

# **The Libertarian Communist**

---

A Discussion Bulletin for and of the Anti State, Non  
Market Socialist/Anarchist sector

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

Clouding Over



The Class Divide

Issue 18 April to June 2012

£1.20

**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 [lib\\_com.bull@mail.com](mailto:lib_com.bull@mail.com) or writing to Ray Carr, Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Branksome, Poole, Dorset BH12 1BQ.**

---

## Contents

Page 2: **Welcome to Issue Eighteen**

Page 3: **An ASNM Grouping: A Critical Evaluation: Martin Bashforth**

Page 3: **A Reply to Martin**

Page 7: **Seeing through the Class Divide: Joe Hopkins**

Page 10: **Organization for Revolution: Stefan**

Page 16: **Occupy: Some Personal Comments: Dave Flynn**

Page 17: **Text of a leaflet handed out at a Occupy Boston (USA) meeting (December 2011)**

Page 19 **Contact details for groups in the anti state, non market sector**

---

## Welcome to Issue 18

This issue starts off with a debate about the attempt to develop an Anti State, Non Market umbrella grouping. Martin Bashforth questions the need for such a development; our reply attempts to deal with the misconceptions over what is being proposed and his general disagreements. We hope that this will clarify the issue to some extent but would like further input from others who share the stance taken by the LC that such a development would be a positive move forward. In his article; "*Seeing through the Class divide*", Joe Hopkins makes a detailed examination of how capitalism succeeds all too well in obscuring the fundamental class division based on the ownership and non ownership of the means of life. In "*Organization for Revolution*", Stefan develops the debate about the pros and cons of parliamentary road versus direct action by taking a more overall look at the strengths and weaknesses of various methods of organising for revolution and beyond it, arguing that no one method is revolutionary of itself. This theme is in many ways developed by Dave Flynn in: "*Occupy: Some Personal Comments*". Dave looks at the positive and negative aspects of the Occupy movement in London and makes the point that as regards movements that are starting to confront capitalism we should not become fixated on a particular form. Continuing with the Occupy theme we include the text from an interesting leaflet handed out at a meeting of the Boston (USA) Occupy movement last December. A special thanks to all the contributors to this 20 page issue.

### **An ANSM Umbrella Grouping: A Critical evaluation**

I understand that you are not proposing yet another 'Libertarian Communist' group, which is good to hear. Most of those that already exist do have a specific rationale peculiar to each one as a project in its own right. However I am not clear what an 'umbrella group' would actually achieve. It is suggested that it 'could play a role in developing the sector as a whole', 'promoting ideas', 'playing an educational role' and possibly 'co-ordinating', though what it would co-ordinate is not specified. These are things existing groups already do and I think that there is already a great deal of this co-operation across 'sectarian' boundaries.

Perhaps it is assumed that existing groups would wish to collaborate together under this umbrella in a more formal way than is already done? That would mean, in the UK for example, the Anarchist Federation, Solidarity Federation, the IWW, The Commune, the syndicalist grouping around Solidarity magazine, etc. etc. I cannot see why they would wish to do this without some tangible benefit and without the effort involved diverting their energies away from their own projects. While individual, non-aligned socialists might benefit from 'belonging', I suspect they would inevitably find themselves drowned out by spokespersons from the main groups. The discussion would go round in circles because of different strategic concepts. This tedium has been evident in the pages of TLC with debates on the finer points of SPGB tenets.

'World in Common' may have been a worthy idea, but as of the time I write this their website was last updated 25 April 2010 and before that February 2008. This hardly suggests much active interest, though it does link to an email discussion forum and to a separate blog, 'Spaces of Hope', both of which are more lively and

concerned with events. I understand the explanation of your personal reluctance to support the World Libertarian Socialist Network and their plans to become more of an umbrella group. But is not this kind of delimitation not just another form of sectarianism? Will we not now end up with two, slightly different, umbrella groups that significantly overlap? What would be the point of that?

There is a natural process already going on at local level with over-lapping and co-operation between many of the groups mentioned above and others not listed. For example: specific campaigns like the Guildhall cleaners in London; the creation of Tyneside Solidarity up in Newcastle; jointly organised bookfairs; and through the medium of local anti-cuts groups, anti-war coalitions and community campaigns. This grassroots co-operation is more appropriate to libertarian socialists than a top-down approach, which tends to create platforms for self-appointed stars, as well as fuel for takeover attempts, such as happened with the National Shop Stewards Network. The local process frequently encompasses much wider groupings, including those new to ANSM ideas, successfully and courteously, without creating artificial barriers. Let co-operation evolve naturally at the local level and federate later when mutual trust has been built at the grassroots. It is happening right now.

**Martin Bashforth, York**

### **A Reply to Martin**

Thanks for your contribution Martin. In the article that Martin is responding to we mentioned about the need to have an open journal where points of disagreements could be openly aired so we are pleased to include this critical piece regarding what we termed as an "*umbrella*" group for the anti state, non market (ASNM) sector. The term

"umbrella" might be problematic but it is meant not in the sense of bringing together all the relevant groups under one roof but in covering the overall aims of the ASNM sector as a movement in itself. Parts of Martin's article are disagreements and other parts are misunderstandings so let's deal with the latter first.

There seems to be three basic misunderstandings: 1) That what we are discussing is about already existing ASNM groups joining or collaborating together in an umbrella group: 2) That it is about setting up a new organisation: 3) That we are opposed to the World Libertarian Socialist Network, (WLSN) and its attempt to set up such a grouping. **Point 3** is best dealt with first because we would not want members of the WLSN to get the idea that the LC regards them as anything but comrades, infact the editor of the LC is still a supporter/member of WLSN. Why some LC supporters took a few steps back from the WLSN project was over one particular issue, the inclusion of "Market Socialists", we felt that including them was casting the net too wide and away from the conception of the ASNM sector and it appeared that the World in Common grouping which was set up to promote ASNM Socialism/Anarchism would therefore be a better avenue. Martin, in fact, has a good point; the setting up of two such groups with only minor differences would make no sense. As someone has already indicated in a private mail it would be better for the two groups to merge, how problematic that would be is another matter. What has become clearer since our last issue is that the setting up of any umbrella grouping is a process that is will take some time to develop.

**Point 2:** we would not be setting up another organisation as both WiC and WLSN are already in existence but the point is there is a need to develop them as more than just on-line entities. Martin is right about the WiC website, it needs updating on a regular basis and this is something that will be part of the

rejuvenation process that is being proposed.

