistic-instrumental rationality of both the dominating and dominated classes. Eder wishes to reconstruct a discourse of class that conforms to the realities of contemporary, "complex" capitalism. He asserts that the classical Marxist concept of a bifurcated class structure, in which opposition to the social order will be structured by objective material interests, is no longer useful as a framework either to explicate or to strategize movements for social change (90–2). What is more helpful, rather, is to examine links between the present class structure in "complex societies" and cultural expressions of opposition to institutions that administer instrumental rationality. Which experiences of really existing and significant class cultures promise to be in the forefront of social movements that oppose the logic of instrumental rational-

ity? It is in his discussion of ecological crises that Eder most lucidly spells out the reasons he posits the "new middle class" as a uniquely positioned class in complex society in terms of oppositional potential.

> The groups comprising an emerging "new middle class" in advanced modern societies differ from historical precursors. They appear as carriers of a new type of society—doubly opposed to the class structure of industrial society: opposed to its dominant classes and opposed to the dominated classes . . . [It] is the potential carrier of counter-culture tradition . . . The ecological crisis contributes to the further socio-cultural crystallization of this new class because it is this class that it affects most directly. The relationship with nature has always had a central significance for the petit-bourgeois lifestyle . . . The ecological crisis threatens the life-world of middle class groups more than that of any other. These middle class groups are emotionally tied not only to a just world but to a good world to live in and they react much more intensely to the effects of exploiting (pollution) the natural environment . . . [T]he new middle classes are the potential carriers of a new relationship with nature. (134–5)

The ecological crisis, then, presents an exciting opportunity for social movements and possesses great potential for oppositional movements by virtue of the *subjective* class experiences of the new middle classes, which render them both capable and likely to mobilize a *moral* opposition to the destruction of the environment brought on by the economistic/instrumental ideologies that both capital and labor unions endorse. Eder is thus able to expand new social movement theory by rejecting the traditional Marxist conceptualization of class as defined by objective material interests *and* at the same time retaining a concept of class that gives greater attention to subjective interests (163–5, 172–6). Class is a social construction that shapes the culturally distinct praxis of collective action (183). How the middle classes relate to each other and the social system, as a result of their collective practices rather than their objective material conditions, is the central issue for new social movement theory (182), and that which holds the key to the expression of class-based collective action in a postmaterial society. This is, ultimately, Marx minus proletarianization and crises of overproduction. Nonetheless, it is a step in the direction of challenging new social movement theory to take seriously its conceptualization of and relationship with class.

Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe

Laclau and Mouffe's *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Toward a Radical Democratic Politics* (1987) is a work that aims to integrate socialist strategy with a non-materialist framework, which sees no basis for any one subject's claim to historical subjectivity. Although others have already provided powerful criticisms of their reading of Marxist theory (Wood 1986, 47–75; Geras 1990, 59–168; Stabile 1994), it remains helpful to be clear where they see their framework departing from Marx's historical materialism and the implications for new social movement theory.

According to Laclau and Mouffe, there is a need for an alternative to a theory of history that has posited that the extant plurality of working-class interests can be overcome as a result of the internal laws of capitalist development or that "an absolutely united working class will become transparent to itself at the moment of proletarian chiliasm" (1987, 84). For them, the critical point of departure from Marx is on the critical (or determinate) role of economic processes vis-à-vis social change and resistance. Even Gramsci, despite the amount of importance his theory of hegemony attached to expanding points of resistance beyond the workplace simple, is to be rejected because of his insistence that subjects comprise fundamental classes and that social formations are structured around a single hegemonic center (138). They propose that socialist strategy should not "privilege" the notion of class (or any) subjectivity and, instead, should develop a new theoretical problematic.

> Here, the alternative is clear: either one has a theory of history according to which this contradictory plurality [of working-class interests] will be eliminated . . . in which case (the working class's) "objective interests" can be determined from the very beginning; or else one abandons the theory and, with it, any basis for privileging certain subject positions over others in the determination of the "objective interests" of the agent as a whole—in which case the latter notion becomes meaningless . . . [F]undamental interests in socialism cannot be logically deduced from the determinate positions in the economic process. (84–5)

Thus, the central problem becomes the identification of "discursive conditions" that provide the foundation for collective action to emerge or to "identify the conditions in which a relation of subordination becomes a relation of oppression, and thereby constitutes itself into the site of an antagonism" (153). They propose, more concretely, that the terrain of struggle be extended beyond "mere" class-based issues to those of the broader frontiers of "citizenship"-oriented struggles. They contend that capitalist relations in the postwar era have intensified to the point where they subordinate the whole constellation of social relations to the logic of commodity production for profit (160–1). Hence the conclusion that capitalist relations can and should be contested on all levels, and no more or less than at the level of class: "that 'new' antagonisms are the expression of forms of resistance to the commodification, bureaucratization and increasing homogenization of social life itself explains why they should frequently manifest themselves through a proliferation of particularisms, and crystallize into a demand for autonomy itself . . . The last in time of these 'new social movements', and without doubt one of the most active at the present moment, is the peace movement" (165).

Although Laclau and Mouffe have been taken to task for their liberal rereading of Marxist historical materialism, they do pose a serious challenge to Marxist class analysis or, at least, one that needs to be taken seriously if we are to overcome some of their most serious theoretical flaws (Diskin and Sandler 1993). To begin with, it should be noted that their theoretical purpose is to design a socialist strategy that is able to articulate itself beyond merely a traditional working-class base, which they regard as one of the central defects of Marxist class analysis. At best, we could even give them credit for (unwittingly) pushing Marxist class analysis to have to theorize the link between

"traditional" class-based movement struggles and "new social movements." Many left and liberal academics and activists are attracted to Laclau and Mouffe's analysis precisely because, as Barbara Epstein writes, "it speaks a language that has much more resonance for these people than Marxism ever could" (1990, 51).

Three Theses of New Social Movement Theory

Despite the apparent appeal, it is precisely the notion that classical Marxist class theory is unable to speak a language that is relevant (both strategically and morally) to the outwardly disparate and fragmented interests of participants in "new social movements" that I aim to challenge. Before embarking on that task, however, let us first consider some common challenges to classic class analysis found in the theoretical works of Melucci, Eder, and Laclau and Mouffe.

1. Social conditions of production have qualitatively changed since the days of Marx's *Capital,* particularly since the postwar era, such that societies (in the advanced regions of the global capitalist political economy) are now "postmaterial." The laws of capitalist development that Marx proclaimed internal to the logic of capitalist production, particularly the increasing proletarianization and impoverishment of working sectors of the population, are no longer at work.
2. A class compromise between labor and capital has been reached in the advanced regions of the postwar, global capitalist political economy. As a result, new non-working-class, cultural/identity-based social movements have become the main agents of social protest and change, replacing the traditional class-based movements of the past.
3. The "economistic" logic of class-based movements is incompatible with what motivates new social movements, which accounts for the failure of class and new social movements to align. Furthermore, new social movement are (therefore) "naturally" middle class in composition.

In the following three sections I will attempt to demonstrate the problems, theoretically and empirically situated, with all three of the above theses.

Postmaterial Capitalism?

It is increasingly apparent that new social movement theorists who cling to the "postmaterial" society notion that objective material conditions are no longer focal issues around which opposition to the social relations of capitalist production can be organized appear, as Ellen Wood puts it, "ill equipped to confront the problems of the here and now" (1995, 46). For example, Melucci illuminates how as the capitalist political

economy has developed, especially in the most advanced regions, the expansion of information technologies and media has rendered the choices and decisions that individuals face all the more complex. This phenomenon is closely linked not only to the development of new "information-based" technologies but also, and more critically, to the globalization of capitalist production, the political-economic effects of which, however, Melucci leaves out of his theoretical model. What the restructuring of the global political economy has generated, since roughly around the first oil shocks and the dismantling of Bretton Woods in the early 1970s, is what Brecher and Costello (1994a) as well as many other social scientists (Broad 1995; Piven and Cloward 1995; Palat 1996; Ross and Trachte 1990; Tilly 1995) now term the global "race to the bottom."

