

THE
LIBERTARIAN
COMMUNIST

Free or Donation

ISSUE 11

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER

2010

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 or writing to Ray Carr, Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Branksome, Poole, Dorset BH12 1BQ.

=====

Contents

Page 2: Help.

Page 3: Opposing the cuts: what should the strategy of the anti state, non market sector be?

Page 4: Toward A Libertarian Socialism: Chris Faatz

Page 7: Problems of Revolution: Parliament and Revolution: some issues to reflect on:
Ricardo Mond

Page 9: Opposition to cutbacks: French workers lead the way.

Page 10: Leaflet from France: We are One, let's be All!

Page 11: Contact details for groups in the anti state, non market sector.

Help

As impossible as it may seem the end of 2010 is not that far off. This is already issue 11 of The Libertarian Communist, a project that started back in March 2009. It began as a way of discussing issues after I had left The Socialist Party (SPGB, Clapham) at the end of 2008 and then moved quickly to become a discussion bulletin for the anti state, non market socialist/anarchist sector. The bulletin is distributed by email or hard copy and thanks are due to one supporter who places it on the internet. It is pleasing to report that the readership has increased steadily since March 09. The other day I was reading the editorial of a 2007 edition of Black Flag (BF) and I was struck by the fact that more professional outfits face similar problems to publications such as The Lib Com. They were making the point that how often BF appeared, its size and quality, depended on supporters sending their articles in, they also made the point that whilst they felt there was a need for BF continuing as an independent journal they would be happy to merge with other journals to produce one good quality anarchist magazine. Personally I think there are benefits in a number of class struggle anarchist journals being available rather than all merging in to one as variety is no bad thing. I not only read Freedom, Resistance, Organise, Black Flag, Direct Action and also the Socialist Standard, I also try and sell them, though in the Bournemouth/Poole area where I live this is no easy task.

So is there a future for The Libertarian Communist? Well, I would like to think so because as far as I know there is nothing else around that is specially aimed at the anti state, non

market sector rather than being specifically anarchist or socialist and whose aim is to focus on the similarities of those two strands rather than on their differences. If there is another such publication than, yes, I would discuss the possibility of a merger, the aim was always to take like minded people on board. Yes this is an appeal for articles, because it is supposed to be a discussion journal and the better issues have been where we have had articles from two or three people. Our readership is probably mostly activists and they have that name because they are busy running around promoting ideas and stirring the working class into self activity. So I would like to remind people that any articles sent in do not have to be freshly written, so if you have written something sometime ago that you think would be suitable or you know of something that someone else has written that they would like publicised then please get in touch. It would be good to hear from you, otherwise its back to searching through places such as World in Common and Libcom.org for suitable material.

=====

Opposing the cuts: What should the strategy of the anti state, non market sector be?

A point that should be made when discussing the present capitalist recession and our response to it, leaving aside the fact that it is global and our response must be organised on the same dimension, is that for many sections of the working class the system is never out of recession. Even at present just when the axe is poised and ready to be swung we hear talk on the daily propagandist programmes that passes for news under capitalism that the economy is coming out of recession. The questions that need to be asked in relation to this are firstly; what precisely is meant by this? Secondly; who is going to benefit from this supposed upturn? So the point is that the crisis is not a short-term problem but has been and is ongoing. In truth any so-called upturn is just in terms of increased profits for some among the parasite class and if we are really lucky a few more part-time £6 an hour jobs. Just how lucky can we get?

That groups within our sector should be providing workers opposing the threat to their working and living conditions with their full support is not a matter for debate. How we go about this is more problematic as was indicated by a

couple of articles in Freedom, [issue 7118, September 25th]. The first of these, "**Persistently Protesting**", concerned a demonstration outside the TUC conference in Manchester on the opening day. The following day the TUC announced that it was to organise a campaign against the cuts. This campaign ranges from the opinion of Bob Crowe that it must include co-ordinated strikes and civil disobedience to that of Les Bayliss of Unite who thought this would amount to suicide. Presumably Bayliss feels that the TUC should send a delegation to meet with the likes of Cameron and Clegg and they would see the error of their ways and withdraw all proposed cuts. The type of campaign that would emerge is indicated by most of the groups represented in the demonstration, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) with its "Right to Work" banners, refashioned "Communists" (meaning more supporters of state capitalism), trade unions, trade councils and the National Shop Stewards movement (NSSM) In other words it would be led by a handful of trade union leaders who will tread carefully and not even consider any action that breaks the law, even if the law on strikes is further tightened, and this in effect will make the campaign a complete waste of time. The left such as Bob Crowe, the SWP, SP (Militant) and NSSM will criticise

such a policy but it is unlikely they will actively oppose it.