The **first point** about the umbrella grouping seeking to unite all ASNM groups under its banner or groups collaborating under its wing is not what is being proposed at all. Such a move would, we believe, achieve nothing and be counter productive as it would probably just collapse owing to internal strife. The proposed grouping would not interfere with any existing group but membership would be open to members of those groups as individuals and this would not affect their retaining membership of whichever ASNM group they belonged to. Why might they wish to join? Probably, because they felt that promoting the sector as a whole is, at least as important, or perhaps more so, than just promoting one particular group or strand. Perhaps because they felt it was time for a more open type of movement. The grouping might also attract people who are inclined towards the concept of a society without a state or market but do not find any existing group to their liking and might be attracted to something less doctrinaire.

Now to points of disagreements: One of Martin's main points is about the co-operation and co-ordination that already exists between groups at local level and that this is better left to the groups themselves rather than being centrally imposed. This, he seems to suggest, makes any proposal for an umbrella group for the ASNM sector unnecessary. It is good to hear about such co-ordination but where the idea comes from that what is being advocated is a top down approach where orders are given out from the centre and have to be followed locally is a mystery, no we have not been converted to "*Democratic Centralism*" Although we can be accused of being speculative the article infact argued for the opposite. LC issue 17, page 5; "*Firstly any type of local organisation, for simplicity lets call them branches, should be autonomous and be able to engage in forms of activity of their own choosing without recourse to any*

*ratification from any centralist body" In the same article, page 6: "So regarding structure there should be no need for a standing central body".*

It does appear that in some areas there has been some co-ordination between the Anarchist Federation (AF) and Solidarity Federation (SF) and this may well include other groups. Such moves are very positive but some of the groups Martin mentions in this regard are not specifically ASNM groups Secondly We would presume that the sort of co-ordination Martin refers to is limited to groups who would describe themselves as anarchists. Any sort of co-operation and co-ordination is good news but the point is that the ASNM sector is made up of anarchist and non anarchist groups. An umbrella grouping would not have any negative effect on such co-ordination. Firstly this type of co-ordination would not be its main objective but if we were to speculate on what it might do in such circumstances then if the members in it from differing groups felt it could play a role in such co-ordination then so be it. However if such co-ordination was happening without such intervention we must presume that there would be no need or point in disturbing such a positive development.

Martin mentions book fairs, now maybe the ones he is referring to are open to all groups in the ASNM sector and book fairs are a good way of getting knowledge of anti state, non market socialist ideas to a wider audience. My own experience has been with anarchist book fairs and whilst we are supportive of them they would be improved by allowing groups to attend them whose only difference to anarchist groups in the ASNM sector is that they stand candidates in elections, especially since there often seem to be groups with stalls who bare less resemblance to anarchist ideas than the groups who are denied participation. So when feasible, at a time when there are sufficient numbers active in the kind of grouping we are proposing the aim would be to organise

book fairs in which all the groups in the sector could participate.

Martin asks the question; what would an umbrella group achieve? Well firstly it would aim at developing a more open movement. Its literature would promote and provide information on all groups that make up the ASNM sector, the WiC and WLSN websites do this at present. It may be true that some other groups also provide links on their website to other groups but these are generally confined to the concept of other anarchist or socialist groupings whichever part of the divide they come from.

As indicated in the article in the last issue there is at present no such thing as an ASNM sector organisation just an array of groups who come under that heading but who stand for strands of anti state, non market socialism/anarchism, Anarchist Communism, Council communism, World Socialism, syndicalism and so forth. Nothing at all wrong with the existence of those strands but what we are arguing for is an open grouping that can put forward the concept of a stateless, market free society without having to defend one particular strand but which can focus on the commonalities of these groups and strands whilst not ignoring that there are issues which divide them. There would not be any interference in any of the already existing groups

Looking at these various groupings the ASNM sector is divided into two main sectors who, in many ways, view themselves as being in partial opposition, social or class struggle anarchists and anti statist Marxists. Unfortunately, and this does not apply to all those involved with either strand, anarchists write off Marxists as statist whilst anti state Marxists accuse anarchists of being interested in abolishing the state rather than getting rid of capitalism For an example of this see the review of "*Anarchism: A Marxist Criticism*", under the heading of "*Leninism v Anarchism*" in the February Socialist Standard, (PP.20-1) although, to be

honest this is rather more conciliatory than many examples. A better or if you like worse example, it depends on which angle you approach it from, comes from the other direction and is in the March edition of **Freedom, (p.20) "The (anarchist idea of Communism", by Brian Morris.** Although this is not dealing with Marxian organisations in the ASNM sector it tends to lump Marxism in general with authoritarian statist tendencies. A prime example of this is in the ending of the article when Morris states:

*"The Marxists are just discovering for themselves what Bakunin was affirming way back in the nineteenth century in his opposition to the statist politics of Karl Marx"*

Another example of this is in **the March edition of Resistance the Anarchist Federation monthly newsheet.** Speaking of the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the anarchist international in August this year they emphasise the split in the international as being based on authoritarian Marxists versus freedom loving anarchists.

*"This split; they suggest: "represents a fundamental divide between those who believe that communism can be opposed from above, and those who believe that we can only have true communism if we have freedom as well."*

So here all Marxism is dismissed as authoritarian from the outset although the anarchists did not realise this until Bakunin and Marx fell out. They also conveniently forget that there was early opposition to developments after the Russian revolution from a Marxist perspective as well as from an anarchist one. It is quite frustrating to have to continue reading this type of biased analysis from groups who one has much in common with. Relating this to the attempt to form an umbrella grouping for our sector the point is not to bring the two strands together into a single unified one but to look at how the two different analyses can be used to compliment each other, examine what they have in

common and attempt to create increased understanding between the two. This would surely be better than the pointless bickering that still goes on and has such a negative impact in promoting our sector as a whole.

Both WiC and WLSN already indicate an outline of the sort of open organisation which is being advocated. Just look at the websites in question and you can see links to a whole host of groups that either are part of the ASNM section or very close to it. What the WiC and WLSN do that almost no other grouping does is to list groups that come from both sides of the divide in the sector as a whole. The other website that crosses this divide to a certain extent is **libcom.org** but that provides this function more via its history and library section than through direct links. However praise where praise is due **libcom.org** is a very valuable source of information for our sector. So in a nutshell the most valuable function an ASNM umbrella grouping would aim at providing is in seeking to bridge this anarchist/Marxist divide in our sector. The point is that this function needs to be performed by a grouping that operates through concrete organisation and not just on the web.

So let's be clear the aim is **not** to organise all ASNM groups under one roof or have them collaborating under that one roof and therefore lose their own identity. It is about developing more understanding between those groups and the two main strands which seem divided at present. This is what the LC was set up to do but the idea now needs to be taken on to an organisational level and the vehicle for doing this would seem to be either WiC or WLSN or better still some type of merger between these two groups. To this end we would urge members of both these groupings to respond to the issues raised here. We would also thank Martin for his contribution which hopefully has led to a better understanding of what is being proposed.