> In 1993, President Clinton unexpectedly acknowledged that there was a "global crisis of unemployment." He noted ". . . [W]e have to figure out how to unlock the doors for people who are left behind in this new global economy." In Europe and Canada unemployment has risen to 11%; it is at historic highs in Japan . . . In the US, unemployment remained near its recession peak after several years of "jobless recovery"; more than 60% of the new jobs created in 1993 were part-time. [For OECD's 24 countries] the official unemployment rate is 8.5%. According to [UN] estimates, there are some 700 million people currently unemployed or underemployed in the developing world. (Brecher and Costello 1994a, 27)

For the working populations in newly industrialized countries (all the rave of development theorists in the 1980s), "development" has come to take on quite a unique meaning. Unlike its Western European and North American counterparts for whom development served as a foundation from which social democratic parties (or in the U.S. case, a liberal party, aligned with organized labor) could pressure the state to implement redistributive social programs, the East Asian newly industrialized countries model has, thus far, only been able to provide its working populations with development plus capital flight, minimal welfare-state reforms, repressive labor regimes that deny workers basic organizing rights, and urban environmental disaster zones (Brecher and Costello 1994a, 24; Deyo 1992; Palat 1996; Smith 1997). For working people in "Third World" nation-states, the ramifications of global "flexible accumulation" are all the more potentially devastating.

> Almost 1/3rd of the population of developing countries, 1.3 billion people, live in absolute poverty—too poor to provide the minimum diet required for full human functioning. It is argued that foreign investment will raise wages in poor countries. But a review of US corporate behavior abroad . . . found that "rather than raising standards of living, American firms are more likely to be paying no better than local minimum wages" . . . [I]n Indonesia—now a favorite spot for companies like Nike and Reebok—88% of woman earning the Indonesian minimum wage were malnourished. (Brecher and Costello 1994a, 24)

Women in the "third world" are most vulnerable and likely to be employed in labor-intensive industries that provide low wages, no job security or mobility, dangerous work conditions, and the like (Ong 1991).

Nor has the impact of global downracing stopped at the doorstep of the advanced regions of global capitalism. While between 1979 and 1989 the real annual pay of (U.S.) corporate chiefs rose by 19 percent, and 66 percent after taxes (Head 1996, 47), average real weekly earnings in the United States (which came to $300 in 1969, compared with $264.22 in 1990) continue to fall (*Business Week* 1995). In lieu of the middle-class way of life, so glorified as the ultimate refutation of Marxist class analysis in Daniel Bell's *The End Of Ideology* (1965), the "middle classes" in advanced capitalist countries of the West see a future of what can only be described as progressive proletarianization and decreasing "autonomy" (Hutton 1996, 15–9). An article in the London *Sunday Times* comments on the situation of the British middle class, one which could well be applied to the rest of the advanced capitalist nation-states:

> In the uncertainty of life in Britain today, one fact stands out: the middle classes are getting poorer. Nor is this a temporary phenomenon. In any future we can foresee, they will get even poorer . . . A decade ago, it was assumed the working class would slowly disappear as it fulfilled its aspirations and became absorbed into an enlarged middle class. Instead, the opposite has happened, with the middle classes being overtaken by the chronic uncertainty and worry that has always gone with working class life. (Gray 1994)

In the United States, since 1982, temping has increased two and a half times, such that it comprises two thirds of new private-sector jobs. The likelihood of poverty for families of part-time workers is six times greater than the national average. At the same time, hours worked by these same workers has actually increased, with a commensurate *reduction* in health insurance and other benefits (Brecher and Costello 1994a, 23).

Alas, however, although such empirical data demonstrate the thin ice on which much of new social movement theory skates when it accepts the premise of post-materialism, we are still left with a substantive challenge—namely, what is the relationship between class and new social movement constituencies? What does Marxist class analysis have to offer them? In answering these questions satisfactorily, perhaps we can finally reduce the hold that new social movement theory has over much of social science and activists.

The Marxist Class Analysis Alternative

One theorist who offers a number of noteworthy answers is the eco-Marxist James O'Connor, in an article on the "second contradiction of capitalism." Synthesizing the works of Marx and Polanyi, O'Connor examines the notion of "conditions of production," which include the personal, community, and "external" or environmental conditions of production. A condition of production "consists of everything that is treated as if it is a commodity even though it is not produced as a commodity in accordance with the law of value or law of markets" (1992, 1–2). Through such an inclusive definition, O'Connor aims to treat labor-power, land and nature, and urban organization as equally important categories and, in the process, bridge the gap between social movements and Marxist critique.

Engaging a traditional Marxist political economy framework, O'Connor contends that there are two contradictions of capitalism: "overproduction," the natural drive on the part of capital to drive down wages and increase productivity to make up for falling rates of profit, and "underproduction," or the costs incurred in that process from underrealization of surplus-value and/or costs on nature (e.g., ecological crises rendering production less and less profitable, let alone possible). The basic cause of the second contradiction is capitalism's self-destructive appropriation and use of labor-power, space, and external nature or environment. The present-day crisis of health, education, and the family, the urban crisis, and the ecological crisis exemplify this self-destructiveness (4–5). Without imposing massive environmental havoc on the world's working peoples, global capital would have been unable to attain the growth rates it did achieve, at least during its peak period before the oil shocks of the 1970s (4). Thus, social movements that arise in response to these unintended consequences of "growth" policies are intrinsically challenging capital's capacity to be flexible. No less than traditional trade union–based movements, they are challenging capital and are therefore, theoretically speaking, quite capable of possessing a subjectivity within the framework of classical Marxist class analysis.

O'Connor rightly notes that new social movements face increasing surveillance and repression from the state and that, faced with such state/capital-sponsored hostility, it would be wise for them and working class–based movements to build alliances: "All the old issues once addressed by classical socialism—inequality, social injustice . . . —have reappeared . . . What better time for labor and the left, labor and the environmental and feminist movements to sublate themselves into a new eco-socialism, an eco-feminism, and eco-urbanism—in short a new movement that can change the history of the world? For the better, this time" (10). This appeal that both engage in some kind of reconciliation for the sake of survival does certainly contain more than a kernel of sensibility (Bellamy-Foster 1993). However, although O'Connor's theorization of the second contradiction of capitalism poses a challenge to the contention that traditional Marxist political economy has little to offer new social movements, we are still left with some problems that remain, for the moment, unresolved. For example, is there any hope for a working class that has entered into a "class compromise"? More important, aren't new social movements predominantly movements of the middle class? Finally, since much emphasis has been on "discourses," does Marxist class analysis have an alternative to the discourse produced by new social movement theory, one that can help to bridge the gap between the two?

Class Compromise?

