

**THE**  
**LIBERTARIAN**  
**COMMUNIST**

**£1**

**ISSUE 12**

**JANUARY/FEBRUARY**

**2011**

**Aim: the creation of a World wide**  
**Libertarian Communist Society.**

A Discussion Bulletin for the Anti State,  
Non Market Sector

The purpose of The Libertarian Communist is to promote discussion amongst the Anti State, Non Market sector irrespective of whether individuals or groups consider themselves as Anarchist, Communist or Socialist as all such titles are in need of further qualification. If you have disagreements with an article in this or any other issue, wish to offer comment or want to contribute something else to the discussion then please get in touch. If any article focuses on a particular group then that group has, as a matter of course, the right to reply. So please get in touch with your article, letters and comments. You can do this by contacting [com.lib.org@googlemail.com](mailto:com.lib.org@googlemail.com) or writing to Ray Carr, Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Branksome, Poole, Dorset BH12 1BQ.

=====

## Contents

- Page 2: Sleep is over, the movement re-emerges
- Page 4: European Calling: it is just the beginning: Paolo do
- Page 5: Notes on the Chinese Student Democracy Movement: Jim Davies
- Page 5: Tiananmen Square: reprint from Aufheben 2008
- Page 7: Problems of Revolution:  
Why the WSM (World Socialist Movement) is not growing: Robin Cox
- Page 10: The World vrs Wikileaks: Rob Ray from Libcom.org December 2010
- Page12: Contact details for groups in the anti state, non market sector.
- 

### Sleep is over, the movement re-emerges

At the time of writing the mass student protests against the rise in tuition fees are still fresh in the mind and the state is in the early stages of planning its revenge. The mass protests of November/December show very clearly that direct action not only in the form of street protest but also in actions of occupations, which are going on at several colleges/universities, is still the major reaction to the discontent that capitalism engenders.

The government did not change its mind, but who expected it to? Their reaction and that of the mainstream media and status quo in general was that, 1) the protests should have restricted themselves to peaceful marches and, 2) that students from poorer backgrounds will be better off under their proposals. To deal with the second point first, the government's policy on tuition fees are part and parcel of their overall cuts strategy, so how they are saving vast amounts of money whilst students are getting a better deal is something that defies logic. Either the government has responded to the mass protest movement and watered down its original proposals, which proves that protesting works, so let's keep it going, or they are being economical with the truth and the latter seems more likely. As for the point that the protests should have been peaceful, the movement would be unwise to get involved in a discussion where it seeks to defend itself against the charge of violence. There are different sorts of violence and violence has been committed by the government with its attacks on working class people in defence of privilege and when workers, including

students, attempt to defend themselves the state uses armed violence to suppress the anger they have caused. Secondly if hundreds of thousands of people march from A to B, listen to a few speeches and then disperse and go home who is going to take any notice? History constantly shows us that the only type of movement that is likely to succeed are ones that show that they are angry and intend to wage an all out campaign in an attempt to change things. Movements are not about pleading to those in, so-called, higher authority to change things for them but are about taking matters into their own hands. We need to remember the quote about the powerful only appearing powerful because we are on our knees; well people have started to get up.

It is not the role of this or any other journal in our sector to tell the student protest movement how to proceed. We congratulate them both on the street protests and occupation activities and need to support them in any way we can. But what we can do is indicate what we would see as positive developments as many of those involved may have similar ideas. Firstly it would be good to see the developments of links between the student protest movement and others in the anti cuts movement such as workers facing wage cuts and redundancies and with protests about the raising of the retirement age which is going to affect us all at some point. A second positive development would be for students to broaden the agenda beyond financial considerations and encompass questions concerning the meaning of education. Firstly access to education throughout ones life should be a right not a privilege. Aligned to this is the concept that education should be about far more than just preparing people for a lifetime tied to employment. Education should be associated with broadening ones knowledge, perception and understanding and courses in the humanities and social sciences which have been constantly downgraded by every government since Thatcher need to be put on a par with courses in the natural sciences and perhaps the relationship between the two needs developing. Education within capitalism, especially in the last few decades, is basically being downgraded to training for employment with more business investment and intervention in educational establishments and colleges and universities being run more and more along business lines. As discussed in a previous issue of this bulletin when discussing the history of independent working class education, the concept of education must not be confined to institutions such as colleges and universities we all need to play a role in educating ourselves and others in our own movements and develop alternative teaching and learning methods.