### **Problems of Seeing through the Class Divide.**

Reading "*Workers Self-Management: Some Thoughts*" (Lib Com #16, page 3) part of the second paragraph reads:

*"The problems when discussing concepts such as workers self-management is that we can be guilty of accepting or rejecting the actual term without considering the actual substance . . . the point is that workers self-management can take a variety of forms."*

With the "Occupy Wall Street" movement spreading all over the world and identifying themselves (us) as the 99 per cent (but for reasons inherent to a leaderless diffuse movement failing to consistently contextualise this mantra in terms of class) it can't hurt to consider the Marxian concept of class as Marx formulated it in the 1840s, and the actual substance, the signified of that signifier, in today's world, its current variety of form. Key to Marx's concept of class is a person's social relation to the means of production that the industrial transformation has brought about. The concept was and is simple – if you work for wages you are *working class*; the only "thing" you have to sell on the market is your labour power. If you derive a pecuniary income from rents, interest and/or expropriated surplus value produced through the labour power of the wage earning working class, you are a *capitalist*; the "personification of capital". The entire population in a capitalist society is ipso facto divided into two classes. This concept is simple, true and still obtains. How and why has it become so obfuscated?

Come let us reason together on the concept of class and try to determine its substantial content in the variety of form its taken in to-days social world.

The way to do this is to track the ideological mutation of the concept of "class" and the adumbrations that have

been used to cloak it through the decades, using the written records and literature left to us by sociologists that have focused some of their studies on the capitalist mode of production and in particular on its effects on the social psyche in an objective way. This form of analysis introduces the Materialist Conception of History (MCH) and Dialectics into our conversation.

### **We see through a Class Darkly.**

*"According to the Materialist Conception of History, technology, ideology, laws, culture and social practices are ultimately shaped by the way in which humans produce the necessities of life" [Dr Who, World Socialist Review, #22 p.59].*

This version of the MCH is a quasi-mechanical teleogism masquerading as a social law. The fetishism of this conception tends to make a transcendent entity of the historical constructions people resort to in order to give an (always provisional) account of, and structure and meaning to, innumerable historical actions, the list of which must always remain incomplete. If possession of the complete knowledge that Pierre Simon de Laplace postulated were possible, then history could be reduced to an automaton driven by the laws of dead matter. But clear-eyed ratiocination dictates that we ascribe that role to the capitalist system (which can be abolished), not to material development (which cannot be). Classes result from power differentials; class relations are always relations of power. State power and those who wield it in the interest of the ruling class perpetuate a class-stratified society and the current "for profit" mode of production, which greatly favours those with political and economic power.

Dr. Who's simplistic definition leaves out of account "class," defined by Marx as contingent on a person's social relation to the means of production; by omitting the class perspective the simultaneous production of various social worlds

escapes detection. This is of ultimate importance – one world (class) of ease and plenty and POWER . . . . The other world (class) of hard labour rewarded by privation and need, want and powerlessness – the absolute basis of the class war. Marx himself said in the *Manifesto* that all hitherto history was in fact the history of class struggle.

### **How the class became so dark.**

*"Man ... is the most imitative of all animals and learns his first lessons through mimicry"*  
**(Aristotle, Poetics).**

*"The whole question as to a class distinction in respect to spiritual make-up is . . . obscured by the presence in all classes of society, of acquired habits of life that closely simulate inherited traits and at the same time act to develop in the entire body of the population the traits which they simulate. These acquired habits, of assumed traits of character, are most commonly of an aristocratic cast."*

**[Thorstein Veblen, 1899].**

Superficially this statement may sound like an application of Lamarckism or Bergsonism but only by inadvertently overlooking the proviso "simulate"

*"These acquired habits"* (mentioned above), **Max Weber** says, *"constitute a 'psychological set' which arises when the habituation of an action causes conduct which in the beginning constitutes plain habit later to be experienced as binding; then, with the awareness of the diffusion of such conduct among a plurality of individuals, it comes to be incorporated as 'consensus' into people's partly or wholly conscious 'expectations' as to the meaningfully corresponding conduct of others; finally these 'consensual understandings' acquire the guaranty of coercive enforcement by which they are distinguished from mere 'conventions'"* **[Max Weber, Economy and Society, 1919].**

The above illustrates that the emulation of what Veblen calls the "Aristocratic Caste" by all other classes is not a product of socio-biology or force of nature (including the ideological construct of "human nature") but a social construct brought

about by an economic system of production and distribution imposed from above that fosters competition rather than cooperation.

Before the technological development of mass media the hard line class demarcation began to dissolve through everyday associations and mimetic socialization; under the rationality of the competitive system a conformed type of pragmatism developed resulting in a social praxis that fits the logic of the system – irrational systems can endure only so long as they express the telos of the dominant class, are perceived as doxic – and go unquestioned. All mass media are now corporate and disseminate the ideology that the world that exists is the best of all possible worlds and, above all, is natural. True bottom-up participatory democracy is impossible through the very existence of a dominant minority class and only a nominal democracy can exist where the dominant minority class has legally defined money as protected political speech. So Aristotle's phronesis **[note 1]** is distorted and stunted, corrupting what he termed Doxa (public opinion), which he believed was inevitably fallible, into Allodoxia **[note 2]**, which is false by definition and is PROPOGATED and SPREAD by the Doxosophists of every commercial mass media outlet during regular news broadcasts as well as entertainment programming.

In **Walter Lippmann's book Public Opinion [1922, p. 174]**, the two-time Pulitzer Prize winner wrote:

*"To anyone not immersed in the routine interests of political science, it is almost inexplicable that no American student of government, no American sociologist, has ever written a book on newsgathering."*

Well, in 1980 Mark Fishman, Associate Professor of Sociology at Brooklyn College City University of New York, wrote such a book entitled **Manufacturing the News**. A review of that book appears at <http://wspus.org/2011/11/manufacturing-the-news/>. This review, written during



the debacle at *The News of the World*, is suggested reading for those who would like to better understand how straight, unbiased, common, routine, everyday news is gathered and produced. Fishman shows with scientific methodology just how much ruling class ideology goes into "normal" news. Though Louis Althusser may be persona non grata among the socialist tribe that reasons in the way many of us do, he did well when he wrote:

*"Ideology is a 'representation' of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence"* [Althusser, 1971].