The idea that there has been a class compromise in effect between labor and capital in the advanced capitalist political economies since the postwar era began is one that holds a considerable amount of currency in much mainstream and critical sociology. Recent revisionist historical scholarship has reviewed the record of the actual

interaction between labor and capital during this era with some interesting findings, particularly with regard to the U.S. case, where the phenomenon of class compromise was thought to be most thoroughly institutionalized (Draper 1994; Dubovsky 1994; Fantasia 1988; Goldfield 1987; Levy 1994; Moody 1988, 41–69). While there does exist a strongly embedded business unionist ideology that has characterized the leadership of labor unions, especially since the 1950s, the idea that a compromise between labor and capital was harmoniously worked out during the postwar era, or in any era for that matter, seriously wipes out historical initiatives on the part of capital that made it all but unlikely that postwar labor in the United States could pursue a militant strategy against capital without paying a very heavy price. Even after the remarkable strike waves of the 1930s and 1940s, U.S. business was still able to pressure the state to attack labor via redbaiting campaigns that resulted in exacerbating or helping to create fratricidal forms of factionalism. The end result, of course, came in the purges of the most militant (socialist, communist, and anarchist) labor activists and the legislative reversal of organizing rights originally secured under the Wagner Act, which culminated in the 1948 passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

> Taft Hartley went far beyond the wartime actions of the federal government. It not only curbed the strike power, but it curbed the union's capacity to organize as well. Union membership declined . . . thereafter . . . and recovered only slowly, reaching 18.9 million in 1968. [A]s percentage of the total work force, union membership was lower in 1968 than in 1947. In the nineteen "right to work" states where compulsory open shop legislation is permitted by Taft Hartley, union membership averages only half the proportion in the other states. *These are restriction that the unions bitterly opposed at the time, and that they have continued to oppose in the thirty years since the act passed.* But without success. (Piven and Cloward 1977, 166–170, emphasis mine; cf. Fantasia 1988, 59–71; Goldfield 1987, 20)

The critical point here is that the notion that the U.S. working class has engaged in a discursively equal class compromise simply fails to capture the balance of class power that made possible that "compromise." It also overlooks the role of earlier labor militancy in effecting changes in the social conditions of production, in a multitude of class and nonclass arenas (Lynd 1996). Indeed, the history of U.S. unionism has been marked by state repression of militant organized labor and support for more conservative leadership during every significant wave of strike activity and labor organizing (Dubofsky 1994, 31–40).

Furthermore, the incredible difficulty of organizing in the South, not a little impeded by the dominance of an economy based on cotton for export production that was intensely hostile to all kinds of unionization efforts of the sharecroppers who worked the fields (Anderson-Sherman and McAdam 1982), also contributed to the political weakness of labor whenever it sought to advance its interests in the legislative arena (Draper 1994). Quite possibly this factor, very much structured by objective material conditions of production, militated most significantly against the U.S. labor movement's attempts to resemble its more unified and militant counterpart in Europe.

This is not to deny that consciousness or ideology had a hand in labor's acceptance of the social contract of Fordism. Rather, I wish to stress that an essentialist view of the working class's "interest" in entering into that contract fails to take into account unequal relations of class power that overdetermined that decision and, more important, misrepresents those "interests" as though they were etched in granite. Indeed, the unequal and coercive setting in which labor settled for gains in the past should indicate that the structurally unequal and antagonistic nature of the relationship between capital and labor in the United States has not changed, even if the latter's capacity to extract concessions from capital, during certain junctures, occasionally experiences variation. Such considerations should at least caution us against accepting the first part of new social movement theory's second thesis.

That thesis also asserts that social movements are the new agents of social change, picking up where the working class–based movements left off after the latter made their Faustian class compromise. There are several problems that make this claim worthy of critical interrogation. The present state of social movements, especially in the United States, *as they are presently geared toward middle-class constituencies*, is a considerably weak and ineffective one (Stout 1996). Two of the most prominent new social movements, namely the feminist (Burk and Hartman 1996; Ryan 1997; Segal 1991; Stabile 1994, 1995) and environmental movements (Bellamy-Foster 1993), have suffered from their inability or even unwillingness to articulate their movements' goals in ways that could potentially win over larger numbers of the disenfranchised working class (e.g., working-class poor women, the inner-city poor, loggers, and others). With the emergence of this dilemma, the drawbacks of new social movement theory have become much more immediate for new social movements.

> The social movement operandi of the dominated forces has resulted in none of these movements achieving much. The United States has strong feminist . . . and ecological movements, but our women have fewer rights than those in societies with universal social programs and our environment is less protected . . . Progressive forces are currently pressuring the government to mandate parental leave without pay for childbirth, adoption, and/or sickness; the majority of developed capitalist countries already provide such benefits with pay. And . . . pollution levels in the US are higher than in other developed countries. (Navarro 1991, 54)

It is important to note that these criticisms of social movements, leveled by Navarro, are directed at their class politics. Such animadversions are no different from those that Marxist class analysis often directs at the U.S. labor movement leadership. This is very pertinent, especially when we consider new social movement theory's suspicious stance toward the often critical views of new social movements held by Marxist class analysis. New social movement theory often takes such criticisms of new social movements (as middle class or liberal) to mean that Marxist class analysis is inherently opposed to these movements or aims, consciously or unconsciously, to

devalue noneconomic forms of struggle morally.[1] Furthermore, the critical stance of Marxist class analysis toward new social movements and the former's insistence on "class primacy" is often taken to mean that it devalues these struggles or is hostile toward them. However, some of the most powerful criticisms of feminists' (Naiman 1996; Stabile 1994, 1995) and environmentalists' (Bellamy Foster 1993, 1995) opposition to Marxist class analysis come from Marxists who are clearly supportive of and active in those movements. Comments from Ralph Miliband on class primacy and new social movements are especially helpful in this regard.

> [Class] "[p]rimacy" does not mean domination or absorption. Nor . . . does it devalue the work of social movements, whose support labor movements would undoubtedly require in the advancement of their transformational endeavours. This support is not only a matter of additional numbers . . . It is also a matter of the contribution which new social movements can make—and have in fact already made—to the enrichment of the theory and practices of labour movements. For there can surely be no question that new social movements are the bearers of many ideas and practices which labor movements have traditionally tended to neglect, or . . . have opposed.
>
> To speak thus, however, is to assume certain affinities and possibilities of cooperation and alliance between labour movements . . . and social movements. (1989, 110)

Note that Miliband asserts that there are *certain* natural affinities, not *a* natural affinity between new social movements and labor movements. Hence the point is not to wish away or to submerge differences in agendas, but to take advantage of *similar* interests and build solidarity where it can be realistically constructed, by virtue of a shared opposition to the logic of capital (Harvey 1993). When we consider that those who suffer the worst from the logic of capital's global flexible production and accumulation are working class, poor minorities and/or poor women, and poor, polluted urban communities, there is certainly plenty more room for working class–based alliance-building than much of new social movement theory would lead one to believe was the case (Brecher and Costello 1994a, 1994b; Mann 1993b; Moody 1996).

If there is a call here, it is for something that, in fact, *already is happening* increasingly, though rarely acknowledged in the new social movement literature—that is, the transformation of social movements into class-based social movements, this time with a greater focus on organizing working-class constituencies in lieu of "middle-class" ones (Anner 1996; Mann 1993a, 1993b; Stout 1996). Likewise, there has been and continues to be much room for greater mobilization of what were once thought to be the constituencies of new social movements—namely, "minorities," immigrants, and women (and not necessarily in that order)—on the part of labor union movements. Indeed, this is precisely what is happening on a gradually larger scale within the U.S. labor movement, and new social movement theory should be both documenting and reconceptualizing the relationship between new social movement constituencies and labor in this age of global accumulation (Belkin 1996; Coughlin 1995; Brecher and Costello 1990; Grossinger 1989; Milkman 1993).

This type of optimism may be objected to by some (many?) scholars who will note that the weakness of both labor and social movements at present does not bode well for any new organizing projects. It is true that the deindustrialization of the Northeast and Midwest has created great losses of membership and resources for American labor unions. The increasing utilization of temporary workers does not leave union sympathizers with much to be excited about (Cook 1994), nor for that matter does capital's increased employment of immigrant laborers (Cooper 1997). This strategy only further depresses the overall wages paid to labor in the United States, all the more lessening the strength of labor at the bargaining table. Furthermore, media reports have portrayed blue-collar, white male workers as responding rather favorably to Pat Buchanan's anti-immigrant, "pro-labor" populist appeals—a man who served as press secretary to the president whose administration's attack on labor's rights to organize were unprecedented in the postwar era (Davis 1986)![2] How could class analysis theorize in anything but a gloomy manner after considering these phenomena?

