

# WOMEN'S OPPRESSION

from

A REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE.



S.W. LONDON DIRECT ACTION MOVEMENT

CONTACT: SWLDAM c/o 121 Railton Rd., London, SE24

50p



## INTRODUCTION

The two articles in this pamphlet were produced after a series of discussions within the WOMEN'S COMMISSION of the DIRECT ACTION MOVEMENT. As such they do not represent DAM policy but the views of the SOUTH WEST LONDON BRANCH. Too often anarchists have been attracted to some variant of patriarchy theory simply because it is opposed to a reductionist marxian reading and because its advocates talked in terms of 'hierarchy' and 'power relationships' as if these were separate dynamics from capitalism. Socialist-feminists like Heidi Hartmann, Sheila Rowbotham, Hilary Wainwright etc appeared to be closer to anarchism than marxism due to their critique of Leninism and their support for an autonomous women's movement. We however were not satisfied with their attempts to combine class analysis with patriarchy theory. To us these attempts were not only unsuccessful but ideologically motivated by a desire to retain a distinct 'feminist' method which could not be collapsed into marxism. This 'method' would then justify separate women's struggle and thus separate organisation. When the Tories came to power in 1979 these feminists predicted that men would force women out of work and back into the home. The article 'WOMEN AT WORK' shows that this has clearly not happened. This leads us to the question 'Who controls women's access to work - is it men or is it capital?' Our answer is that it is capital which benefits from and controls women's access to work and women's reproduction, not working class men. This will undoubtedly upset some libertarians but we believe that our analysis not only enables us to understand women's oppression better but to fight it successfully.

The 'autonomous' women's movement in Britain today is in a sorry state. Many socialist feminists like Hilary Wainwright have been drawn into the Labour Party and its internal and interminable bureaucratic wranglings. Others like Bea Campbell of the Communist Party have abandoned the working class altogether and call for 'broad democratic alliances' whilst denouncing miner's pickets as 'macho'. The Greenham Common women who blame men for the arms race have seen Cruise arrive regardless of their protests and may well see the missiles withdrawn, whilst their 'sisterhood' is shattered by infighting involving women from the King's Cross Women's Centre. Many feminists have opted for 'personal liberation' or else carry out unpaid social work in women's refuges, treating symptoms not causes. The so-called 'anarcho-feminists' continue to hold conference workshops on rape, male violence, pornography, sexuality etc without ever arriving at a coherent analysis or strategy. We believe this pamphlet outlines the basis of such a method, a working class approach to women's oppression. Further work needs to be done but our method we believe to be unchanging. The complete emancipation of women is our goal and the working class is the only force which can put an end to all systems of oppression.

South West London DAM. November 1987.



## WOMEN'S OPPRESSION.

### What's wrong with feminism?

The radical feminist movement of the 60's and 70's was politically diverse and dominated by the thinking of middle class American women who largely viewed traditional socialism with scepticism. The labour movement and the revolutionary left, for their part, still held backward views on women which led many feminists to counterpose the struggle for women's liberation to that of socialism. Feminist theories differed widely but most were underpinned by some vague notion that men had always oppressed women and many naturally concluded from this that they always will oppress women. Unless we can understand the material basis for the oppression of women we cannot understand oppression as arising in a specific period of history. Consequently we cannot envisage a society where we can lay the material cornerstones for women's liberation. If women's oppression will persist despite socialism then feminist modes of organisation and activity are all as equally valid as other forms of struggle(; consciousness-raising groups, peace-camps, women's refuges etc) because the struggles are separate. Equally if women's liberation has nothing to do with the class struggle then it is legitimate to prioritise activity around the superficial manifestations of women's oppression ie. language, advertising, television, pornography and male violence. We intend to demonstrate that women's oppression as it exists today was created to meet the needs of capitalism, that it differs in form and content from previous precapitalist forms of domination over women such as patriarchy, and that consequently the struggle for women's liberation is essentially anticapitalist. We will further argue that this is not to reduce women's liberation to a marginal side-issue but to make it central to revolutionary politics and the class struggle

### Modern Patriarchy Theory

Some socialist feminists do not accept the radical feminist view that male domination is inherent but try to locate this dominance in a historical and materialist framework. In one form or another they try to sustain an argument that 'patriarchy' as a system of oppression not only predates but continues to co-exist



alongside capitalism as a separate or at least equally strong dynamic. The practical implications of these theories was to provide an ideological basis for an autonomous women's movement which they regarded as essential given the sexism of the labour movement and the left.