### **Enter Leviathan and its Ideological Apparatus**

*"Ever since capitalism came into existence states have intervened in the world market, to try to distort it in favour of enterprises operating from within their borders. They have used their political power to help their 'home' enterprises acquire a bigger share of world profits . . ."* [A. Buick and J. Crump, *State Capitalism*, p. 14]

States have always conspired to foster growth in their domestic economies i.e., states are the administrative arm of the capitalist class. "America's business is business"; "What's good for industry is good for America." These statements are quotes from U.S. presidents and echoed by the U.S. political class. You do not have to be a kookaburra wearing a tinfoil hat to see the state as a participant in a conspiracy that favours big business and the minority capitalist class. It is dialectical reasoning that favouring one of two classes that are in opposition necessarily redounds to the detriment of the other class. The power of economic (and therefore social) exploitation by the dominant capitalist class is enhanced by state practices and helps maintain their higher position in the distributions. As **Adam Buick** says,

*"In the real world, the unequal distribution of power inevitably leads to unequal distribution of goods"* [ibid, p.58].

*"Rationally consociated conduct of a dominational structure finds its typical expression in bureaucracy"* [Max Weber, *On Law in Economy and Society*, 1954, p.337].

One of the ways bureaucracies exert domination is through the creation of categories. The independent variable of "class" in the Marxian sense is replaced by income categories and high earners are termed upper class, middle income earners are called middle class and so on – they are all working class; a term you seldom hear nowadays.

The state, through its bureaucracies, has the capacity to trace out salient social demarcations according to various criteria. Through its work of inculcation of effective, distinct and discrete categories and classifications, the state produces an alledoxic social reality. This expressive and representational capacity to segregate artificial classes and integrate distinct class fractions into competing factions – creating hierarchically graduated class strata within the dominated class – always striving to attain the distinctions (material and symbolic) of the dominated class faction above them, spawns an internecine class struggle between members and groups within the dominated class which is now apperceived as the natural order of society: *"It's just the way things are."*

The intra class struggle masks the objective and very real solidarities of the dominated class and is the most effective negation of the struggle against the exploitation by the dominant capitalist minority. The bureaucratic administrator knows that membership of distinct classes, even down to the most formal of statistical categories such as age brackets, come with distinct advantages and obligations, such as (in the U.S.) retirement at 65 and/or early social security payments at 62 or liability to be sued at 18, the legal age of majority. The

frontiers between groups are the stakes in struggles and the classifications establishing these frontiers are instruments of power. This, as I've written elsewhere, is domination through administration.

Look, comrades, producing an awareness of these mechanisms that divide us as a class (and are intended to do so) does not neutralise them. Shining a bright light on social contradictions does not resolve them. Hegel thought states were the subject agent of history, but we, the 99%, know goddamn good and well that it's the working class that authors the world and its history through our labour power. **J.P Sartre** wrote:

*"Alienation consists in the free abdication of freedom in favour of the demands of worked-upon matter" [Critique de la Raison Dialectique, 1960].*

This is how we've been conditioned to work and live – alienated. A conscious and aware working class can neutralise the mechanisms of government and economy through direct and engaged political action after we have resolved the social contradictions first and foremost amongst our own class.

There's no better place to start than wherever you're at; there's no better time to start than now. The strongest weapon against wage slavery is to break debt bondage. Call, write, e-mail, visit and talk to your comrades. Communicate. Come to grips and share what you can, including flats or houses and transport. The fealty of household is a tonic to comradeship, while shared babysitting and domestic chores can reduce dependence on money, save time and effort, deepen communal ties and foster self-development. If you don't do it, then who will?

We say freedom is the conscious decision and act involved in producing for the satisfaction of social needs to the best of our ability with sustainable methods and technologies that do not harm the

environment and leaves time for social connexions and growth to develop well rounded and concerned social actors.

### **JOE R. HOPKINS**

Any thoughts on this article may be sent to [joehopkins@verizon.net](mailto:joehopkins@verizon.net)

### **Notes**

[1] In Aristotle's time, phronesis created conduits for the unconstrained communication necessary for the proper mode of democratic governance. The phronesis that has been spoken of since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until today recalls the efforts of the legal realists to find an immanent rationality through a process of balancing the particular interests of an always changing historical situation.

[2] All of the false recognitions encouraged by the dominant discourse.

---



---

## **ORGANIZATION FOR REVOLUTION**

The question of how to organize for revolution has always divided socialists. The importance attached to this question is reflected in the way that various schools of thought are labelled according to the form of organization they favour (syndicalism, guild socialism, council communism). Such divisions need not prevent socialists from working together, for it is quite possible for us to tackle our immediate tasks while leaving the question open, but clearly they make cooperation more difficult. So I have decided to overcome my reluctance to participate in the discussion [1] and offer some comments.

### **One question or two?**

Are we dealing with one question here or with two? Namely:

**Question 1.** What form of organization do we anticipate and/or advocate for the period of heightened resistance to capital and rapidly spreading socialist

consciousness that culminates in the transition to socialism?

**Question 2.** What form of organization do we anticipate and/or advocate for running social affairs in socialist society (or at least during its initial period)?

Socialists usually assume continuity (if not identity) between the answers to the two questions. Thus, for syndicalists the industrial union (syndicate) is both the chief tool of the intensifying struggle against capital and the main institution through which people in socialism will organize their lives. For council communists, the workplace council (soviet) again serves both purposes. Classical or "pure" anarchists, who envision socialism as a federation of local communes, tend to view the residential neighbourhood as the crucial locus of resistance to capital. The classical social democrats of the WSM are likewise oriented toward organization on the territorial principle (if not quite in the same way).

A certain degree of continuity between forms of organization in the two periods is inevitable: inertia is bound to be a factor even during a revolution. It will also have its advantages. In particular, it should facilitate the process of planning and preparation for the first steps to be taken upon the transition to socialism. Besides helping to ease the huge task of coping with the accumulated problems left by capitalism, this process should help strengthen socialist consciousness, giving it a more concrete and practical cast. **[2]**

Nevertheless, the desirability of organizational continuity is limited by requirements specific to each period. As the transition to socialism approaches, the top priority must be to thwart any possible attempts to suppress or derail the revolution by such means as violence, terror, provocation and sabotage and ensure that the revolution is successfully completed with as little violence as possible (ideally, none at all). Any large-

scale violence would doom the revolution to failure, either through its outright suppression or by fostering paranoid and repressive tendencies in the post-revolutionary society. The forms of organization best suited to achieve this goal are not necessarily the same as those best suited to democratic decision-making in socialism.