However, there is also good reason to be wary of pessimism, from a class analysis perspective. For one, Goldfield points out that contrary to popular opinion, "[in the United States] there has been no sudden, stark, or 'spectacular' decline in either new union organizing or in union growth since 1937, 1948, or even 1954" when labor was at its peak in terms of union penetration of the labor force (1987, 231). Furthermore, new and stepped-up organizing drives of workers in the South are taking place and will continue, a phenomenon that could potentially finally enable labor to rid itself of its Achilles heel—namely, an underorganized Southern labor force. Further, there is a rethinking taking place in many major U.S. unions and concomitant aggressive unionizing campaigns in progress, which target women, racial minorities, and immigrants (Sweeney 1996). These three constituencies comprise the prime recruiting base for newly created "service-sector" jobs that provide low wages, job insecurity, long hours, and few or no benefits (Moberg 1996). Finally, U.S. labor unions have begun to reconsider and formulate new strategies for building alliances across borders to confront capital's strategy of global flexibility of production and labor markets (Stand 1993; Coughlin 1995; Brecher and Costello 1994b). All these developments (or opportunities) are shaped by the changing contours of the global

1. One recent historical work (Levy 1994), which documents the often positive interaction between the New Left in the United States and labor union activists, leaves one inclined to doubt the presumed complete hostility between labor and the New Left that often is so taken for granted in the new social movement theory literature. On the alleged hostility of labor to the civil rights movement during the 1960s, see Draper (1994). Michael Goldfield (1993) provides considerable insight into what transformative potential of alliance-building between labor and blacks was largely ruined by the purges and Taft-Hartley Act.

2. Recall that this was only a media portrayal and that no labor unions supported or contributed to the Buchanan campaign. Indeed, Buchanan's campaign was a real failure when compared with the amount of votes Jesse Jackson received from white working-class voters in the North and South. Only a few months after the Buchanan campaign quickly petered out, much greater excitement was generated among the U.S. working class at the founding convention of the U.S. Labor Party (see Weinstein 1996).

capitalist political economy and the changing material conditions as well as class relations wrought by them.

It would appear that there does remain an internal logic to capitalist production and resistance, worldwide—Laclau and Mouffe's iconoclastic interpretation of classical Marxist texts notwithstanding. At the same time, new social movement theory has pushed the spaces of theorization such that Marxist class analysis has to rethink what it has to offer new social movements at the present moment. To merely reassert that opposition to the logic of capital should be class-based is not enough. Marxist class analysis must grapple with new social movement theory's theoretical strengths and provide a workable alternative to its flawed premises.

An Alternative Language of Class

In a critical review of Laclau and Mouffe's post-Marxism, Diskin and Sandler (1993) affirm the rejection of determinist versions of history that essentialize class. However, they likewise assert that Laclau and Mouffe's theorization of capitalism is devoid of a theory of the economic in capitalism, where one is clearly needed. Resnick and Wolff (1987) have amply demonstrated how class can be both narrowly conceptualized as processes based on a specific form of surplus labor appropriation, production, and distribution while at the same time, in a nonreductionist manner, delineating how "class processes both determine and are determined by non-class processes in social change." In this light, Diskin and Sandler also insist that making intelligible how the political economy of capitalism is overdetermined by our discursive practices is a crucial component of any solid Marxist class analysis (1993, 46). As much as new social movement theory may not recognize the critical (but not singular) role of material interests in subjectivity, the theory nonetheless does seek out languages that provide the soil in which resistance to the logic of capital can be more broadly and solidly rooted. However, if there remains a subject neither perspective has explored sufficiently, it is the relationship between a language of class and organizing on the manifold terrains of opposition to capital (Kadi 1996, 39–57; McNally 1995). At the same time, the Left today has an opportunity to rethink how a language of class can be used to organize new social movement constituencies. By a language of class, I mean a language that speaks to and resists both (ostensibly) purely economic and noneconomic forms of oppression under the logic of capital, in a way that motivates those who experience the most intense form(s) of exploitation(s) and/or marginalization(s) under capitalism to resist the logic of capital. I add ostensibly in parenthesis because if it is reduced to economics, class loses the substantive meaning that Marxist class analysis attaches to it. Gibson-Graham (1993, 20) notes that in any given capitalist society we may encounter numerous kinds of exploitation, none of which should be simply assumed to be "marginal." The language of class, then, which is the logical product of Marxist class analysis, is one that speaks (*a*) to converting the political economy to one that works in the interests of the local

producers, who are located in diverse work sites and experience distinct forms of exploitation, and (*b*) to converting individual and group behaviors to ones that make (*a*) possible. The latter would entail a twofold project consisting of (1) battles against ideological beliefs (e.g., racism and sexism) that make (*a*) impossible and (2) *imagining* strategies that make (or better, empower) working-class actors (to) believe and see that their agency can make (*a*) realizable.[3]

New social movement theory, a project closely tied to the emergence of the New Left, posed itself as an alternative to a seemingly stultified Marxism that was hindered by economism and unable to adequately theorize how its discursive practices could apply to social movement constituencies who did not directly identify their opposition to capital in terms of class. However, we would do well to avoid stereotypes that portray an "Old Left" as uninterested in non-class-identity-based issues. Before civil rights and feminism, the Old Left was usually the only political grouping that took very progressive stands on and (more important) actively participated in militant organizing around race and gender issues during a time in which opposition to racial and gender discrimination brought with it far greater risk than is the case today (Brown 1993; Lynd 1996). We would do better to ask what the actual (both positive and negative)[4] relationships looked like between different sections of the Old Left and social movement constituencies, for different wings of Marxism have engaged different forms of class analyses.[5] In hindsight, it is all too clear that the Communist Party USA's adherence to a policy of "peaceful coexistence" with the Democratic party left it unable to imagine how to organize constituencies that saw the latter as part of the problem in the first place. While the new social movements filled this void, in the process new social movement theory often generalized Marxist class analysis as either equivalent to Comintern directives or as increasingly irrelevant. Both assumptions were seriously mistaken.

Navarro (1991, 54) and Segal (1991, 90–1) are correct that without a strong, organized working class, the potential for transforming capitalism in the United States is next to minimal. At the same time, while the class politics of the social movement model employed in the United States are a problem, they are no less mutable than the political direction of the union movement. The challenge that new social movement theory has presented through its interrogation of the role that identity formation plays in political agency is not one from which Marxist class analysis need hide. While trade union power is critical to securing political-economic gains for capitalism's (working and unemployed) disenfranchised, social movements are in a unique position to organize around issues that unions, by virtue of their mission, are not as bound to prioritize. Unfortunately, when new social movement theory and new social movements emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s, Marxists tended either to embrace these new movements uncritically or to dismiss them for their lack of a working-class base.

3. Clearly Buchanan's language is not a language of class as we have defined it here.
4. Too often only the latter are focused on, which ultimately contributes to the hegemony of what Noam Chomsky has termed "America's National Religion"—namely, anticommunism.
5. This is a topic that space does not permit me to cover in this paper, but that merits much more research.

Neither position helped from the vantage of Marxist class analysis. For one, new social movements did merit criticism for their class biases and politics, just as much as union movements. At the same time, classical Marxist class analysis nonetheless clearly advocated involvement in noneconomic struggles that fought the logic of capital. In *The Poverty of Philosophy,* Marx (1963, 172–3) talks of unions as the "first" form in which workers organize among themselves, but nowhere does he claim that they are the only sites of resistance. In *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin (1973, 71–4, 77–8) likewise insisted that working-class organization should not be restricted to merely economic forms of oppression and that revolutionary activists should involve themselves in struggles against the myriad forms of domination that serve to maintain capitalism (cf. Azzara 1995, 118).