***Taking an historical perspective, movements do not come to the fore and then die away completely there is always something of a continuum. At times their momentum may wane and fade into the background, maybe for long periods but they will rise again and each time with a more radical and questioning perspective. The process is a long haul but the flame seems to have been reignited.***

---

On the following page we continue with the theme of opposition to the cuts and the role of students in this movement. The following piece was posted on the World in Common forum in December. It provides an interesting analysis and gives an international dimension to the sort of actions and movements that are developing. Across Europe it appears that the movement is being lead by students the question is are we going to see events unfold in a similar way to France in 1968 when protests by students were taken up by workers with strikes, protests and occupations. Time alone will tell but we could have an interesting start to 2011.

**From: paolo do: Dec 2010**

---

[European Calling: It is just the beginning!](#)

...You don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows: occupation of universities everywhere in Europe, blockades of the cities and rage. This is the answer of a generation to whom they want to cut the future with debts for studying, cuts of welfare state and increasing of tuition fees.

The determination of thousands of students in London, the rage of those who assault the Italian Senate house against the austerity and the education cuts, has opened the present time: this is because the future is something to gain when you decide collectively to take risk and to struggle.

The extraordinary struggles that we are seeing have the capacity to show a present with an intensity that exceeds the linearity of the time, which refuses our precarity condition: it is an assault to the future!

We don't want to get into debt; we don't want to pay more fees to study in London as well as in Paris, Wien, Rome, Athens, Madrid, Dublin, and Lisbon. This European movement is about refusing austerity policies, refusing to get into debt for these miserable politicians. Que se vayan todos!

What is happening nowadays in Rome first spread out in Athens and Paris, then in Dublin and London: it is the irruption of a movement who speaks a common language, the same young generation in revolt, who inhabits different cities but shares the same determination to struggle, floating like a butterfly and stinging like a bee.

We have to meet each other and invent a new political grammar against the weakness of the Nation-state and their strategy to face the crisis: their receipt

is just austerity, cuts and debt.

In Italy we have occupied not only universities, but also blocked motorways and the mobility of the country in order to circulate struggles outside the national borders and coming in Europe and beyond. The circulation of struggles is living within the Book Block and the wild demonstration in London, Paris and Rome.

This autumn we are living a real European student movement, that is various and radical, really heterogeneous. Its common reclaim comes from a protest that is born in the middle of the crisis, and that represents the most courageous answer. It is a struggle composed by different struggles, heterogeneous temporalities that reclaim more scholarships for student and a public university for everyone.

Within the book block a new generation recognized and found itself in the protest. Today in lots of cities the Italian student movement is showing something more than just solidarity: this is because your struggle is our struggle and all around Europe students are against the increasing of fees, the privatisation of the university and the education cuts. You are not alone in the UK: a European event, a new generation do not want to stop. We have the force and want to change the world and we have the intelligence to do it. It is just the beginning!

We propose to students, researchers, precarious workers and PhD students to build up together a European meeting at the beginning of the 2011, to continue the struggle, to transform this wind in a tempest!

---

*Continuing with the theme of student protest we now look back to the events of 1989 in China when students were at the forefront of the pro democracy movement. We feature two articles the first was written just after that movement was crushed and argues that the movement was not all it seemed to be. The second is a small section from a longer article in *Aufheben* a couple of years ago and looks at, among other things, how these events in China differed from what was happening in Eastern Europe at around the same time.*

### **Notes on the Chinese Student Democracy Movement**

Now that the bureaucrats of the Peoples Republic of China have crushed the student movement of democracy (in a hail of gunfire and extra-judicial mass executions), it is time to critically assess the movement.