" Women should not trust men to liberate them after the revolution....their immediate self-interest lies in our continued oppression. Instead we must have our own organisations and our own power base." (1)

Feminists like Heidi Hartmann criticise Engels' account of the relationship of the family to private property to try to demonstrate that patriarchal relations still persist separately from capitalist relations. Hartmann defines patriarchy as:

"...a set of social relations which has a material base and in which there are hierarchical relations between men and (our emphasis) solidarity among them which enable them in turn to dominate women. The material basis of patriarchy is men's control over women's labour power. That control is maintained by excluding women from access to necessary economically productive resources and by restricting women's sexuality." (2)

Before analysing whether it is men or capitalism that excludes women from the 'necessary economically productive resources' we must briefly examine Engels' account in 'The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State'. The crucial insight of Engels' work was to locate the origin of the patriarchal family in the rise of class societies and the transition from hunter-gatherer to primitive agricultural society. As productive forces (technology) developed to the point where a surplus could be produced so too did a struggle for the appropriation of that surplus produce. In hunter-gatherer societies a biological division of labour existed based on the strength of men and the childbearing function of women, and this crucially determined which sex came to dominate in the struggle for private appropriation of the surplus product (ie. private property). With the advent of private property came the need for institutionalised inheritance of wealth through the male line and monogamous marriage. Engels ascribed three functions to the patriarchal family a) to transmit wealth b) to serve as an economic unit of production and c) to reproduce the human species. The conclusion he drew from this was that under capitalism, as women were drawn into the labour



process as propertyless proletarians, women's oppression and the family would tend to disappear.

"The first condition for the liberation of the wife is to bring the whole female sex back into public industries." (3)

Feminists have pointed to the 19th century labour movement's struggle for protective legislation and the family wage as proof that working class men sided with their bosses to exclude women from the labour process. We would argue that these measures primarily were introduced to serve the interests of capital not men.

#### The role of the Family under capitalism

When large scale capitalist industry emerged this did destroy the patriarchal family as a unit of production in which the male patriarch governed over women, children and younger siblings alike. Capitalism also destroyed the function of the family (for workers) as a means for handing down property. Women and children were drawn into the labour process en masse. However the reasons for the bosses passing legislation such as the Factory Acts in Britain which protected women and children from much productive work was to prevent the physical elimination of the labour force. In the absence of any welfare state, capitalism needed the family to ensure the reproduction of the labour force because this was the cheapest and most convenient mechanism for this purpose. Although trade unions did press for the family wage and did exclude women because they saw them as undermining their wages these early craft unions were thoroughly sectionalist and excluded unskilled workers and immigrants equally. Protective legislation was also passed in industries where unions were weak primarily to ensure the reproduction of the human species, to serve the needs of capital. It is in this period that we can locate the origin of women's oppression, in the division of labour which ensured that the reproduction of the labour force was privatised in the family. The crucial question is why did this division of labour assume a sexual character and result in a subordinate status for women workers?

The answer lies not in the continuing force of 'patriarchy' but in women's natural role as childbearers. In the 19th century the lack of reliable contraception, safe abortion and the continued strength of religious taboos about birth control together with the high infant mortality rate meant that women had to spend a



greater proportion of their adult lives childbearing. The average number of children in the family was of necessity higher and as socialist feminists Ann Ferguson and Nancy Folbre point out:

"The number and spacing of children is important because even in societies in which children over the age of three are cared for by other members of the group the biological mother tends to care for infants under the age of two. Increases in the number of children born increase the biological mother's responsibilities....Such demands inevitably increase women's specialisation in sex-affective production ( ie. childrearing). (4).

The early labour movement lacked the political consciousness to fight for equal pay, maternity leave and nursery provision. Capitalists were neither willing nor due to the massive costs entailed were they particularly able to provide such facilities. What is crucial to understand here is that the struggle for access to the labour process is not one between men and women but one between labour and capital. As such it served capital's interests to concede a family wage to men which would have been less than to concede a wage to a woman and provide childcare facilities too. Capitalism also benefitted in creating a second class worker in women who could be used as a section of the reserve army of labour. Engels aim of bringing 'the whole of the female sex back into public industry' was not realised in the 19th century which is why a women's right to work must be an essential part of the class struggle today.