The Piedmont Peace Project: A New Social Movement Speaking the Language of Class

During the 1980s, much energy was mobilized in support of nuclear disarmament. While more progressive unions actively supported such efforts, even had the leadership of the AFL-CIO actively supported them (which was hardly the case), the peace movement was the best-equipped agent to organize directly around that issue. In the process, a multitude of alliances with other social movement constituencies was made and sustained. Few social movements could sustain their mobilization efforts without alliance-making, a common-sense fact of organizing too often forgotten by some advocates of identity politics.[6] However, if there was one area in which alliances were not forged solidly enough, it was in working-class communities. Ironically, but not mysteriously, this is the one sector in advanced industrial capitalism that has undergone the most growth in the past two decades. Marcuse and his epigones in new social movement theory were not wrong to theorize the need for a greater participation of those constituencies left out of liberalism's postwar reforms. However, what they failed to grasp adequately was that class identity–based organizing was likewise (if not more) viable as a strategy for organizing them.[7] In a discussion of the politics of black political culture in America, Manning Marable advocates utilizing a new language "which clearly identifies the role of class as central to the theoretical and programmatic critique of contemporary society. And we must do this in a manner which reaches out to the newer voices of U.S. society—Latinos, Asian Americans, Pacific Island Americans, Middle Eastern Americans, American Indians, and others" (1995, 84–5).

How is it then that a language of class can speak at once to both class-specific and non-class-specific constituencies? Consider that those who experience (disproportionately) the severest forms of oppression in advanced capitalist societies are working class, poor, ethnic and racial minorities, and/or women. While a non-class-based, cultural identity–based movement has little materially to offer these groups, social movements that address the material needs of a particular identity group's most exploited members have much more potential to expand that group's transformational power, quantitatively and qualitatively. As Marable notes, this does not in the least call for erasing the racially and culturally specific types of oppression experienced by "minorities" in American history. Rather, the focus is on the distorting effects that these types of oppressions have on the poorest (and majority) of "minorities." Thus, race is not conceptualized as an abstract identity that similarly affects all members of minorities alike. Rather, how racism affects the poorest of racial and ethnic minorities is seen as the critical (albeit not only) question, since they suffer the harshest forms of (political-economic and cultural) marginalization, are the most in need of organization, and are most likely to support more comprehensive reforms that would both transform capitalism *and benefit them most directly.*

A language of class is not one whose foundation is guilt, although it recognizes the necessity of making moral appeals to the community in the process of fighting for social change. This is important because the source of working peoples' increasing material hardship is not one of individual morality at root. That is, social transformation is not engendered through moral conversion of those who produce or appropriate the surplus. It can only be secured through *agency* on the part of the producers, employed and unemployed (Marx 1977, 793–4). While retaining and advancing moral claims to the surplus, a language of class embraces a language of conversion, but one not directed at the "moral culpability" of individual producers. Working people instead need to be converted to the belief that they can effect local and systemic social change through political organization and resistance (in union or social movements or a combination of both) and that ideologies (such as racism and sexism) hinder that goal.

The bulk of the literature on new social movement theory that I reviewed above makes strong appeals to changing the consciousness of individuals (especially middle-class ones). New appeals are made to a morality that opposes itself to instrumental rationality, a morality which will supposedly attract middle-class "individuals."[8] This

6. See Young (1997) for a refreshing exception to this trend. She argues that identity-based social movements have been interested and involved in opposition to class inequality and support for redistributive transformation. This is an empirical question that merits further research. Harvey (1993) contends that although such an identity politics is possible, as it has been practiced to date, such is not the trend. See also Reed (1997).

7. Even in the case of organizing around sexuality, a seemingly purely lifestyle-, identity-oriented issue, this remains the case. As Gluckman and Reed (1997) note, there exist real divides in gay and lesbian politics, with "a growing chorus of conservative gay writers . . . calling for gay activism to separate itself from any broader progressive vision that might address the needs and interests of the less visible, less privileged members of the gay community." See also Allison (1993), Kadi (1996, 143–57), and Raffo (1996).

8. Recall Eder's appeals to an alleged affinity between middle-class individuals and ecological concerns, which working-class actors apparently lack due to their more "utilitarian" values. For an excellent qualitative study of the actual ecological attitudes of loggers that refutes such stereotypes, see Dunk (1994).

type of appeal is not unlike another made to the alienated middle classes in advanced capitalist societies—namely, conversion to fundamentalist religions. Where Marxist class analysis sees class-based resistance built around objective, material self-interests and solidarity (or in language working people can relate to most directly, economic injustice), new social movement theory views economic relations under capitalism as an impediment to seeing through the ideologies that cascade our everyday lives in this media information–saturated, postmaterial society. Hence new social movements' constant battle to "raise consciousness," which is apparently repressed and capable of being snapped out of (middle-class) individuals through appeals to a noninstrumental-oriented "good life," the embraces of an essentialized, nature-bonding ethos, or appeals to rights."

In the concluding section of this article, I will look at an alternative new social movement theory organizing paradigm, namely the Piedmont Peace Project, a peace organization in North Carolina that is based in low-income, working-class communities. In *Bridging the Class Divide and Other Lessons for Grassroots Organizing,*[9] its founder Linda Stout describes the often negative reactions, from traditionally middle class–based peace organizations, that the Piedmont Peace Project initially encountered when, from the earliest stages of formation, it insisted on employing a language of class to organize around military spending. Stout contends that the classist language often employed by social movement organizers has been a major barrier to broadening (and strengthening) the base of progressive social movements.

> When I first began my work with PPP, I often heard middle class people talking about wanting to include low income people and people of color in their organizations. At PPP we used to call this "just talk," talk that acknowledged the importance of diversity but was never put into practice. We thought if people really wanted to include us, they would act differently . . . but then I began to see things differently. Because of my involvement with (some) folks in Boston, I started to realize that these people did want to be inclusive, but they just didn't know how. (1996, 118)

The language of this very passage is one that explodes the all-too-popular assumption that difference need be a barrier to class-based organizing. Stout instead seeks to develop a language that both recognizes and honors the variegated languages employed by different groups while pursuing similar social justice–oriented goals. She contends that new social movement activists are prone to assume that poor communities do not understand complex, "abstract" national issues such as military spending, to which she counters that they often employ a class-biased language that fails to speak to wider (i.e., lower-income) constituencies' actual knowledge base(s) (121). Indeed, they presume that differences of experience naturally lead to *absolute* differences in knowledge, where in fact there is considerable overlap, at least of the latter.

> As low income people, we bring to our organization a clear understanding of how to talk to other working-class people like ourselves. We bring an ability to make clear connections between local and national issues . . . Most middle-class people assume that the people at PPP are the "exceptions"—that we have skills and intelligence that are above those of low-income people. Middle class organizers . . . were surprised to discover that folks in our neighborhood paid close attention to national issues . . . We didn't have to explain the connections to them. They already had made the link, while many middle class people miss those connections. Low income people understand that spending decisions of the government affect their lives directly because they experience it on a day-to-day basis. In fact, *they know, even though they don't always know that they know.* (108–9)

Stout directly challenges the notion that difference should lead to an isolationist strategy of organizing. In fact, in her very insightful understanding of class language differences as "foreign languages," she is insisting that middle-class organizers *can* learn working-class languages and that identity-related barriers are bridgeable. What new social movements need are "interpreters" between the different classes, a powerful notion that at once recognizes difference and similarity of interests. The interpreters that Stout seeks are those who already reside in low-income neighborhoods and who can relate national issues to the immediate concerns of low-income people (e.g., day care, housing, health care) in their own language and who likewise can translate low-income members' interpretations back to middle-class activists. In the process, insights are made into how organizing that addresses class contradictions in capitalism is effective, even in middle-class communities.