What is wrong with such a campaign from an anti state, non market (ASNM) perspective is indicated by the second article in Freedom, "**Light Trim Sir**". As this article suggests if we are to organise a meaningful campaign it must be organised from the bottom upwards where the workers concerned make their own decisions and ongoing strategies and structures have to be developed directly by those involved in the struggles. So any strategy likely to be developed by the TUC is not only ineffective because it lacks militancy, and that will be the main criticism of the left, it will be ineffective because it will be based on a leadership basis where a hierarchy not directly affected by cuts will be issuing instructions. The second problem with any campaign initiated by the trade unions and the left is that it will fail to put forward a radical alternative, meaning a perspective that will point out to workers that the whole problem is rooted within the capitalist system and that the only meaningful way forward is to begin to think outside the capitalist box. So while being fully behind workers in their struggle to oppose the cuts groups within the anti state, non market sector need be careful not to entangle themselves in a traditional going nowhere campaign organised by a trade union movement and supported by the state capitalist left. In this respect it is encouraging to see that in the Anti Cuts March proposed to take place in London on October 23rd there is a proposal for a Radical Workers Bloc (RWB) so we can map out how our views differ from the mainstream labour movement. A statement from the South London Solidarity Federation states the following: "**We also intend to be a visible anti-capitalist presence on the demonstration pointing out that it is capitalism that has caused the crisis that has led to these cuts and that in response to their class war we need to reciprocate meeting cuts with direct action – strikes, occupations and civil**

disobedience – whilst fighting for a different world which puts human needs first." The idea of a *radical workers bloc* was criticised by Ian Bone at a meeting at The London Anarchist Book Fair but we would argue that it is a positive idea because we need to spell out to workers that there is an alternative to the left. If the idea of a RWB is criticised because it is seen as separating us from the 'mass' of workers then I believe this is a false view because what is proposed is about inviting workers to join us in a more radical grouping. Would we, for example, cancel all our meetings on the cuts and just meekly attend those of the so-called mainstream labour movement? No of course not. Let's come together and use any opposition to the cuts to not only aid workers in their struggles but also to put forward our message; "*Oppose the cuts by opposing the profit system*".

+++++

The Following article was posted on the World in Common forum in March of this year. It fits fairly well into the rationale of what The Libertarian Communist stands for and whilst we might not agree with everything it is well worth inclusion and hopefully will raise further discussion. The original reference is:

<http://flag.blackened.net/liberty/tals.html>

TOWARD A LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM

By Chris Faatz
(cfaatz@teleport.com)

"By 'socialism' I mean a classless society in which the State has disappeared, production is cooperative and no man [person] has political or economic power over another. The touchstone would be the extent to which each individual could develop his [or her] own talents and personality."
--Dwight Macdonald, "The Root is Man" (1946)

At one point in the not-so distant past, a friend and I were discussing certain people, Victor Serge, Gustav Landauer, Daniel Guerin--who attempted to combine the libratory vision of social anarchism with the rigorous analytical method of Marxism in a libertarian Marxist, or libertarian socialist form. While the discussion, at that time, didn't really progress too far, it hardly died altogether, and has been festering in the back of my mind ever since. Recently, the whole issue was brought vividly back to life in my reading of social ecologist Murray Bookchin's book *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism*, a book which quite effectively if somewhat vitriolically demolishes the "anarcho- primitivism" and anti-rationalism of large elements of the anarchist milieu (at least in North America: see the paper "Fifth Estate," or the works of the likes of John Zerzan and Hakim Bey for illustrations of this current). As Bookchin describes it, "lifestyle anarchism" emphasizes "personal insurrection rather than general revolution... as opposed to social anarchism, with its roots in historicism, the social matrix of individuality, and its commitment to a rational society." Social anarchism, on the other hand, is summarized as "heir to the Enlightenment tradition, with due regard to that tradition's limits and incompleteness. Depending on how it defines reason, social anarchism celebrates the thinking human mind without in any way denying passion, ecstasy, imagination, play, and art. Yet rather than reify them into hazy categories [as lifestyle anarchists are, according to Bookchin, prone to do [CF], it tries to incorporate them into everyday life. It is committed to rationality while opposing the rationalization of experience; to technology, while opposing the 'mega- machine;' to social institutionalization, while opposing class rule and hierarchy; to a genuine politics based on the confederal coordination of municipalities or communes by the people in face-to-face democracy, while opposing parliamentarism and the state."