### **Parliamentary and/or extra-parliamentary organization?**

This brings me to the issue of whether it is possible to use parliament and other electoral institutions of the capitalist state for revolutionary purposes. Recently someone working in the SPGB archives rediscovered a leaflet produced in 1975 by those of us associated with the journal ***Libertarian Communism*** (we were soon to be expelled, after which we created the "**Social Revolution**" group). The leaflet explained our areas of agreement and disagreement with the views of the SPGB majority. Re-reading it, I find little with which I would quarrel even now. I reproduce the section on "Socialist Revolution" as an appendix. Here I summarize the main points, adding further comments of my own.

**First point:** The institutions of the capitalist state are ill suited to socialist revolution. Indeed, in large degree they have been deliberately designed to block revolutionary change, as the constitutional history of the United States, for instance, makes crystal clear. **[3]** Therefore the crucial elements of revolutionary organization must develop outside and independently of state institutions.

**Second point:** There may nonetheless be advantages in working inside as well as outside electoral institutions. This means not so much using parliament in any positive sense (let alone relying on it) as "occupying" it in order to prevent its use by anti-socialist forces. The aim is to acquire legitimacy (while delegitimizing anti-socialist forces) in the eyes of parts

of society that are not socialist but respect the "legally and democratically expressed will of the majority." Most crucially, electoral legitimacy may affect the attitude of the armed forces and their willingness to be used against the revolution. True, the strength of this argument depends on the size and disruptive potential possessed by such "middle-of-the-road" parts of society at the time of the revolution. Doubtless this will vary from one country to another. In a deeply polarized situation, it may hardly matter who controls parliament.

One reason not to be dogmatic on this issue is the shifting nature of the borderline between official and unofficial forms of organization. Originally all forms of working class organization were unrecognized and illegal. Only when the capitalist class started to make political concessions to the working class did there arise the dilemma of whether to act inside or outside the system. Whichever choice is made, circumstances can always turn it into its opposite. Parliament can be suppressed and a state of emergency imposed. Conversely, new forms of organization that arise outside the state system can be co-opted and absorbed by it, as happened to the soviets in Russia in 1917-18. There is nothing inherently revolutionary in any particular form of organization.

### **Pre-WWI German social democracy**

A historical digression – but a relevant one. The iconic example of the failure of the parliamentary form of socialist organization is the pre-WWI German Social Democratic Party. Most socialists who have studied this history would probably agree that the voting of war credits in 1914 was merely the culmination of a long process of degeneration. However, it is possible to interpret this process in a way that does not discredit the parliamentary approach as such. This is what the SPGB does when it says that German social democracy lost

its socialist character because it grew too preoccupied with the struggle for immediate reforms, reducing adherence to the socialist goal to a formal ritual on ceremonial occasions.

There was a debate in the early SPGB about how far the party should go in renouncing reform politics. Contrary to a common stereotype, the party rejected the extreme options of blanket opposition or indifference to reforms. It was decided that socialist representatives in parliament or on local councils should support or oppose specific reforms proposed by others on their merits (based on an assessment of working class interests). They would not, however, put forward reform proposals of their own. In this way an optimal distance from reform politics would be maintained, enabling the party to preserve its full commitment to socialism and nothing less.

But how stable would such an attempt at compromise prove in practice? Suppose that a socialist party initially views some non-socialist reform proposal as promising in principle but unworthy of support due to certain defects. The promoters of the reform then approach the party to ask what changes in their proposal would suffice to remedy those defects and win the support of the party's representatives. It would be very difficult to avoid getting drawn into the process of designing possible reforms. My impression is that the degeneration of the SPD was a complex process and that preoccupation with reforms was only one of its aspects. Another important aspect was the corrupting effect of constant contact with a bourgeois social milieu. Many socialist parliamentarians and trade union leaders came to aspire to a higher social position, if not for themselves then at least for their children. They wanted to become "respectable" – that is, gain the respect of the bourgeoisie. [4] The SPD also worried about losing its bank accounts and other property if it was too defiant. It was for all these reasons that when push came to shove in 1914 the SPD caved in.

Thus, the problem of how any organization that works within official institutions can maintain a real commitment to socialism is a very difficult and perhaps insoluble one. This does not necessarily mean that the use of parliament has to be rejected altogether, regardless of circumstances, but it does show the enormous danger of *relying* on an electoral strategy.

### **Occupational or territorial organization?**

Ideas of revolutionary organization based on occupation, workplace or industry (syndicalism) go back a long way. So do ideas of revolutionary organization based on place of residence (consider the Paris Commune of 1871). As both occupational and territorial forms of organization clearly serve useful and distinct purposes, it is worth paying special attention to tendencies that have combined them. One such tendency is council communism, which takes the workplace council (soviet) as its basic unit but brings workplace delegates together in congresses that correspond to territorial units at the city level and above. Workers' unions organized by industry or craft do not fit into this schema.

Another "combined" tendency that has been undeservedly forgotten is guild socialism, as theorized by **G.D.H. Cole**. [5] **Cole** envisioned a flexible system for representing and integrating the functional interests of both producers and consumers. His system can readily be adapted and extended in the light of new concerns (e.g., to incorporate environmental interests). Workplace organization inevitably follows the contours of the existing industrial structure and division of labor, but for precisely this reason its role should not be overemphasized. Highly pertinent here is the critique of syndicalism as a basis of organization within socialism offered by the Japanese "pure anarchist" **Hatta**

**Shuzo**. [6] **Shuzo's** argument is that syndicalist organization tends to preserve the division of labor inherited from capitalism and the associated narrow mentality. It encourages people to continue thinking of themselves as builders, farmers, miners, physicians, etc. rather than as human beings and members of society, impeding the emergence of a fully rounded personality.

Perhaps the fully rounded personality can only be a long-term goal of socialism, but the process of overcoming limited occupational identities needs to begin immediately because the existing industrial structure is ecologically unsustainable and urgently needs to be transformed. Will people whose sense of identity is tied up with being car makers, truck drivers, mechanics and highway engineers be inclined to cooperate with a rapid shift away from an automobile-based economy?

I also think that this critique can now be extended to territorial organization, because the spatial structure of human life needs to be transformed together with its industrial structure. Thus, suburban sprawl is a concomitant of the automobile-based economy. [7] This was not yet the case in Shuzo's interwar Japan, when the traditional rural commune still existed and could be envisioned as a territorial basis for socialism.