The first image that comes to mind on reflection is the cultural revolution of the late 1960s. And upon an even deeper look I find that the two movements share more than at first meets the eye. Both movements were youth movements against the bureaucracy. Both movements were a manifestation of an internal power struggle within the bureaucracy that they were against. Both movements were used by a faction of the Communist Party to defeat its opponent. The only difference was that in the first Cultural Revolution the Maoist faction won its fight and in the present one it lost. And yet even the object of the fight was the same for both revolutions.

Deng's faction lost its struggle against Mao in the first Cultural Revolution, winning only on the death of Mao. Being the victims of the first they were determined not to lose again. While at first they seemed powerless against the rising democracy movement, they were organizing their power for the death blow against the movement.

While the media attention kept the student movement in the world spotlight, the ensuing spectacle also masked the movement of the bureaucracy against the students. Caught up in their own created image, the students became victims to that very image. Revolution by videotape is no match against counter-revolution by machine gun and tanks.

The student movement represented a movement by a rising new class of technocrats to assume state power. Its victory would have brought China no closer to democracy than it is now in the throes of counterrevolution. The rule by experts is not democracy.

A question must be asked. "Where were the councils in all of this, if this was truly a social revolution?" To answer this question is to cut right to the core. No social revolution happened in China, the student movement for democracy was only a public and bloody manifestation of a bureaucratic power struggle.

Jim Davies, (June 18<sup>th</sup> 1989).

### **Tiananmen Square**

*From Class Conflicts in China, Aufheben 16, 2008 pp. 1-24, the extract printed below can be found on pp. 7-8.*

For bourgeois commentators in the West perhaps the most famous, and certainly the most commemorated social unrest in China since the Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s has been the mass student-led protest centred on Tiananmen Square in the spring of 1989. Coinciding with the growing political crisis in Eastern Europe, the mass protests at Tiananmen Square seemed too many at the time to herald the beginning of China's own 'velvet revolution'. It seemed that, as was happening in Eastern Europe, a predominantly middle class movement of mass peaceful protest was about to

bring the downfall of yet another decrepit communist regime. This would then open the way for both liberal economic reforms and a move towards bourgeois democracy in China.

However despite such apparent similarities, the situation in China was very different from that in Eastern Europe, and as such was to produce a very different outcome. In Eastern Europe the demands made by middle class intellectuals for liberalisation and democracy had had a far greater resonance amongst the population as a whole, including many functionaries of the Communist parties, than the similar demands made by the student protesters in Tiananmen Square. The peasants, who of course constituted the overwhelming majority of the population, remained indifferent, if not unaware of the daily mass protests in Beijing and other major cities across China. At the same time the economic reforms of the previous ten years had created a '*red bourgeoisie*' of entrepreneurial bureaucrats that had a vested interest in defending the political and ideological monopoly of the party-state against liberal political reform. The urban working class, particularly the labour aristocracy of the *danwei*, had, as we shall see, for the most part done well during the reform period and although a sizeable section undoubtedly were sympathetic to the students' denunciation of the unaccountability and corruption of party-state officials, they were at first reluctant to join the protests [1].

No doubt many 'hardliners' amongst the party leadership cast a nervous eye over the continuing demonstrations and their similarities with the events that were occurring in Eastern Europe. However Deng Xiaoping, backed by the 'market reformers' faction within the leadership was at first confident enough to tolerate the protests. Indeed, although he was certainly not prepared to make any concessions to the

demonstrators that might undermine the dominance of the CCP, Deng had proved particularly adept at using similar protests on previous occasions to further his factional struggles within the party and no doubt had hoped to do so again.

However, at the beginning of May the urban working class began to join the demonstrations in significant numbers under the banners of some of the leading *danwei* of Beijing. Links began to be forged between the workers and those students who saw the mobilisation of the working class as the only means of breaking the standoff with the government. Attempts began to be made to form independent trade unions in direct opposition to the official party-state unions. Then, as fears of government repression began to rise, workers were at the forefront of initial attempts to form armed defence committees to defend the movement.