#### Do working Class Men Benefit from Women's Oppression?

Feminists argue that working class men benefit from having to do less domestic work which is why they continue to oppress women. This argument has dangerous implications in that taken to its logical conclusion men can have no immediate interest in fighting women's oppression nor is the unity required for that struggle immediately, if at all, possible. Whilst it might be said that men receive marginal or perhaps more accurately illusory benefits we cannot in any way say that these correspond to their interests as working class men. Certainly men are the agents of women's oppression but working class families would be economically better<sup>off</sup> and their quality of life would be vastly improved if housework and childcare were socialised and women could have equal access to the labour



process. The diminution of the family wage in real terms has meant that women have had to re-enter the labour force to supplement their partner's incomes. Primarily because of childcare problems women are often concentrated in part-time work, home-work and more recently job sharing. Working class women who return to work after having children return to worse jobs. About 42% of skilled women workers return to less skilled jobs after child-birth whilst 94 % of unskilled women return to part-time jobs only. (5) Middle-class women especially those in managerial grades are not similarly handicapped from having children. 90% of professional women return to a professional job after child birth. These women are not only more likely to afford private nursery places but usually enjoy much more favourable conditions of maternity leave. This can involve longer periods of leave, better rates of maternity pay and retraining during their leave. For working class women the present Tory government has cut maternity benefits and through the 1980 Employment Act made it easier for an employer to dismiss pregnant women.

It can only be in the immediate economic interests as well as the historical class interests of working class men to fight the closure of nurseries and equally to fight for abortion rights and maternity rights which increase the access of women workers to better paid jobs. Whilst sexism prevails in the trade union movement the solution is not autonomous women's organisations but to fight for class politics against the collaborationism of the trade union bureaucrats. In the unions this means building a rank and file movement which fights for full participation and control over working class struggles. In practice this means fighting for union meetings during work-time so women with children can attend. It also means raising issues, such as the fight for abortion rights, in the workplace. In political organisations the fight for women to play a full role in society must include creche facilities at public meetings and conferences to release women into the political sphere.

The class struggle advances and retreats bringing with it gains during periods of mass struggle but also attacks on these gains during periods of reaction. A classic example of this is the Russian Revolution. After the October revolution divorce was made easily available, abortion was legalised for the first 3 months of pregnancy, homosexuality was legalised and communal kitchens, creches and kinder-



-gartens were established. However most of these advances were eroded during the Stalin era by which time a new ruling class had emerged. Although private property had formally been abolished capitalism had not. The Soviet Union had to compete on the international market and was subject to the same crises as the west. Thus economic difficulties meant that the family was still required to carry out the traditional capitalist work of reproducing the labour force. Abortion and homosexuality were banned, divorce was restricted and medals were given out to women who produced lots of children.

### women's Oppression Today

Capitalism has changed since the 19th century which has meant demographic changes in the working class. Women are today a permanent and proportionally larger part of the labour force. 60% of women in Britain today work and they constitute 45% of the workforce (6). The picture according to Ferguson and Polbre in America writing in 1981 is similar:

"Twenty-five per cent of all households in the U.S today are headed by women.

Only ten per cent of contemporary U.S families fit the traditional nuclear family picture with children at home, father working, mother as full-time

housemaker. The number of people in the average household has been drastically diminished. In 1970 17% of all households were comprised of only one person."(7)

When the Tories came to power in Britain in 1979 many feminists predicted a back-to-the-family drive in which women would be forced out of work and back into the home. What has happened has been an ideological back-to-the-family drive which has meant that much of the burden of social welfare has been shifted from the state onto the family (and therefore women) through cuts in benefits, the NHS and social services yet the number of women in work has remained static. The decline in manufacturing industry has actually meant that the proportion of women in the workforce has increased as the number of men in work has fallen. The precise value to the Tories of a back-to-the-family drive is to make the working class family pay for the crisis rather than actually driving women out of work. These changes must have consequences in that many unemployed men will by necessity be forced to do more domestic work. As the woman's wage packet increases <sup>in importance</sup> as men's real wages fall and state benefits are cut this must undermine traditional ideas about men



as breadwinners .