> One of the benefits of learning how to make these translations is that you may stumble upon an educational message that *crosses class lines in both directions* . . . [D]uring the . . . Gulf War, it was the job of two PPP staff people to try to understand the more complex issues being written about in the peace movement and to translate these issues into a language that the rest of us could understand . . . When we fully understood the issues, we made a video in our own language to use in our area . . . [It was] specifically created by and for low income folks, [but it] became an important educational tool in the middle class peace community. (112–3; emphasis added)

Moral appeals do comprise a part of the discursive practices of the Piedmont Peace Project's class-based organizing. However, these moral appeals are quite unlike the standard peace movement's abstractly moralistic antiwar proclamations, which tend to employ a discourse that is primarily oriented toward the middle class and which fail to acknowledge that for many working-class poor, their involvement in the war machine is tied less to patriotism than to economic opportunity. Their family members (should) resent a language that does not recognize that basic reality. The language of class embedded in the Piedmont Peace Project's antiwar stance spoke to the effects that war has on the (disproportionately working class and minority) communities of those who are actually fighting the war.

9. I chose to discuss the Piedmont Peace Project in this paper because Stout speaks most directly to the issue of a language of class and new social movement organizing. For other equally illuminating discussions of class-based new social movement organizing as an alternative to non-class-identity-based organizing, see Anner (1996), Kadi (1996), and Mann (1991). See Brecher and Costello (1990) on examples of labor union alliances with community-based social movements.

Finally, the Peidmont Peace Project is an example of a class-based social movement that confronts difference head on with a language of class that perceives how socially constructed racial, gendered, and sexual identities both apportion privileges *and* enable the appropriating class to play the divide-and-conquer card, thus enabling it, in the process, to expropriate even more surplus labor from the producers.[10] Two-thirds of its board must be low income, women, and people of color. Diversity training is an integral process that takes place *continually.* However, it is not a middle-class, liberal, lifestyle-oriented notion of equal rights, enunciated from above, that motivates this insistence on taking diversity seriously. Rather,

> (r)acism and homophobia have often been used to try to set our members at odds . . . When PPP was trying to help Broadway residents get a community development grant, a contractor told a Broadway resident . . . that PPP should not be trusted because of our support for "homosexual rights." His strategy did not work because we had been open about our mission statement and had conducted workshops to prepare people for this kind of divisive tactic . . . If people are not prepared to see how the opposition plays on common prejudices to divide and disempower them, they are often persuaded to abandon their common struggle. (176–7)

The Piedmont Peace Project takes on the interconnectedness of and resistance to all forms of oppression, *in principle* as well as strategy: "[W]e must pay attention to how different types of oppression—classism, racism, sexism, and homophobia—are interconnected, and how just about all of us, no matter how oppressed we might be, can sometimes be part of the oppressor group" (99–100).

The Piedmont Peace Project's employment of these principles, however, is harnessed to political agency (praxis) of those who suffer the most intense forms of exploitation in capitalism, in lieu of spiritual appeals to diversity that do not make any concrete links with those who suffer most from class inequality. As Diskin and Sandler (1993, 38, 47) note, by employing a nonreductionist Marxist class analysis that theorizes the gamut of political/economic/cultural conditions, external and internal, that undergird the existence of capitalist exploitation, new social movements put themselves in a better position to challenge the very noneconomic forms of oppression/alienation that new social movement theory contends Marxist class analysis fails to problematize.

10. An almost obsessive interest in difference is often rationalized on the grounds that alliance-building most benefits those groups that possess the most "identity-group privilege." What ends up overlooked is the fact that oppressed identity groups themselves recognize the deleterious effects of the divide-and-conquer card as it is played by the powerful and that constant reminders about their ostensibly insuperable "differences" leave the disenfranchised without strategies that speak to this dilemma. For example, Stout (1996, 61) quotes Reverend Joseph Lowery, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, who spoke at a 1989 Piedmont Peace Project–sponsored community event, under federal marshal protection from threatened Klan violence. He addressed the link between local and international issues on low-income people's lives and "the need for blacks and whites to work together," saying, "Black and white working folks . . . were . . . busy fighting over paper boats in the mud puddle while the fat cats were laughing and had taken the yacht and gone to Bermuda!" (See also Ryan [1997]; Naiman [1996, 21.])

I propose that the language that the Piedmont Peace Project engages in its organizing efforts is one that speaks a "language of class." This alone is not necessarily anything remarkable. However, such a model serve as a guidepost that potentially points Marxist class analysis in a direction of learning from new social movement theory's strengths and going beyond its weaknesses. That is, we can agree with a new social movement theory that correctly asserts the need (especially for Marxist class analysis) to expand the multifarious constituencies to be organized in the battle against the logic of capital. At the same time, we can also go beyond the class biases of new social movement theory, which cause it to unnecessarily reject the possibility that a mode of social movement organizing that speaks a language of class is strategically a discursive practice that could render such a task accomplishable. This is not to say that such organizing is easy or unproblematic, but it clearly is not a form of activity that new social movement theory should rule out or relegate to the periphery of its theoretical project. Nor, for that matter, should those who wish to employ a Marxist class analysis that speaks to those who are not directly organizable under the rubric of class as it has been traditionally conceptualized.

An earlier version of this article was presented at the international conference, "Politics and Languages of Contemporary Marxism," organized by RETHINKING MARXISM *at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 5–8 December 1996. I wish to thank Franz Brozwimmer, Frank Fries, Shi-jen He, Jon Goldberg Hiller, Barbara Joyce, Hagen Koo, Peter Manicas, James Marsh, Tom Philion, Doug Porpora, Sandy Schram, and the two reviewers (Enid Arvidson and anonymous) for their helpful comments and suggestions. The usual disclaimer applies.*

References

Allison, D. 1993. "A Question of Class." In *Sisters, Sexperts, Queers: Beyond Lesbian Nation,* ed. A. Stein, 46–60. New York: Plume.

Anderson-Sherman, L. and McAdam, D. 1982. "American Black Insurgency and the World Economy: A Political Process Model." In *Ascent and Decline in the World-System,* ed. E. Friedman, 165–88. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Anner, J., ed. 1996. *Beyond Identity Politics: Emerging Social Justice Movements in Communities of Color.* Boston: South End.

Azzara, S. G. 1995. "Marxist Thought, Leninism, and the Historical Balance of the Twentieth Century." *Rethinking Marxism* 8 (1): 116–21.

Belkin, L. 1996. "Last Chance for Labor, the Union Kids Come to Town." *Sunday New York Times Magazine,* 12 January.

Bell, D. 1965. *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the 1950's.* Glencove, Ill.: Free Press.

———. 1973. *The Coming Advent of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting.* New York: Basic.

Bellamy-Foster, J. 1993. "The Limits of Environmentalism Without Class: Lessons from the Ancient Forest Struggle of the Pacific Northwest." *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism: A Journal of Socialist Ecology* 4 (1): 11–41.