As it became clear to the party leadership that the situation was beginning to slip beyond their control, the balance of opinion within the government shifted towards repression. On 3<sup>rd</sup> June tanks were sent into Tiananmen Square and the protest movement was crushed. The student leaders of the protest were either rounded up and given prison sentences or were forced to flee into exile, often into the welcoming arms of American universities. However it was the leaders of the workers who had joined the protests that were to bear the full brunt of the repression. With little opportunity to flee many of those identified as ringleaders were either given lengthy prison sentences of hard labour or executed.

[1] *danwei* workplace centred communities. The Aufheben article, (page 5) states; "By aggregating entire former peasant households, many of which were often recruited from the same locality, if not the same village, the *danwei* tended to recreate many of the traditional cultural and social characteristics and attitudes of the Chinese village. Indeed many observers have described the *danwei* as 'urban villages'".

## **Problems of Revolution:**

### **Difficulties in building revolutionary organisations**

Below we are reproducing a contribution from Robin Cox (World in Common) which appeared on the World Socialist Movement (WSM) forum (November 2010) As the contribution is too long to include in a 12 page bulletin we are, with the author's permission, dividing it into two parts and the second part will appear in our next issue. Whilst Robin's contribution focuses on a situation which concerns the WSM the issues touched upon are of concern to the Anti State, Non Market (ASNM) as a whole. The issues raised are important because all groups within our sector, even though they might organise along different lines, have to deal with a situation where even if we add all our support together we would only make up a tiny fragment of the working class. A lack of progress in terms of gaining support leads to a concern among some for preserving what seems unique about our particular group and change becomes something to fear. There develops a fine line between preserving fundamental principles and dogma. A particular organisational position has to be taken on issues that could be left open for individuals within the group to hold different opinions on. In essence the question refers to how we structure our internal democracy. Is democracy promoted by means of adopting a group position on a range of issues by majority vote or would it be more democratic to keep group positions to a minimum and allow individual members to hold differing opinions on all but the most fundamental principles that hold the organisation together? The latter would allow for an ongoing discussion. We hope that this contribution will provoke further discussion from individuals within the ASNM sector on the question of internal democratic organisation. Whilst we would welcome contributions from members and supporters of the WSM we would particularly appreciate comments and contributions from those involved in other groups in the ASNM sector such as Anarchists who organise on different lines.

### **Why is the WSM not growing?**

(A modified version of a contribution to the

WSM forum on 16.11.2010)

### ***"Resolution creep"***

I don't think the WSM has been quite so ineffective as is sometimes portrayed. However, that said, what is clear is that it has not been nearly as effective as it could have been and this cannot simply be attributed solely to factors beyond its control. It must bear some responsibility for its own lack of growth. I say this as a sympathetic critic, or critical sympathizer, of the WSM who would wish that things were otherwise.

One reason for this lack of growth, at least in my opinion, has to do with something that I call "resolution creep". This is something that I have become increasingly aware of - even when I was still a member some years back. By "resolution creep" I mean the tendency of the party to want to take an official view of whatever theoretical issue happens to grab its attention at the time by voting to determine what the "party line" should be on the matter. Voting is fine when it comes to deciding on practical matters - like whether or not to raise the price of the Socialist Standard or whether or not to have a paid Head Office Organiser - but I have never really understood the point of voting on theoretical issues. Perhaps a WSM comrade could enlighten me.

Some WSM comrades like to call themselves "scientific" socialists but the scientific community would never settle a theoretical dispute by putting the matter to a ballot. Imagine a collegiate of physicists voting to decide whether string theory should be officially adopted as orthodoxy. It would just be daft.

I don't want to resurrect the ethics debate again but here we have a good example of what I am talking about in the form of a ballot to determine the Party's views on whether or not socialism is a matter of class interests only and not morality. But why? Why have a ballot on this at all? Lets say the the resolution is carried - what would it mean? Would it mean that any member who thereafter held that there is a role for moral motivation in the socialist movement would be flouting the "democratically-decided party line" and must therefore be forthwith expelled? Obviously not - or at least I assume not! Could it, alternatively, be just a way of

determining the strength of support for one or other side of the argument within the party? Well, again, obviously not. The poll is not intended to be just a kind of Gallup poll, a snapshot of party opinion. Something more is intended than simply to gauge the relative strength of support for or against a particular resolution.