### **Past and future**

I am not against the study of past experience and ideas, but let us bear in mind that the future is bound to differ in important ways from the past. Is there not something contradictory in revolutionaries being so attached to tradition? For example, when council communism arose it reflected a process of learning from what was then a *new* experience – the emergence of workers' councils (or, to use the Russian word, soviets). Now, almost a century later, the conditions that gave rise to the councils have changed. In most places the large

factory has lost its earlier status as the dominant type of workplace. So the same attitude of learning from new experience is now expressed not in dogmatic adherence to what has become an *old* doctrine, but in openness to new and unforeseen developments. Modern technology is steadily expanding the range of feasible forms of organization. Both workplace-based and territorial forms bring people together physically. However, computers, teleconferencing and the like enable geographically highly dispersed groups to communicate intensively and cohere on the basis of shared views, concerns, projects and activities. For instance, I take part in an e-mail discussion group conversing mainly in Russian and with members in Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Japan and the US. Such virtual communities will continue to grow in importance. In particular, they have the potential to make organization across state borders a reality in a way that was not possible in the past. They open up the possibility of granting rights of representation to groups defined neither by occupation nor by residence, but (say) by esthetic outlook, global conception or interest in a given social or scientific problem area. How can these communities best be incorporated into a general model of revolutionary organization?

### **The democratization of bureaucracy**

My final remark reflects my experience of working in the British civil service at an earlier phase of my life. It seems to me that discussions of revolutionary organization place excessive emphasis on arrangements and procedures for formal representation. Whatever its representational format, the proceedings of any decision-making body will be largely shaped by the bureaucracy (apparatus, secretariat, civil service – call it what you will) created to serve it. These bureaucrats will inevitably play a crucial role (even if not an exclusive one) in

setting agendas, presenting background information, framing issues, and defining and appraising options.

So it is crucial to consider how the functioning of bureaucracies can be made more democratic and pluralistic. Formal decision-making bodies must be presented not with a single “expert” consensus that they will be in no position to challenge (with phony alternatives all but one of which are designed to be rejected), but with material reflecting the full diversity of specialist opinion. This is an incomparably more important matter than, say, provisions for the recall of delegates.

### **Stefan**

#### **Notes**

[1] I used to consider the discussion so futile in the current situation that I refused to participate in it. I recall that at one of the meetings in the 1970s that led to the formation of Social Revolution (basically a breakaway from the SPGB) I chose just that moment when the question came up on the agenda to go out for a walk, to the evident annoyance of other comrades who attached greater urgency to it.

[2] See Andy Cox’s paper “Planning the Revolution” at <http://socialistmatters.webs.com/>. At this stage the focus of public discussion will shift away from the question of *whether* to establish socialism – it will be taken increasingly for granted that socialism will soon be established – to the question of *how* various problems will be tackled by socialist society, with a wide range of competing conceptions advocated by different (though equally socialist) associations (socialist pluralism).

[3] The classic work on this subject is **Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* (1954).**

[4] I draw here on my reading of the sociologist **Robert Michels**, who had inside knowledge of the SPD (in his youth he was active on its left wing). His book ***Political Parties*** is considered a classic on the process

of bureaucratization. One interesting point made by Michels is that the socialists least prone to corruption are those who themselves come from a bourgeois background: they know best what the bourgeois milieu is like and have made a deliberate choice to reject it.

[5] Cole disseminated his ideas in the 1910s and 1920s. His *Guild Socialism Restated* was republished by Transaction Publishers in 1980.

[6] **John Crump, Hatta Shuzo and Pure Anarchism in Interwar Japan** (Macmillan and St. Martin's Press, 1993). For a broader survey of anarchism, social democracy and syndicalism in Japan, see **John Crump, The Origins of Socialist Thought in Japan** (Croom Helm, 1983), especially Chapter 10.

[7] On the car culture, suburban sprawl, and their effects on land use, see: **Brian Ladd, Autophobia** (University of Chicago Press, 2008); **John A. Jakle and Keith A. Sculle, Lots of Parking** (University of Virginia Press, 2004)

**APPENDIX. Section on "Socialist Revolution" from leaflet produced in 1975 by SPGB members associated with the journal *Libertarian Communism*.**

We agree that socialism can only be established by the majority of the working class in the industrially advanced countries acting on the basis of an understanding of, and desire for, socialism. The SPGB view is that when there is majority socialist consciousness the working class will elect Socialist Party MPs into Parliament who will be mandated to take the necessary steps to abolish capitalism and establish socialism. We hold however that socialism means such fundamental changes in all areas of social life that the form of organisation used to effect the social revolution must be one that allows the fullest participation of all in the determination of policy and the conversion of policy into practice.

Parliament is by no means such a form of organisation, for several reasons: MPs are not delegates, once elected they can't be removed from Parliament till the next election. These MPs would, according to the SPGB constitution, act on the instructions of the EC (Rule 29) who are not delegates, but answerable to the

members only once a year. The MPs would not be elected as delegates from all the different areas of social life – different industries, education, transport systems, etc – that would have to be transformed, but would be members of a political party to which certainly not all the working class would belong. And, perhaps most fundamentally, a 'Parliamentary' revolution obviously involves only a handful of people in the actual transformation of society, exactly at a time when the greatest mass participation is needed. We hold that it must be the working class itself that takes power, not a political party in the name of the working class. Thus the main means of organisation used in carrying through the revolution must be councils of revocable delegates in workplaces, community areas, educational establishments, etc, acting on the guidelines provided by regular mass meetings and referenda. These councils would be federated to co-ordinate activity.

A further danger of the Parliamentary position is that the assumption that a majority in Parliament automatically gives control of the armed forces, (we think that it might help, but that it by no means guarantees it), might lead socialists to neglect the vital task of getting socialist ideas across to the working class members of the armed forces. That these workers are conscious to the extent that they would not be prepared to fight other workers is the only real guarantee against an organised and violent counter-revolution. We think that if Parliament-type institutions are in existence in some parts of the world at the time of the socialist revolution, they might be used by the working class as a subsidiary tactic. However if they are used at all it should be purely for propaganda reasons, and to demonstrate the size of the socialist movement (especially for the purpose of influencing the armed forces). It must be stressed that any socialists elected on to such bodies would not be there for the purpose of deciding how socialism was to be implemented. The way in which socialism is to be implemented can only be decided by the whole of the democratically organised working class.

## **Occupy: Some Personal Comments**

Just what are we to make of the global Occupy movement? It is probably fair to conclude straight away that it raises more questions than it answers, at least from a communist point of view.

### **Form and Content**

If we start with its strengths we can identify the *form* itself. Although Occupy is part of a highly visible global reaction to the global capitalist crisis, (and I will restrict most of my comments to the London based movement), we can make the following observations.

Occupy is not passive, theoretical or armchair – it *occupies* space, and by so doing challenges basic notions of what constitutes public/private including the concept of private property itself. It is non-hierarchical and has democratic decision making (for example, general assembly's), and allows people to contribute according to ability or commitment. It provides an open door policy to the public, and a space where ideas can be discussed on an ad hoc basis or in more detail if you prefer. It provides educational facilities including the use of "expert" guest speakers (often mavericks from the banking/corporate world itself), and offers the maxim "anyone can teach, anyone can learn". This is thoroughly inspiring stuff by any standards, but what of the *content*?