———. 1995. "Marx, History, and the Environment." *Monthly Review* 47 (3): 108–24.
Brecher, J. and Costello, T. 1990. *Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community*. New York: Monthly Review.
———. 1994a. *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic Reconstruction From the Bottom Up*. Boston: South End.
———. 1994b. "Taking on the Multinationals: The Liliput Strategy." *The Nation*, 19 December, 757–60.
Broad, D. 1995. "Globalization Versus Labor." *Monthly Review* 47 (7): 20–31.
Brown, M. 1993. *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of US Communism*. New York: Monthly Review.
Burk, M. and Hartman, H. 1996. "Beyond the Gender Gap: A Recovery Movement for the Women's Movement." *The Nation*, 10 June, 18–21.
Business Week. 1995. 17 July, 54–62.
Cook, C. 1994. "Diaspora Employees: Temps—The Forgotten Worker." *The Nation*, 31 January, 124–8.
Cooper, M. 1997. "The Heartland's Raw Deal: How Meatpacking is Creating a New Immigrant Underclass." *The Nation*, 3 February, 11–7.
Coughlin, G. 1995. "Power Across Borders: From Global Solidarity to Global Organizing." *Democratic Left* (September/October): 14–7.
Davis, M. 1986. *Prisoners of the American Dream: Politics and Economy in the History of the US Working Class*. London: Verso.
Deyo, F. C. 1992. "The Political Economy of Social Policy Formation: East Asia's Newly Industrialized Countries." In *States and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim*, ed. R. Appelbaum and J. Henderson, 289–306. London: Sage.
Diskin, J. and Sandler, B. 1993. "Essentialism and the Economy in the Post-Marxist Imaginary: Reopening the Sutures. *Rethinking Marxism* 6 (3): 28–48.
Draper, A. 1994. *Conflict of Interests: Organized Labor and the Civil Rights Movement in the South, 1954–1968*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR.
Dubovsky, M. 1994. *The State and Labor in Modern America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Dunk, T. 1994. "Talking About Trees: Environment and Society in Forest Workers' Culture." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 31 (1): 14–34.
Eder, K. 1993. *The New Politics of Class: Social Movements and Cultural Dynamics in Advanced Societies*. London: Sage.
Epstein, B. 1990. "Rethinking Social Movement Theory." *Socialist Review* 20 (1): 35–64.
Fantasia, R. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Geras, N. 1990. *Discourses of Extremity: Radical Ethics and Post-Marxist Extravagances*. London: Verso.
Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1993. "Waiting for the Revolution, or How to Smash Capitalism While Working at Home in Your Spare Time." *Rethinking Marxism* 4 (2): 10–24.
Gluckman, A. and Reed, B., eds. *Homo Economics: Capitalism, Community, and Lesbian and Gay Life*. London: Routledge.
Goldfield, M. 1987. *The Decline of Organized Labor in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 1993. "Race and the CIO: The Possibilities for Racial Egalitarianism during the 1930's and 1940's." *International Labor and Working Class History*, no. 44 (Fall): 1–32.
Gray, J. 1994. "Into the Abyss?" *London Sunday Times*, 30 October.
Grossinger, K. 1989. "Labor: Can Strikes Still Be Won?" *Social Policy* (Spring): 4–12.
Habermas, J. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1985. *The Theory of Comunuicative Action*. Vol. 2, *A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon.
Harvey, D. 1993. "Class Relations, Social Justice, and the Politics of Difference." In *Place and the Politics of Identity*, ed. M. Keith and S. Pile, 41–66. London: Routledge.
Head, S. 1996. "The New Ruthless Economy." *New Yorker*, 29 February, 47–52.
Hutton, W. 1996. *The State We're In*. London: Vintage.
Kadi, J. 1996. *Thinking Class: Sketches from a Cultural Worker*. Boston: South End.
Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Trans. W. Moore and P. Cammack. London: Verso.
Lenin, V. I. 1973. *What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
Levy, P. 1994. *The New Left and Labor in the 1960's*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Lynd, S., ed. 1996. *We Are All Leaders: The Alternative Unionism of the Early 1930's*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Mann, E. 1993a. "Los Angeles—A Year After (1): The Poverty of Corporatism." *The Nation*, 29 March.
———. 1993b. "Los Angeles a Year After (2): The Left and the City's Future." *The Nation*, 3 May.
———, ed. 1991. *L.A.'s Lethal Air: Strategies for Policy, Organizing, and Action*. Los Angeles: The Labor/Community Strategy Center.
Marable, M. 1995. "History and Black Consciousness: The Political Culture of Black America." *Monthly Review* (July/August): 71–89.
Marcuse, H. 1964. *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Societies*. Boston: Beacon.
———. 1969. *An Essay on Liberation*. Boston: Beacon.
———. 1972. *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. Boston: Beacon.
Marx, K. 1963. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. New York: International Publishers.
———. 1977. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Vintage.
McNally, D. 1995. "Language, History, and Class Struggle." *Monthly Review* 47 (3): 13–31.
Melucci, A. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Meszaros, I. 1989. *The Power of Ideology*. New York: New York University Press.
Meyerson, H. 1995. "Perestroika on Sixteenth Street: Can a Revitalized AFL-CIO Point the Way for the Left?" *Democratic Left* 23 (5).
Miliband, R. 1989. *Divided Societies: Class Struggle in Contemporary Capitalism*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Milkman, R. 1993. "The New Gender Politics of Organized Labor." *Annual Proceedings of the IRRA Annual Meeting*, no. 45: 348–57.
Mills, C. W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford.
Moberg, D. 1996. "The New Union Label." *The Nation*, 1 April.
Moody, K. 1988. *An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unions*. London: Verso.
———. 1996. "A New American Politics: Who Will Answer the Invitation?" *New Left Review*, no. 216: 9–18.
Naiman, J. 1996. "Left Feminism and the Return to Class." *Monthly Review* 48 (2): 12–28.
Navarro, V. 1988. "Social Movements and Class Politics in the United States." In *Socialist Register 1988*, ed. R. Miliband et al., 425–47. London: Merlin.
———. 1991. "The Limitations of Legitimation and Fordism and the Possibility for Socialist Reforms." *Rethinking Marxism* 4 (2): 27–61.
O'Connor, J. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin.

———. 1995. "Marx, History, and the Environment." *Monthly Review* 47 (3): 108–24.

Brecher, J. and Costello, T. 1990. *Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community*. New York: Monthly Review.

———. 1994a. *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic Reconstruction From the Bottom Up*. Boston: South End.

———. 1994b. "Taking on the Multinationals: The Liliput Strategy." *The Nation*, 19 December, 757–60.

Broad, D. 1995. "Globalization Versus Labor." *Monthly Review* 47 (7): 20–31.

Brown, M. 1993. *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of US Communism*. New York: Monthly Review.

Burk, M. and Hartman, H. 1996. "Beyond the Gender Gap: A Recovery Movement for the Women's Movement." *The Nation*, 10 June, 18–21.

Business Week. 1995. 17 July, 54–62.

Cook, C. 1994. "Diaspora Employees: Temps—The Forgotten Worker." *The Nation*, 31 January, 124–8.

Cooper, M. 1997. "The Heartland's Raw Deal: How Meatpacking is Creating a New Immigrant Underclass." *The Nation*, 3 February, 11–7.

Coughlin, G. 1995. "Power Across Borders: From Global Solidarity to Global Organizing." *Democratic Left* (September/October): 14–7.

Davis, M. 1986. *Prisoners of the American Dream: Politics and Economy in the History of the US Working Class*. London: Verso.

Deyo, F. C. 1992. "The Political Economy of Social Policy Formation: East Asia's Newly Industrialized Countries." In *States and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim*, ed. R. Appelbaum and J. Henderson, 289–306. London: Sage.

Diskin, J. and Sandler, B. 1993. "Essentialism and the Economy in the Post-Marxist Imaginary: Reopening the Sutures. *Rethinking Marxism* 6 (3): 28–48.

Draper, A. 1994. *Conflict of Interests: Organized Labor and the Civil Rights Movement in the South, 1954–1968*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR.

Dubovsky, M. 1994. *The State and Labor in Modern America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Dunk, T. 1994. "Talking About Trees: Environment and Society in Forest Workers' Culture." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 31 (1): 14–34.

Eder, K. 1993. *The New Politics of Class: Social Movements and Cultural Dynamics in Advanced Societies*. London: Sage.

Epstein, B. 1990. "Rethinking Social Movement Theory." *Socialist Review* 20 (1): 35–64.

Fantasia, R. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geras, N. 1990. *Discourses of Extremity: Radical Ethics and Post-Marxist Extravagances*. London: Verso.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1993. "Waiting for the Revolution, or How to Smash Capitalism While Working at Home in Your Spare Time." *Rethinking Marxism* 4 (2): 10–24.

Gluckman, A. and Reed, B., eds. *Homo Economics: Capitalism, Community, and Lesbian and Gay Life*. London: Routledge.