In Britain and the USA recession and the downturn in the class struggle has enabled the Right to take the offensive. The Ideological backlash of the Moral Majority in the US and Thatcher's 'Return to Victorian Values' paves the way for actual attacks on working class living standards. Attacks on social welfare provision force workers into low paid jobs which are essential to the restructuring of capitalism. Attacks on women's rights such as maternity and abortion rights will almost certainly accompany because this only restricts women from better paid full time work whilst allowing them to carry out reproductive domestic work at home and further segregating women in the part-time service sector jobs. In these jobs women do not enjoy full employment rights, good wages or strong unions. It is clear that before a woman can play a full role in this society all restrictions from her entering the labour process on an equal basis must be removed. This can only be enabled by abortion on demand, free pregnancy testing on demand, safe contraception and adequate nursery provision for all. These preconditions for a woman's right to work can only be won through class struggle not by women's Officers in local councils or consciousness-raising groups.

#### Perspectives for a Revolutionary Organisation

To conclude, we locate women's oppression in the sexual division of labour between social production and privatised reproduction. We therefore see the material basis for women's liberation in the socialisation of housework and childcare, through the provision of communal restaurants, laundries, dormitories, creches and nurseries as well as full reproductive and maternity rights. Capitalism cannot afford to meet these needs for every worker so women's liberation is essentially anticapitalist.

working class men have a common interest in fighting for women's rights and to fight alongside women in the class struggle. The potential for consciousness to be transformed through the experience of mass struggle is immense as was shown in the 1984/5 miner's strike. Unity in struggle between men and women holds the key to the success of the class struggle and the struggle for women's liberation. As we reject a separation of these struggles we therefore reject autonomous women's organisations and argue for a rank-and-file movement that prioritises women's rights and fights for the full participation of women workers in working class organs of



struggle. we also believe that a revolutionary political organisation must put women's liberation at the centre of its political programme. Revolutionaries must not only combat all reactionary anti-women attitudes in the workplace but argue for men to actively take up the struggle for women's rights. whilst only working class power can lay the material basis for woman's liberation, reactionary ideas about women amongst workers will only disappear through the consistent intervention of conscious revolutionaries before, during and after the destruction of capitalism. A principled commitment to women's liberation given priority in our propaganda and practical work can only encourage women to participate in the class struggle both as union militants and as revolutionaries. A coherent analysis of women's oppression and how to fight it can alone arrest the drift to separatism, reformism and disillusionment which is an inherent danger in any form of patriarchy theory (especially during periods of low struggle) and is manifest in the present day disintegration of the women's liberation movement.

•Footnotes•

- (1) The Unhappy Marriage Of Marxism And Feminism: Towards A More Progressive Union.

Heidi Hartmann. From 'Women And Revolution' . Black Rose Books 1981. p32.

- (2) Ibid p.18.

- (3) 'The Origin Of The Family, Private Property, And The State' F. Engels.

- (4) 'The Unhappy Marriage Of Patriarchy And Capitalism'. Ann Ferguson and Nancy Folbre. From 'Women And Revolution'. p321.

- (5) For a fuller account of the changing composition of the labour force see 'Women At Work-Changes In Employment Patterns'. SW London DAM. From 'CATALYST' Theoretical Journal of the Direct Action Movement. No.1. Also see 'The Forgotten Majority- Women at Work!'. Ann Rogers. International Socialism Summer '86 .

- (6) Women At Work.

- (7) Women And Revolution. Ferguson and Folbre. p326.



# Women At Work.

## THATCHER & FEMINISM.

In 1979 when Margaret Thatcher came to power, many feminists predicted that this would result in women being driven back into the home, and that this would be a major factor in worsening womens lives. For example in 1983 in 'Marxism Today' it was predicted that the governments plan for job sharing would severely affect womens employment opportunities. What this approach failed to realise was the extent to which womens employment patterns already fitted the needs of capital.

More and more women have actually joined the labour force in recent years. 60% of women in Britain now work; in September 1986 women constituted 45% of the total workforce, while mens share of the job market declined between 1979 and 1983 by 3%, a drop of 1.5 million jobs. A recent Manpowers Service Commission report shows that 40% of new jobs in the year ending March 1987 went to female part time workers, 110,000 jobs were filled by women part timers, only 22,000 went to men.

Despite all this evidence, feminists still depict women primarily as housewives whose major role is the servicing of men and the production of children. They have ignored the massive impact that working has made on womens lives. This inability to adequately assess reality is not by coincidence. The failing of feminism to adapt to these fundamental employment developments is in fact a direct result of the theoretical basis of reformist feminism. It has not attempted to analyse the interrelation between womens oppression, the family and employment. Instead feminists have concentrated and prioritised womens personal experiences.