### **Economics Forum**

In January I attended an all day economics meeting at the occupied *Bank of Ideas* building, and the type of ideas being discussed were typical of my other experiences at the St Paul's camp. To describe the ideas and perspectives floating about as *reformist* in the traditional sense of the term, would be misleading. Perhaps the common theme was that the global crisis was caused solely by the banking system which has become decadent over recent years.

Banks would have to be prevented from the corrupt practice of *creating money and debt from nothing*, so the idea of currency reform was an overriding concern. Contempt for modern banking seemed to go hand-in-hand with empathy for industrial capital which was characterised as being fleeced by the financiers. The overall impression seemed to be that we do not live in a globalised system of *capitalism*, but a form of banking landlordism, and insofar as we have capitalism at all it is not proper *free market capitalism*, but a form of *crony capitalism*. As one Speaker said "Not the capitalism that Adam Smith fought for". It is worth pointing out that this particular gentleman had previously published for the Adam Smith Institute and also rather gingerly paid homage to **Frederick Von Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom***. There were a few communist interventions which were well received by some people but the prevailing viewpoints were as described above. The interesting thing about the relationship between the *form* and *content* is that even though many libertarian communist boxes are ticked, such people appear trapped in a petit bourgeois worldview reminiscent of nineteenth century Proudhonism, and it was precisely this which I found most frustrating.

This said and such apparent incoherence notwithstanding, it would be churlish to write off Occupy on this basis alone. This has been a common criticism from both left and right. For the latter, after accepting that there may actually be a few problems with the system that they usually support uncritically, often shout "What is your alternative? You don't really have one do you"! For the left, failure to understand that "socialism" is the answer, or even worse, the "revolutionary party" potentially does not get to grips with what may actually be the beginnings of a revolutionary dynamic. Even if we believe that "socialism" or "libertarian communism" is the answer, we are still no further forward. Aspiration alone will not be enough to advance the revolutionary



process, no matter how much we talk about *class struggle*, *workers councils* or even the SPGB's *revolutionary* use of parliament.

If we are indeed in the early stages of a revolutionary period, it would be arrogant in the extreme to claim we know exactly how things should be played out. Existing political theories and practices may well preserve knowledge from the *moments* that have gone before, but it is reasonable to assume in our modern age that new forms and practices will come into play. It is in the light of this that we should evaluate not just Occupy, but any future reactions to the crisis.

### **From Proletariat to Precariat?**

This raises the question as to the class nature of Occupy. Obviously, using a standard Marxian analysis one would conclude working class, and they do argue "*we are the 99%*" which is certainly a basis for a class analysis. However, use of such a generic (although valid) category does not necessarily allow us to grasp any subtle changes that have affected any (re)composition that may have occurred in recent years. According to the left-leaning BBC Journalist Paul Mason a new sociological category; the graduate with no future (armed with internet social networking), stands at the epicentre of many a recent global disturbance. How does this link to a wider section of the so-called middle class whose lives have seemingly become more "precarious" in recent years, and does this apply to Occupy activists? (**See *Occupy Everything* Edited by Alessio Lunghi & Seth Wheeler** for a fuller discussion on Mason's ideas). I will leave this as an open question.

### **Revolutionary Pluralism**

In any case, if we are to understand the dynamic nature of capitalism, and moreover the strategies of the ruling class in response to the crisis, we are going to need a plurality of responses ourselves.

This is what **David Harvey** refers to as a co-revolutionary politics in his book ***The Enigma of Capital***:

*"The trick is to keep the political movement moving from one sphere of activity to another in mutually reinforcing ways" (p228).*

This means not getting fixated on a particular form and becoming static. We need to know when we have to try something else or even abandon an idea or practice if it ceases to serve our purpose, and confront capital at its most vulnerable point at any one time. This may involve packing the tents away forever.

After many months of turning the steps of St Paul's into a genuinely exciting throb of political activity, the inevitable happened and the authorities moved in and destroyed the camp. I do not believe that this should be lamented. If the tactic is still valid, there will be other occupations (as indeed there are), and if necessary, activists will have to come up with something else. As the great dialectical martial artist, Bruce Lee once put it: "*Be formless, like water*"....

### **Dave Flynn**

---

*Continuing with the theme of the Occupy movement: The following is the text of a flier handed out at an Occupy Boston meeting on the Boston Common in December, 2011 the day after the police forcibly removed Occupiers from Dewey Square, Boston. It was posted on the *World in Common Forum**

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

"We are the 99% ... and most likely you are too!

Our goal: 'A society that prioritizes the needs of all before the profits of a few.'

From the 'Declaration of Occupation',  
passed by consensus, at General Assembly,  
**Dewey Square, Nov. 29, 2011**

Lets ask a scandalous question:

Who needs a 1% in the first place? Why should we allow the super-rich, and institutions controlled by the super-rich, to run our lives?

Why can't the 99% run this world ourselves? Why can't we share the wealth and run our economy along lines of mass participatory democracy? Why can't we remake this society's political and economic systems, along egalitarian and socially just principles?

Why should we accept a world where billions go hungry while billionaires bathe in ill-made money they literally can't find anything productive to do with? (They hoard it, and pour it into reckless speculation, into usurious loans, as well as into obscene material consumption ... not to mention the bribing of politicians, and on and on...

Why should we accept an economic system where those who don't have money have no rights to have their basic human needs met? Where people must go into debt and into wage-slavery to obtain housing or education? A system where homeless people huddle in the shadow of empty bank-owned foreclosed homes that cry out for new occupants? A system where food rots and people starve until speculators say the price is right?

Why should we accept a system that poisons the planet and destroys the very environment upon which the life of our species (among others) depends? A system that sees the wages and benefits paid to workers as a 'cost' of production that is to be minimized and squeezed whenever possible so that profit can be increased? A system that year after year spends trillions on war and military occupations, while cutting back on social programs and benefits that poor and working people depend on? A system that spends money on opening up new prisons as it shuts factories and schools? Accept this?

Why should we, the 99% settle for a reformed version of this system, of better 'populist' rhetoric from politicians who have been bred to serve the 1%. Why on earth would we respect or fall into line for politicians who represent this system? Why settle for kindlier, gentler tyrants? For a slightly less predatory and toxic capitalism?

### **Why not instead, go... For the whole thing?**

Of course if and when we do, they will tell us we are being 'crazy'. That we 'are not being realistic.' That things are 'under control.' That things will be O.K.. Above all, the cynicism: that 'this is just the way it is' Our goals are 'impossible' or 'unrealistic'. They call us 'utopian.'