This, as I see it, and as Bookchin makes clear in the second essay in this book, "The Left that Was: A Personal Reflection," a compelling "socialist vision", albeit of a very specific type, as well. Indeed, throughout this little book the argument is implicit (and, on occasion, explicit) that, in the end, there's very little difference between a coherent

social anarchist and libertarian socialist vision it's all just a matter of words. Refreshingly enough, in this age of relentless analysis and little prescription, Bookchin goes on to offer a libertarian left program around which such a rational, humanistic, pluralistic socialist project could and might cohere. Bookchin emphasizes four points as central to such a program: confederal forms (a commune of communes, as he puts it at another point); opposition to statism, class oppression, and hierarchical forms of social organization; a belief in direct democracy; and what I can only delightedly call "the vision thing," i.e., a picture, however fuzzy, of what a libertarian society might look like. He then goes on to insist that:

The most important issue that left-libertarianism, libertarian socialism no less than anarchism faces today is: What will it do with these four powerful tenets? How will we give them social form and content? In what ways and by what means will we render them relevant to our time and bring them to the service of an organized popular movement for empowerment and freedom?

These are all interesting and challenging questions, and for those of us who have emerged from the hermetically-sealed world of those parts of the left that Bookchin has little patience with, they are perhaps the most challenging of all the issues he raised. Of course, to be fair, one must recognize that those who adhere to some form of Leninism or social democracy would find this program, and the resulting questions, noxious, petty-bourgeois nostrums at best, downright reactionary utopian misleadership at worst. But, we live in a world where time-hallowed assumptions are changing, where orthodoxies of all sorts are fraying in the face of never-before imagined realities, and where serious people are seriously examining the history and trajectory of movement(s) for social change and for revolution. In the context of the environmental crisis, such a vision of decentralization and direct, grassroots democracy makes more than a little sense. In an age of particularistic obsessions on large parts of the left, whether it be with race, gender, or sexuality, the Universalist message virtually cries out to be heard. And, in the post-Bolshevik era, the focus on the centrality of the individual and of a radical localism is, at the very least, reassuring, if not downright inspiring. At least in my heart and mind, the cogent libertarian

thrust of Bookchin's argument cuts right to the bone. Indeed, there's something of the prophetic in Bookchin's assertions. His ideal society is one that is compelling, beautifully, and starkly and eminently human and humanizing. It's something that's far out there on the horizon and just beyond our grasp, as he's convincingly argued in such earlier works as *Post-Scarcity Anarchism*. And, let's face it: prophets don't wait for reality to catch up with them before they start bellowing from the mountaintops at least not when the reality is as sordid as the one that has today so effectively shackled the popular mind, and is winding its poisonous course across the face of our planet.

In the book's second essay, Bookchin relates his views of "how the left once was," highlighting the pluses of the pre-Bolshevik experience, and emphasizing, once again, that "vision thing." He stresses confederation, anti-militarism (as opposed to pacifism), internationalism (Lenin's "opportunistic" kowtowing to the nationalist aspirations of his period, in Bookchin's mind, helped lay the seeds of the crisis of particularism as opposed to an internationalist universalism that was to come), the radically-democratic spirit, and the rational secularism that moulded the pre-Bolshevik (far) left's worldview and principled interventions. While one can't disagree really with the overall thrust of Bookchin's arguments, it's here in the details that his tendency for narrowness and dogmatism, his tendency to insist, ironically enough, on One True Path come forth. These are, perhaps, niggling points, but I feel they must be made. For example, he disparages the "broken rifle" of contemporary pacifism as compared to a glorified radical "anti-militarism" of an earlier age, the ideal of an entire citizenry in arms against the state or the class enemy. In doing so, he seems to forget that the flame of the Left that he holds so dear was kept, at least in part, flickering by the radical conscientious objectors and absolutist pacifists of World Wars I and II, of Korea and Vietnam, with their refusal on all fronts to cooperate with the state or with the killing machine that is capital at its most feverish. He shrugs off the experience and influence of organizations such as Peacemakers, or its precursor, the Committee for Nonviolent Revolution; of periodicals such as Dwight Macdonald's marvellous and irritating "Politics;" and he