### *Two kinds of theoretical positions*

This is precisely where the problem begins, in my view. To understand more clearly what the problem is one needs to differentiate between two kinds of theoretical positions within the WSM. These are:

1) Essential or compulsory positions upon which membership of the WSM is predicated e.g. the view that capitalism is a class society that cannot be operated in the interests of the working class. These can be called primary positions

2) Non-essential or non-obligatory positions in respect of which members can hold differing views e.g. the view that economic crises are tending to get more severe or the view that the state would be immediately abolished rather than be allowed to "wither away" upon the capture of political power by the socialist majority. These I call secondary positions

It is the second type of theoretical position, and the way in which the party deals with it, that I am mainly concerned with here. Why is it a "problem" that such secondary positions are regularly voted upon and officially adopted and how does this hinder the growth of the party itself?

Actually, there is a double aspect to this problem. The first aspect affects the way in which the party is perceived from outside. Once a party line has been decided upon then the official propaganda of the party has to conform to this line. Any departure from this line is considered to be "against the party case" and you can hear this particular expression routinely invoked every time some novel or dissenting theoretical proposal is suggested - "its not the party's case", meaning you cannot go ahead and expound it in public on behalf of the Party. We are talking here of democratic centralism, in other words. A small example of this - correct me if

I have got the facts wrong - is when an article was recently submitted for publication in the Socialist Standard. Apparently, the editorial committee, as I understand it, refused to publish because it used some ethically-laden term ("justice"?) to convey the feelings of the writer of the article. This may seem petty but it points to a much bigger problem.

The consequence of this party line-ism is unfortunately to project an image of the Party as some kind of monolithic organisation in which there is a standardised and uniform outlook amongst its members. The words "cult" and "clones" spring to mind here. Of course, this is very far from being the case but initial impressions, however deceiving, can be decisive. While the membership does indeed hold a variety of view on all sorts of things, the constraints of party line-ism means that only the officially sanctioned view gets to be publicly propagated. This, I think, actually makes it more, not less, difficult for a new sympathiser to feel drawn towards becoming a member because the likelihood of such a person adhering to each and every officially sanctioned position of the party would seem pretty remote (even though many members themselves do not necessarily toe the official party line on some matters). It may well appear to such a sympathiser that you need to accept every such position - or at least not to publicly oppose them - in order to be a member and this, for some, may be a quite unacceptable thing to do. In this way you are actually putting more obstacles in the way of someone becoming a member than you need to. You are actually making it relatively harder for them to join.

Conversely, and ironically, if the official propaganda (e.g. the Socialist Standard) of the Party were to, say, open itself up, as it were, to reflect more accurately the diversity of opinion within the Party, this may actually serve as an inducement to outsiders to join. If the official party line on some matter is one that you as a sympathiser do not find yourself in agreement with then, the fact that you know that there are members who hold the same views as you, might actually encourage you to join - more so than if the only point of view you heard was the officially sanctioned one. Remember that I am talking here about the second kind of theoretical position which is "non-obligatory" even though it is officially

sanctioned. Officially sanctioning such a position has the effect of seemingly, if unwittingly, turning it into a timeless fixed dogma inscribed on tablets of stone. The feeling seems to be that you can't or shouldn't argue against it because to do so is somehow not being "democratic" - not accepting the democratic wishes of the majority. This argument has actually been put to me several times with the very definite implication that by leaving the party over a particular decision I was somehow questioning the democratic process by which such a decision was reached. That is not at all the case. I fully accept the impeccably democratic nature of the process by which decisions are made within the Party but this is not really the point at all.