Feminism has failed to adopt a class analysis, instead it sees all womens experiences as equally important, whether it be those of a suburban housewife, a factory worker or a female professional. In such an analysis class becomes submerged under the belief that all women suffer the same oppression and thus all have the same interest in fighting against this oppression. Feminism, by adopting a pluralist theory, where class becomes just another vehicle for struggle, not only fails in not realising the nature of womens oppression, and how it is an integrated aspect of capitalism, but it also lacks any strategy for winning. Genuine working class women who become involved in the reformist feminist movement get demoralised as a result.

Because feminism has never concentrated on the workplace, feminists have failed to understand the extent to which womens employment has become an integrated part of capitalism. Because women are oppressed it was thought that women were bound to be more affected by economic recession than men are. It was not seen that the government does not want to upset business by forcing one of its most pliant workforces back into the home.



## WOMEN WORKING.

Women now provide capital with a cheap and flexible workforce. For several reasons women are adaptable to the specific needs of capitalism. Firstly, women are especially suited to working part time because of their childrearing duties; part time work now constitutes 25% of the total workforce. As far as the state is concerned the growth in women working has not created any demands on state services - the majority of working class women rely on their family to do the childcare. The type of work women tend to do is mainly in the service sector (74% of working women work in this field) which has seen an 8% growth between 1979 and 1986. Work in the service sector tends to be non-unionised, difficult to organise and therefore conditions tend to be poor and wages are kept low. So 60% of women now work, but the type of work women do is very much restricted. In a survey in 1983 it was revealed that 60% of manual work was confined to hairdressing/cleaning/catering. And 64% of non-manual work was restricted to clerical and sales work. The effect that working has made on womens lives cannot be overlooked by anyone who is serious about analysing womens oppression. As women have become a permanent sector of the workforce, ideas about women working have changed. Womens attitudes are altered substantially by whether or not they work. A housewife is much more likely to believe that a womans role is in the home than would a woman worker. Men too are likely to have a less reactionary attitude about women working if their partners work. Capitalism put women into the workforce for its own ends but in doing so it has stimulated a trend which undermines social structures and ideologies which have been used to weaken the working class. A fact directly related to this is the varying amount of housework women do depending on whether or not they work. Husbands or partners are more likely to share in the housework if their partners work. While women still bear the brunt of privatised reproduction in the family, and are still seen as responsible for housework, even if their partners 'help' them, womens traditional role in the family is being partially negated as womens role as workers causes some of the housework to be redistributed to other members of the family.



# PART TIMERS.

The type of work and the times that women are able to work is tied totally to whether or not a woman has children. Part time work accounts for 44% of all the work that women do. Nurserys, when available, are geared almost totally to women only working part time hours. If women work then they must find work that fits in around their childcare duties. The repercussions of women being restricted to certain types of work are substantial. Even with equal pay legislation women have never received wages higher than 75% of the male wage. The key factor that ensures womens inferior income is that women are ghettoised in low paid jobs. This reality is as true in the age of high-tech science as it was in the days of the cotton mill. 58% of women who work, work totally with other women; 84% of men who work, work totally with other men. Women are paid less per hour than men because they predominate in low paid work. And it is not only in rate per hour than women suffer. Frequently women work where there is no holiday pay, no sick pay, no pensions, no access to bonus systems, overtime or shift pay - and this is especially true of part time work,

Part timers are often not given the same legal employment rights as full timers. Part time workers who work between 8 and 16 hours a week only get full legal employment rights when they have worked continuously for the same employer for more than 5 years. This obviously discriminates against women who take time off to have children. The recent repeal of the legislation requiring employers to re-employ women after maternity leave, and the abolition of the maternity grant are also obvious attacks on womens rights at work. This attack must be seen in the context of the state's strategy to create a non-unionised, mobile and cheap workforce. High unemployment and anti-trade union legislation are another part of this attack.

Feminists were correct when they predicted that a tory government would attack women at work. This they have done, but the motive was not to drive women back into the home, merely to weaken their position and provide a more favourable workforce. Women have received specific attacks. The way that cuts in the NHS has affected women is a good example of this. Not only do women make up 80% of the workforce in the health service and thus are going to be affected by cuts and privatisation plans, but women specifically are affected by the 'care in the community' drive. Patients who were once the responsibility of the state, such as elderly people, have been sent back into the community. This puts the burden of care back into the family and ultimately on women. Women are also specifically affected by the states offensive on the benefits system. Many women, especially single parents, are forced to rely on supplementary benefit, single payments, family allowances, etc. Cuts in all of these areas force more and more women into poverty traps.