pays no attention whatsoever to the role that such organizations and others of their ilk, or of individuals such as AJ Muste and Barbara Deming, played in keeping the memory, practice, and, above all else, principles of a more humane and humanizing left alive in the face of overwhelming opposition by the status quo. Indeed, it's arguable that, without the existence of such radical pacifists and their consistent and principled witness and actions, alongside that of the rump IWW, SLP, left communists, and tiny, fractured anarchists of the period, the light of Bookchin's "left that was" would have flickered out altogether. There's another weakness, in my mind, one shared by most of the secular left, and still capable of raising the hackles of comrades of almost any flavour. That, of course, is the question of religious radicalism. To keep it brief, one need look no further than the Catholic Worker movement, and its stance for sixty-plus years, or the reality of base-community organizing in liberation theology to realize the role that radical religionists can and do play in keeping alive and advancing the vision that Bookchin describes. To ignore them is folly, to attack them is sectarian. They are, whether we like it or not, a vital and living part of our tradition. I, for one, like that very much, and anticipate that we'll be seeing much more, rather than less, organizing along left libertarian lines among persons of faith--Christians, Jews, Buddhists, and none-of-the-above alike in the days and years to come.

Can such a libertarian, decentralist vision be melded with the "scientific" analysis of Marx and Engels? How can the innumerable lessons of Russia and the USSR, the Ukraine, Germany, Italy, Spain, China, Hungary, Cuba, etc., etc. be integrated into such a vision, creatively and without mindlessly reiterating the ideological certitudes half-truths, at best that so many of us have, quite literally, spouted for decades to no avail? Organizationally, what is called for in such a vision of a libertarian socialist movement, playing a prophetic and principled role in the class struggle and the battles of all the oppressed for a world of true justice and harmony for the cooperative commonwealth of all humankind? In a pluralistic movement, what means are most appropriate in advancing such a vision? How might fluidity and continuing openness to new ideas be insured? Can we return to a vision of the

individual and her or his fulfilment in community as key, leaving behind the fetish of five year plans, industrialization, and production for production's sake as the relic of an earlier period from which we have learned much, but have now passed by? Could such a distinct tendency operate across organizational boundaries, advancing a broad left-libertarian program, while loyally building, say, the IWW, NUP, IWA, Solidarity, the left of the Socialist Party, Class War, or Love and Rage? If such were the case, as unlikely as it sounds, how could work and focus and vision be coordinated? Ideological hair-splitting is not the monopoly of any one tendency on the far left. Nor is sectarianism, and the inability to see the value of another's experiences and practice. But, it seems to me, the kinds of principles and vision that Bookchin elucidates are the kind that can draw many of the fragments of the far left together again, however loosely, in a kind of phoenix rising of the "left that was." In short, it is possible for the construction of a liberatory vision of the left freed from shackles of all kinds, and wedded to the drive to move forward to a confrontation with history, organically rooted in a culture of struggle and an understanding of the real world, and armed with a vision of the immense potentials inherent in a pluralistic movement dedicated to the sacred nature of human personality? Bookchin writes that "present society is totally irrational and must be replaced by one that is guided by reason, and ecological ethics, and a genuine concern for human welfare. There's no halfway. The prophets are bellowing from their mountaintops, and the world cries out as never before for liberty and justice. What then are we waiting for?"