The point has to do with the decision itself - not the process by which it is reached - or, indeed, whether the decision needs to be formally reached at all. Ironically, democratically deciding on an official party line on some theoretical position only makes matters worse precisely because democracy can be invoked as an argument against questioning a particular theoretical decision. It would be a lot easier to question such a decision if it were, for example, unilaterally made by some vanguard elite within the Party and imposed on the membership from above. But because we are democrats who embrace democratic values we tend not to question the decisions that clearly have the support of the majority. This is OK for practical decisions, as I have said, but when it comes to making theoretical decisions along democratic lines this tends to be inimical to a critical, open-minded and - dare I say it - "scientific", approach to the matter in question and, as such is fundamentally unhealthy and corrosive of the creative vitality of the organisation itself. It stifles innovatory thinking and reinforces conformism which, from the perspective of an outsider looking in, is not a particularly attractive feature for a political organisation to have.

The other aspect of this problem is the affect "party line-ism" or "resolution creep" has on the membership itself. Minority tendencies within the Party tend to acquire a sense of themselves akin to a resistance movement in an occupied country. Commitment tends to be grudging and half hearted. Competition between members to secure for their hobby

horse idea the esteemed status of becoming the "party line" is intense and passions are, accordingly, inflamed. Fallouts happen and some members leave as a result. All this would be unnecessary if there was no such party line.

It is interesting that some members intuitively sense the risk of all this. Recently I was engaged in a quite protracted (and at times, heated) discussion on the subject of ethics on the WSM forum. I could not help noticing the somewhat oblique comments (mostly from WSM members themselves!) creeping in about "debating societies" and the like. The subtext of these somewhat critical comments, it seems to me, was that to go on about something so abstract and rarified as "ethics" was really quite irrelevant to the business of a political party. Actually, I agree wholeheartedly with this sentiment but what these individuals fail to see is that the very problem of "resolution creep" almost inevitably pushes the party into a position of having to engage in constant doctrinal debate of this nature. It has constantly, as an organisation, to defend itself a far wider range of theoretical positions than it needs to by virtue of the fact that these are part of its official outlook. The result is that it becomes more concerned with making theories than with "making socialists" (as William Morris put it). It is not in that sense a truly pragmatic revolutionary organisation and there is some truth in the claim that it is little more than a debating club. Don't get me wrong, there is nothing wrong with debate. It is absolutely necessary and vital. The problem really has to do with the terms under which such debate is conducted. The superimposition of "party line-ism" on debate within the WSM has a debilitating effect which undermines its whole purpose as a practical revolutionary organisation, in my view.

Perhaps, some counterweight to this habitual and institutionalised tendency towards party line-ism may need to be put in place - such as a quarterly theoretical journal in which theoretical issues can be discussed in an open-minded and critical manner without any expectation of formalising the conclusions reached. It would serve as a useful safety valve for those of an argumentative disposition to let us steam so to speak. Arguments advanced would carry weight not because they have the official backing or

blessing of the Party but simply because they were demonstrably sound and such a demonstration of their soundness could only be affected by counter posing and engaging other arguments. Such a journal could thus become one of a variety of means by which the Party could actually showcase the diversity of opinion within it which would actually work out very much to its own advantage, in my opinion, and would paradoxically help to make the Party seem less of a "debating club" whose primary purpose was to provide entertainment value debating with other organisations. This would be because Party decision-making at an official level would (hopefully) be exclusively concerned with practical matters as opposed to being concerned with these as well as with (secondary) theoretical matters as is the case now. There would no longer be any "decisions" to be made (and therefore to officially defend or promote) in respect of such theoretical matters. Non-obligatory or secondary theoretical positions would simply become a matter for individuals to take up, develop or, indeed, change their mind over, as they see fit - a kind of overlay upon, or refinement of, the basic obligatory theoretical positions on which membership of the Party is predicated.

**Robin Cox**

*The second part will deal with the issue of people with religious convictions in relation to organisations such as the WSM.*

---

Apart from opposition to the cuts the biggest story around at the present time has been the Wikileaks episode. The following contribution which appeared on libcom.org in December is therefore of particular interest.