## THE UNIONS.

Womens conditions at work and the wages that they are likely to receive are directly related to workers militancy. Wages and conditions have only ever been improved by workers fighting to improve them. Very often women work in areas where it is difficult to organise and be militant. A good example of this is in the health service - nurses are portrayed not as workers, but as caring professionals: the Florence Nightingale syndrome. Because of this, nurses tend not to be militant, are not prepared to take effective strike action, and therefore their wages stay low. The trade unions have begun to realise the changes in employment patterns: the growth in part time work, the increasing number of jobs in the service sector, and the increasing importance of women to employers. In the battle to recruit new members (needed since TUC membership has fallen from 11.5 million in 1979 to 9.5 million in 1985) NUPE have reduced subscription rates for part timers. At the 1987 TUC Congress attracting new members, especially in growth areas, was high on the agenda, and a motion by the TGWU stressing the need for recruitment in these areas was passed unanimously. Of course areas where growth has taken place are not necessarily areas where union organisation is possible. Employers in fast food joints and hairdressers, to name but a few, are often notoriously anti-union. Another problem is the high turnover rate in areas such as hotel and catering work. Less than a third of workers in this field stay in one job for even a year. Because workers in the private service sector tend to work in scattered units, under direct management supervision, union organisation is again made very difficult.



# SEXISM.

Many sectors of womens work is non-unionised and difficult to organise but even in areas where there is an established union, women who want to become active find they have problems. In many union branches, sexist attitudes prevail which dissuade women from becoming involved. Coupled with this is the fact that many union meetings are held outside work hours and no childcare facilities are provided, making it near to impossible for many women to participate. Of course there are no easy solutions to any of these problems. A revolutionary analysis of womens oppression sees that womens oppression can only be destroyed by smashing its material base - which is capitalism. But at the same time revolutionaries must be active in fighting reactionary attitudes in the here and now. Where women are prevented from becoming active in the class struggle, whether it be because of lack of childcare provisions or because of the reactionary attitudes of male activists, then revolutionaries have a very clear role. We must be in the forefront of fighting for conditions that actively encourage women to become active.



# CLASS STRUGGLE.

As revolutionaries we must be able to draw the correct conclusions from the changes that have taken place concerning womens employment. The majority of women in Britain are not merely housewives, the majority of women now work and this has clearly affected womens lives. To ignore these fundamental changes is madness. It is a trap that the feminist movement has fallen into but it is not a trap that revolutionaries can afford to fall into. The classic feminist criticism of working class politics, criticism that a male working class cannot liberate women through revolutionary struggle, because women are not part of that class - these criticisms can be swept aside with evidence that women are now a crucial sector of the workforce. The situation of women being isolated in the home, away from production is one that is declining with these shifts in employment patterns. All this should put us in a far stronger position to argue with reformist feminists, when they stress the need for a pluralist strategy. By realising our strengths, by readily analysing changes in employment, by being in the forefront in fighting sexist attitudes, we can encourage more women into revolutionary struggle. Denise.

This article is from 'Catalyst', available from Box DA, 75 Piccadilly, Manchester.

## DAM-IWA

1. The Direct Action Movement is a working class organisation.
2. Our aim is the creation of a free and classless society.
3. We are fighting to abolish the state, capitalism and wage slavery in all their forms and replace them by self-managed production for need not profit.
4. In order to bring about the new social order, the workers must take over the means of production and distribution. We are the sworn enemies of those who would take over on behalf of the workers.
5. We believe that the only way for the working class to achieve this is by independent organisation in the workplace and community and federation with others in the same industry and locality, independent of and opposed to all political parties and trade union bureaucracies. All such workers' organisations must be controlled by the workers themselves and must unite rather than divide the workers' movement. Any and all delegates of such workers' organisations must be subject to immediate recall by the workers.
6. We are opposed to all States and State institutions. The working class has no country. The class struggle is worldwide and recognises no artificial boundaries. The armies and police of all States do not exist to protect the workers of those States, they exist only as the repressive arm of the ruling class.
7. We oppose racism, sexism, militarism and all attitudes and institutions that stand in the way of equality and the right of all people everywhere to control their own lives and environment.
8. The Direct Action Movement is a federation of groups and individuals who believe in the principles of anarcho-syndicalism; a system where the workers alone control industry and the community without the dictates of politicians, bureaucrats, bosses and so-called experts.