+++++

Problems of Revolution:

Parliament and Revolution: some issues to reflect on

By Ricardo Mond

One of the major points of division amongst groups in the anti state, non market sector (ASNM) is the question of how we go about achieving our aim of bringing about a free society. In many ways this disagreement seems strange as at the moment we are a

million miles away from being an advanced enough movement to have to worry about this problem. However the point is that even at this stage we need to have some idea of how our methods fit in with our aims. Secondly how we intend to go about establishing a revolutionary change in society does impact on the way we organise in the here and now. There would seem to be three methods available to us; to use a dual method of gaining a parliamentary majority whilst at the same time building Revolutionary Industrial Unions as advocated by the De-Leonist Socialist Labour Party and similar but separate groups; to declare that parliament can never be used to bring about a free society and argue that we need to focus on methods of direct action and the formation, when the time is right of workplace and community councils or to focus almost exclusively on Parliament as does the Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB). They may deny that this is their policy but since their only current activity is propaganda meetings and contesting elections it is difficult to see how they can deny that their overriding strategy is to achieve socialism via a parliamentary majority. The reason for this article is a response to a recent pamphlet published by the SPGB; *"What's wrong with using Parliament"*? And an article about the pamphlet in the September Socialist Standard, *"For or Against Parliament"*? However whilst what follows concentrates on arguments set forth by the SPGB it is the issues involved that are important rather than the group/s that hold them.

A Violent or Peaceful Revolution

There is a supposition amongst the advocates of using parliament that their method will lead to a peaceful transformation to socialism whereas one based on forms of direct action will be violent. For example the article in the September Socialist Standard states; *"... and most organisations or political parties calling for revolution still envisage, whether explicitly or otherwise, violent means"*. [For or Against Parliament, Socialist Standard, September 2010, p.17]

Firstly where is the guarantee that using what might be termed as legitimate means such as parliamentary elections will result in a peaceful transformation? Whether it will be peaceful or otherwise is dependent on the

actions of the ruling class when they feel their rule is threatened and such a decision is likely to rest on them losing power rather than because a particular method is being utilised. Secondly advocates of direct action are not arguing that workers should arm themselves and, in the case of Britain, storm Buckingham Palace, Parliament and other institutions of power and take control by force. Such a strategy could only lead to failure and bloodshed. The whole question of whether a revolution is peaceful or violent is a false one but in such a situation it would be foolish in the extreme not to organise in such a way that we were able to defend ourselves against any possible violent backlash.

A Faith in Capitalist "Democracy"

Linked to the point about using the parliamentary system to avoid violence is a belief that meaningful democracy exists under capitalism and the ruling class would act fair if their rule is threatened. This seems strange for any organisation which has a revolutionary objective but there is little meaningful criticism of the assumed democratic system and an assumption that, *"it still provides the means for a majority to take political power once a socialist majority has emerged"*. [ibid] Individuals and groups who argue that the ruling class would never allow a revolution to take place via democratic elections are labelled as conspiracy theorists. The article states; *"... but the main one is that there is somehow a power behind or beyond elected governments that in reality controls them . . ."* However it should be stated that in the October issue LB in the article **"Practical Politics"** pages 13-15 puts a more realistic view: *"Where there are genuine intentions to help workers, protect the environment etc, these soon come up against the power behind the parliament which is not the people' as we are led to believe but the capitalist owners" [page 13]* And on page 15 the same writer states: *"Democracy is exploited by the capitalist class as a disguise for the basic set up, which is mass exploitation of workers for minority gain, and not for the wellbeing of society as a whole."* It seems highly dubious that the capitalist class, or it's representatives, who have committed all type of acts in various parts of the world to prevent, even reformist governments taking power would simply stand by whilst their whole system is overturned. Of course their argument is that a socialist majority would be organised in such a way to prevent such a

reaction. But that is the whole point it is the way the working class is organised in their workplaces and communities that would cement the socialist revolution not any parliamentary activity. Should a majority of the working class see as necessary some sort of vote to confirm the revolution whether via parliament, if it still existed or some other institution that had taken its place, this would be merely rubber stamping what had actually already taken place.