Goldfield, M. 1987. *The Decline of Organized Labor in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1993. "Race and the CIO: The Possibilities for Racial Egalitarianism during the 1930's and 1940's." *International Labor and Working Class History*, no. 44 (Fall): 1–32.

Gray, J. 1994. "Into the Abyss?" *London Sunday Times*, 30 October.

Grossinger, K. 1989. "Labor: Can Strikes Still Be Won?" *Social Policy* (Spring): 4–12.

Habermas, J. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1985. *The Theory of Comunuicative Action*. Vol. 2, *A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon.

Harvey, D. 1993. "Class Relations, Social Justice, and the Politics of Difference." In *Place and the Politics of Identity*, ed. M. Keith and S. Pile, 41–66. London: Routledge.

Head, S. 1996. "The New Ruthless Economy." *New Yorker*, 29 February, 47–52.

Hutton, W. 1996. *The State We're In*. London: Vintage.

Kadi, J. 1996. *Thinking Class: Sketches from a Cultural Worker*. Boston: South End.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Trans. W. Moore and P. Cammack. London: Verso.

Lenin, V. I. 1973. *What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

Levy, P. 1994. *The New Left and Labor in the 1960's*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Lynd, S., ed. 1996. *We Are All Leaders: The Alternative Unionism of the Early 1930's*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Mann, E. 1993a. "Los Angeles—A Year After (1): The Poverty of Corporatism." *The Nation*, 29 March.

———. 1993b. "Los Angeles a Year After (2): The Left and the City's Future." *The Nation*, 3 May.

———, ed. 1991. *L.A.'s Lethal Air: Strategies for Policy, Organizing, and Action*. Los Angeles: The Labor/Community Strategy Center.

Marable, M. 1995. "History and Black Consciousness: The Political Culture of Black America." *Monthly Review* (July/August): 71–89.

Marcuse, H. 1964. *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Societies*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1969. *An Essay on Liberation*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1972. *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. Boston: Beacon.

Marx, K. 1963. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. New York: International Publishers.

———. 1977. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Vintage.

McNally, D. 1995. "Language, History, and Class Struggle." *Monthly Review* 47 (3): 13–31.

Melucci, A. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Meszaros, I. 1989. *The Power of Ideology*. New York: New York University Press.

Meyerson, H. 1995. "Perestroika on Sixteenth Street: Can a Revitalized AFL-CIO Point the Way for the Left?" *Democratic Left* 23 (5).

Miliband, R. 1989. *Divided Societies: Class Struggle in Contemporary Capitalism*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Milkman, R. 1993. "The New Gender Politics of Organized Labor." *Annual Proceedings of the IRRA Annual Meeting*, no. 45: 348–57.

Mills, C. W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford.

Moberg, D. 1996. "The New Union Label." *The Nation*, 1 April.

Moody, K. 1988. *An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unions*. London: Verso.

———. 1996. "A New American Politics: Who Will Answer the Invitation?" *New Left Review*, no. 216: 9–18.

Naiman, J. 1996. "Left Feminism and the Return to Class." *Monthly Review* 48 (2): 12–28.

Navarro, V. 1988. "Social Movements and Class Politics in the United States." In *Socialist Register 1988*, ed. R. Miliband et al., 425–47. London: Merlin.

———. 1991. "The Limitations of Legitimation and Fordism and the Possibility for Socialist Reforms." *Rethinking Marxism* 4 (2): 27–61.

O'Connor, J. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin.

———. 1992. *The Second Contradiction of Capitalism: Causes and Consequences*. CES/CNS Pamphlet 1.
Offe, C. 1972. "Structural Problems of the Capitalist State." In *German Political Studies*, vol. 1. Beverly Hills: Sage.
Ong, A. 1991. "The Gender and Labor Politics of Postmodernity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 279–309.
Palat, R. A. 1996. "Pacific Century: Myth or Reality?" *Theory and Society* 25 (3).
Piven, F. F. and Cloward, R. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, and How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon.
———. 1995. "Is It Global Economics or Neo-Laissez-Faire?" *New Left Review*, no. 213 (September/October): 107–14.
Raffo, S., ed. 1996. *Queerly Classed: Gay Men and Lesbians Write About Class*. Boston: South End.
Resnick, S. and Wolff, R. 1986. "What Are Class Analyses?" *Research in Political Economy* 9: 1–32.
Reed, A. 1997. "Token Equality." *The Progressive* (February): 18–9.
Ross, R. J. S. and Trachte, K. C. 1990. *Global Capitalism: The New Leviathan*. Albany: SUNY Press.
Ryan, B. 1997. "How Much Can I Divide Thee, Let Me Count The Ways: Identity Politics in the Women's Movement." *Humanity and Society* 21 (1).
Scott, A. 1990. *Ideology and the New Social Movements*. London: Unwin-Hyman.
Segal, L. 1991. "Whose Left: Socialism, Feminism and the Future." *New Left Review*, no. 185: 81–91.
Smith, R. 1997. "Creative Destruction: Capitalist Development and China's Environment." *New Left Review*, no. 222 (March/April): 13–41.
Stabile, C. A. 1994. "Feminism Without Guarantees: The Misalliances and Missed Alliances of Postmodernist Social Theory." *Rethinking Marxism* 7 (1): 47–61.
———. 1995. "Post-Modernism, Feminism, and Marx: Notes From the Abyss." *Monthly Review* 47 (3): 89–197.
Stand, K. 1993. "Global Thinking, Global Action: The New Labor Internationalism." *Democratic Left* (September/October): 29–30.
Stout, L. 1996. *Bridging the Class Divide and Other Lessons for Grassroots Organizing*. Boston: Beacon.
Sweeney, J. 1996. *America Needs a Raise: Fighting for Economic Security and Social Justice*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
Tilly, C. 1995. "Globalization Threatens Labor's Rights." *International Labor and Working Class History*, no. 47 (Spring): 1–23.
Weinstein, J. 1996. "Conventional Wisdom: A New Labor Party Is Inaugurated." *In These Times*, 24 June–7 July.
Wood, E. M. 1986. *The Retreat from Class*. London: Verso.
———. 1995. "A Chronology of the New Left and Its Successors, Or: Who's Old Fashioned Now?" In *Socialist Register 1995*, ed. L. Panitch et al., 22–49. London: Merlin.
Young, I. M. 1997. "Unruly Categories: A Critique of Nancy Fraser's Dual Systems Theory." *New Left Review*, no. 222 (March/April): 147–160.

Rethinking MARXISM Volume 10, Number 4 (Winter 1998)

Restructuring, Flexibility, and the Politics of Workplace Subjectivity: A Worker Inquiry in the South African Car Industry

Franco Barchiesi

Recent shifts and changes in forms of industrial conflict and worker struggle in postapartheid South Africa constitute a challenge for assumptions common in various theoretical perspectives about the development of worker behaviors, attitudes, and class consciousness. Many episodes of industrial action have developed as unpredictable events or unintended consequences of broader social, economic and productive changes in the "new," democratic South Africa. As a result, management and unions alike have often been unprepared to manage worker resistance through existing organizational and ideological apparatuses.

Some authors emphasize in particular how the legitimation gained during the 1990s by the union organizations in South Africa as key players in political transition, industrial policymaking, macroeconomic debate, and collective bargaining at a central level is still matched by the permanence of what was called the "apartheid workplace regime" (Von Holdt 1995) in the factories. This is apparent in widespread authoritarian styles of management, abusive and discriminatory practices by middle-level supervisors, permanence of substantial wage differentials, lack of recognition of the skills of the African work force, and racially biased grading systems. After a massive nationwide strike in 1994 and recent prolonged episodes of industrial action at major companies (Toyota, Volkswagen, Mercedes-Benz), the automobile industry has been one of the sectors most sensitive to these changes and contradictions (Bohmke and Desai 1996). Moreover, worker resistance has been heightened in this