The world vrs Wikileaks

Submitted by Rob Ray to libcom.org on Dec 12 2010

Assange is a distraction from the real revelation of Wikileaks - that our lords and masters are utterly terrified by the holes they see appearing in the carefully crafted story of Western democracy

As Libcom's resident big-mouth blogger on the subject of the media I've been a bit wary of touching the Wikileaks/Assange story, in part because I'm reluctant to throw in on the subject of Assange's legal case. The timing of the allegations is certainly notable, but given humanity's appalling collective record on taking sexual molestation claims seriously I really don't want to add to the unsavory, possibly inaccurate cries of "they're faking it/CIA agents" etc.

So I've decided to sidestep it by saying I simply hope justice (or given the inherently unjust system that claims the name, maybe just truth) will out. Because as far as the wider implications are concerned it doesn't really matter whether it's a true claim or not. If the powers that be want Assange out of the picture they will find a way - hence the Obama administration's bizarre claim that the leaking of embarrassing information into the public sphere amounts to "spying" (better arrest [Woodward and Bernstein](#) then) which carries a sentence of anything up to life.

If Assange is an arsehole, he's an arsehole. It wouldn't be the first time or the last that a fighter for good things has been a bastard on the side. He's also not the only one involved in the project, as the tales of a possible split in the group into an "[Openleaks](#)" faction have demonstrated (interesting in itself is the quoted dislike of "political agendas").

What's more important is the way in which the world's elites have banded together across industry and nationality to clamp down on a perceived loss, albeit temporary, of control over their Big Storyline.

Bear in mind that right-wingers like to talk about corporations being plucky, independent entities whose prioritising of profit immunises them against sinister "left-wing" state agendas and bureaucracy, while liberals love to waffle on about the state as benevolent provider, a kind of bulwark between rapacious corporates and the

evils of Communism (in Soviet Russia, the state presumably leaks you).

And the current set of revelations, quite rightly disparaged by the right as little more than diplomatic title tattle, haven't damaged any US interests. More than that, they contain some absolute zingers in favour of White House priorities for Iran and North Korea, enough so that some observers of a cynical bent have wondered whether the "leak" might not be a case of double-bluff from the US secret state. Certainly it wouldn't be beyond the capability of a well-funded but austerity-threatened CIA to dump the Wikileaks material with an agenda of backing long-term interests while simultaneously justifying their own jobs.

But on this matter we have a curious consensus. Well yes, yes it is a wonderful thing for a democracy to be transparent, separates us from those brutal dictatorships, marvelous, but obviously that doesn't include anything important, you know, vital matters of national security like US diplomats' agreement with practically everyone else outside of Italy that Berlusconi is a philandering buffoon psychotically attached to anything which might smack of more power. Letting that cat out of the bag is *terrorism*.

Bar a few token objectors, we've had damning opinions from columnists both left and right about Wikileaks' unhinged, anarchic and irresponsible approach to information (despite their willingness to redact names, addresses and anything else the Guardian thinks should go). The world has fallen over itself to capture the man considered responsible, posting an international warrant which would otherwise have barely registered right to the top of the agenda ahead of some of the nastiest characters ever to stand for a mugshot. The biggest companies in the world have attacked Wikileaks on all fronts, grabbing its money, barring its internet access, using every possible avenue to down the information.

It's an extraordinary alliance which itself doesn't fit the Big Story at all. Surely in a free democratic West it wouldn't be necessary for a group like Wikileaks to dart from country to country in a frenetic attempt to stay ahead of a globally-organised byte hunt while its activists face bread behind bars? In the US alone, there's constitutional guarantees to protect such journalism, and of course capitalists love to brag about the theoretical impossibility of companies dumping big clients for ideological reasons in a genuinely competitive market.

The key to this is to be found in one overriding concern. If sensitive US information can be so easily leaked who might be next? What nobody in our pantheon of the powerful wants is for massive infodumps to become something that happens as a matter of course, potentially taking the Big Story of progressive Western values inexorably civilising the world out of the hands of its responsible guardians in PR firms, media groups and state handlers.

And it is here that a key lesson is to be learned about the true nature of our endlessly vaunted democratic capitalist model, so smugly set above those freedom-denying "Communist" mandarins who run Beijing by Nobel Prize judges. In the midst of all that weight being thrown around in the cause of official secrecy, uncovered in this little episode is something even more damaging to Western democracy's image than a warped Big Story.