### **But who is really being realistic and who utopian here?**

Isn't it the case that if the 99% doesn't go for the whole thing, that if we leave a 1% in control of the collective wealth of this society when this movement is done, then whatever reforms or concessions a mass movement manages to win from this elite will eventually be evaded, eroded, and undermined by the army of lawyers, lobbyists, and campaign finance-pimps? Moreover, how can we even have a meaningful, informed mass dialogue in this country when the 1% owns, controls, and manage the media ... making the very discourse in our faces, in our eyes, and in our mouths a toxic, deluded manipulated thing? The list goes on and on...I for one am sick of making these lists. Let's get to the root instead: capitalism, a system designed for the endless accumulation of profit, a system that renders all other human and planetary needs external to that singular, predatory, virus-drive. It's a sick system and the 99% can be the cure.

We need to do better than just reforming this toxic mess of a 1% profit-driven system. We can and must not just speak truth to power, but build genuine people's power, with the goal of overthgrowing and overthrowing the rule of the 1% across all aspects of our lives. Let us reject and repulse -- TOGETHER -- the tyrant's grasp of capitalist elites over our economic, political, and social lives.

'Together we're unstoppable ... Another World is Possible!'  
a slogan from Dewey Square

'99 to 1. Those are Great odds!'

**Anti State, Non Market Sector Groups**

**worldsocialistmovement/SPGB:**  
worldsocialism.org/spgb: Postal address: 52  
Clapham High Street London SW4 7UN.  
Email [spgb@worldsocialim.org](mailto:spgb@worldsocialim.org)

**Promotional Material for the World Socialist Movement**

**Tee-shirts Blue** with a polar bear and *"If You Were a Polar Bear, You'd be a Socialist, Yellow,* with blue and green globe and *"The World is a Common Treasury for All"*. **Sizes S, M, L, XL, XXL State size when ordering. £7.00 Plus postage and packaging. (P&P).**

**Mugs:** Standard size, red and white. On the front, *"Only Sheep Need Leaders"* and on the reverse side, *"Famine? War? Pollution? Capitalism is the Problem, World Socialism is the Solution"* **£5 Plus P&P.**

**Pens: blue and white** with blue ink; *"Only Sheep Need Leaders"* and a sheep. **Red and white** with blue ink with *"Workers of the World Unite"* **Black** with black ink, *"Only Sheep Need Leaders"* and a sheep. **50p each Plus P&P.**

**Baseball Caps:** Navy blue with embroidered *"World Socialist Movement"*. **£7 each plus P&P.**

**Balloons:** different colours with *"World Socialist Movement"*. **15p each plus P&P.**

All items carry the WSM website address. Cheques and Postal Orders made payable to SPGB SW Regional Branch. Also available, a SPGB enamelled badge, *"The World for the Workers"*. £10.  
For further details on all items contact Veronica at [veronica.clanchy@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:veronica.clanchy@hotmail.co.uk) or phone 01202 569826

=====  
**Read issue 22 of the World Socialist Review: Publication of World Socialist Party US.**  
*"Socialists take a look at Obama" "Is Obama a socialist? He does not regard himself as one. Neither do we. This issue of World Socialist Review examines Obama's outlook and life story, his packaging as a politician, and his policy in such areas as healthcare, the economy and the environment. It also places Obama in*

*the context of world capitalism and the American political system."*

Also available ***"Role Modelling Socialist Behaviour: The Life and Letters of Isaac Rab"***. There is a review of this book in the World Socialist Review 22 and further details can be obtained by contacting the address below.

**World Socialist Party US (WSPUS) website** [wspus.org](http://wspus.org) Postal address: World Socialist Party, Box 440247, Boston, MA 02144.

=====

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

-----

[www.Libcom.org](http://www.Libcom.org);

-----

**Red and Black Notes**

You can obtain some RBN items from [libcom.org](http://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

-----

**Red Anarchist Action Network (RAAN)**  
[www.redanarchist.org](http://www.redanarchist.org)

=====

**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 Commune**

**For workers' self management and communism from below.**  
Website: [thecomune.co.uk](http://thecomune.co.uk)  
Postal address: The Commune, Freedom book shop, 84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

Take a look at Andy Cox's website which looks at how socialism might be developed:  
<http://socialistmatters.webs.com/>.

---

Comrades may be interested in the following links:

For Libertarian Communists in Russia and Belarus: <http://wiki.avtonom.org/index.php>

"Eretik" (Heretic) is a left communist journal in Russian and English that appears both on the net and in print. This is produced by a group in Moldova.

See: <http://eretic-samizdat.blogspot.com/2012/immunity-of-rich-and-powerful.html>

---

**A couple of places to purchase Literature and help support the ASNM sector.**

**"there is an Alternative!"**

**STIMULANTS:** A collection of material highlighting an opposition to the Mantra that "There Is No Alternative" to how we live today. Journals, Pamphlets, Books, DVDs and Cds etc available [www.radicalbooks.co.uk](http://www.radicalbooks.co.uk)

**Libertarian Communist Literature** has a selection of pamphlets and journals related to the anti state, non Market sector. Journals Include: **Black flag, Aufheben, Socialist Standard, Organise** and others. We have a variety of pamphlets and a few books.

If you are interested please contact the postal or email address on Page 2 with your details This list is also included in our blog which can be found at <http://lib-com.blogspot.com/> This also includes issues 1 to 16 of The Libertarian Communist. The Libertarian Communist can also be found at [www.scribd.com](http://www.scribd.com)

---

**Worth taking a look at**

Institute for Anarchist Studies, the similar but separate, Anarchist Studies Journal and Anarchy Archives. See also the Socialist Labour Party of America ([www.slp.org](http://www.slp.org)), and the Marxist Internet Archive Library

**Direct Action Industrial Unions**

**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.uk](mailto:rocsec@iww.org.uk).

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

---

*The following groups although not strictly defined as anti state, non market are still worth taking a look at*

**World Libertarian Socialist Network**

An excellent resource for groups who come under the heading of Libertarian Socialism many of which come within the remit of the anti state, non market sector [www.libertyandsocialism.org](http://www.libertyandsocialism.org)

---

**Radical History Network of North London.**

For details contact Alan Woodward on 020 8800 1046 or RaHN at [alan@petew.org.uk](mailto:alan@petew.org.uk) Email: [radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com](mailto:radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com) This group have published a series of articles to commemorate the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Spanish Revolution this can be found at <http://radicalhistorynetwork.blogspot.com/>

---

**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)

---

**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).