The reality is that a mild embarrassment from a bunch of enthusiastic hackers is more than enough to strip away our lords and masters' thin veneer of civilisation merely because it sets a dangerous precedent of openness. And with students showing the same physical reality on the streets, as police are given free rein to beat children and the disabled senseless, the protestations of right-wing media sources that the government is a hero battling the forces of chaos are looking very thin indeed.

**Contact Details for Groups in Anti State, Non Market Sector.**

**Radical History Network of North London.**

For details contact Alan Woodward on 020 8292 8862 or RaHN at alan@petew.org.uk  
Email: [radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com](mailto:radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com)

=====

**worldsocialistmovement/SPGB:**

worldsocialism.org/spgb: Postal address: 52 Clapham High Street London SW4 7UN.

Email [spgb@worldsocialim.org](mailto:spgb@worldsocialim.org)

+++++

**Northern Anarchist Network (NAN)**

If you want further information about this group contact: **Brian Bamford, 46 Kingsland Road, Rochdale, Lancs O11 3HQ** or email [northernvoices@hotmail.com](mailto:northernvoices@hotmail.com)

=====

**World In Common:** [www.worldincommon.org](http://www.worldincommon.org)  
Email [worldincommon@yahogroups.com](mailto:worldincommon@yahogroups.com)

=====

**Anarchist Federation:** [www.afed.org.uk](http://www.afed.org.uk):  
Postal Address **BM Arnafed, London WC1N 3XX.** Email [info@afed.org.uk](mailto:info@afed.org.uk)

=====

The following three groups are industrial unions. They offer an anti bureaucratic alternative to trade unions. You can join either as an individual or if there is support for organising at your workplace.

**Solidarity Federation.** [www.solfed.org.uk](http://www.solfed.org.uk) or **PO Box 29, South West P D.O Manchester M15 5HW**  
Email: [solfed@solfed.org.uk](mailto:solfed@solfed.org.uk)

**Industrial Workers of the World:** [www.iww.org](http://www.iww.org) Or **P/O Box 7593, Glasgow, G42 2EX** Email: [rocsec@iww.org](mailto:rocsec@iww.org).

**Workers International Industrial Union.** [www.wiiu.org](http://www.wiiu.org) or [www.deleonism.org/wiiu.htm](http://www.deleonism.org/wiiu.htm) or see the article on Industrial Unionism in issue 9

**www.Libcom.org;**

Another place to keep up with news from around the world from a Libertarian Communist view point.

-----

**Wrekin Stop War**

This can be found at [www.wrekinstopwar.org](http://www.wrekinstopwar.org) or contact

**Duncan Ball, 23 Sunderland Drive, Leegomery Salop, TF1 6XX** email: [Duncan.ball@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:Duncan.ball@blueyonder.co.uk).

=====

**Red and Black Notes**

You can obtain some RBN items from libcom.org as listed above. If you want to know more than read issue 6 Of The Libertarian Communist and the article by Neil Fettes pp.4-7. Recommended site if you can still obtain the full listings.

=====

See also: Institute for Anarchist Studies, the similar but separate, Anarchist Studies Journal and the Socialist Labour Party of America ([www.slp.org](http://www.slp.org)). Not to be confused with the Scargill mob.

=====

**Red Anarchist Action Network (RAAN)**

[www.redanarchist.org](http://www.redanarchist.org)

=====

**Another place to get your books/Literature.**

Looking for books, pamphlets or Journals from the Anti state, non Market perspective well try the following: STIMULANTS at [www.radicalbooks.co.uk](http://www.radicalbooks.co.uk)

=====

The Libertarian Communist now has a few pamphlets and journals related to the anti state, non Market sector. Journals Include Black flag, Aufheben, Socialist Standard, Organise and others. If you are interested please contact the postal or email address on Page 2 with your details so we can send a full list of the literature we have in stock including their prices.

You can now also visit our blog at [lib-com.blogspot.com](http://lib-com.blogspot.com)