Advocates of the use of parliament argue that; *"it is essential for the revolution to be brought about by a majority using democratic means"*. [Sept Socialist Standard, p.17], No argument about that but parliament is about a particular and limited form of democracy suitable for running a system where political parties, mostly elected by a minority of the electorate anyway, govern on behalf of a minority class but not applicable to a society where people are organising production and distribution for themselves. Is a movement or movements where people begin to develop institutions of their own to run their workplaces and communities not democratic? In reality it is more democratic because as these organisations develop people begin to learn how to run things themselves, they will develop their own democratic structures based, probably on delegates not as far removed from them as MPs or whatever would be and therefore more directly accountable and removable if necessary. The type of society advocated by the anti state, non market socialists/anarchists has to be brought about by democratic means otherwise the new society would be doomed to failure.

Some will argue, and understandably so, that debating how we go about bringing the new society about is rather premature at the point when we are a tiny minority. But it is an important point because to some extent whether we organise along the lines of representative or direct democracy has an important bearing on what sort of organisational structures we develop. The question is can a political party that intends to select some of its members to stand for parliament in order to bring about revolutionary change avoid organising itself, to a certain extent anyway, along a hierarchical basis? Who will select and have control over the selected candidates? Will it

be the local organisations or will control rest with a central body normally who, it may be claimed, is more representative of the entire membership of the organisation? We are dealing here with a situation where the representatives are far removed from those they represent and there is likely to be a problem of direct control. Compare this to a situation where the whole purpose of organisations is to develop structures based on a local level where any delegates elected at a workplace or in a community are not so far removed from those that have elected them. Report back meetings can be organised and the delegate or delegates are therefore far more accountable than would be the case of representatives far removed in an institution such as parliament.

It would not be so bad if what was being advocated was a dual method which sought to use parliamentary or local elections only as a tool to push forward the idea of a anti state, non market society. It seems possible that some anarchists in London are suggesting such a strategy for elections in 2012. Or if to go along with contesting elections there was also some concentration on helping to develop class consciousness through forms of direct action at grass root levels. But judging by the activity of groups who appear to advocate parliamentary action alone this is not the case they seem to shy away from any connection to the class struggle because in their view such activity is reformist. This analysis is not being applied to organisations that focus on building revolutionary unions as well as engaging in elections. What role revolutionary unions can play or how they can be built is a somewhat separate issue.

These are just a few of the issues that need to be picked up on in this debate. No doubt there are many more and it will be interesting for others to pick up on some of these as well as developing thoughts critical or otherwise on the issues that have been tackled here.

OPPOSITION TO CUTS: FRENCH WORKERS TAKE THE LEAD

The following is news on the recent struggles in France which many readers may have already picked up on but this is to remind them and inform others of what has been happening there: the following is from <http://liensjournal.wordpress.com/>: This gives a flavour of what has been happening in France and the kind of actions that could develop elsewhere.

Days of Struggle in Rouen (October 13th to the 15th)

Rouen 24 hours of all sorts of blockades and demos.

From now on, each day at 11 in front of the prefecture, the different sectors in struggle assemble to organise blockades.

Wednesday, 13th October: the assembly turned into a demonstration which blocked successively (and briefly two bridges). In the afternoon around 200 people (train drivers, postal workers, hospital workers, electricians, teachers, students, etc) blocked the eastern industrial zone for an hour.

Thursday, October 14th: at 5.00 am: the sorting office was blocked for more than two hours, with the aim of the preventing lorries from leaving to distribute the post to smaller offices. The students and railway workers went to support the struggling postal workers.

At **11.00 am** the interprofessional assembly was cut short by the arrival of masses of lyceens [1]. Many high schools were blockaded in the morning. At one of them the police intervened, making some arrests. At this assembly it was decided to leave all together in order to go and interrupt the Europe 1 [2] radio broadcast (live in Rouen that day) with the aim of broadcasting our own message.

At **1 pm** a blockade was installed (by more than a hundred people) at a fuel depot. The nearest refinery is one of the 10 refineries on strike in France. The region was supplied

by the small reserves at the fuel depot. To stop lorries entering this depot amounted to depriving the petrol stations of their last supplies.

Rouen, October 15th; blockades of roads, bridges, petrol depots etc.

4 am: the blockade of the fuel depot was restarted. That morning it was the truck drivers who had just come out on strike who initiated the blockade. They were quickly joined by workers from different sections and students. The truckers left to block another depot next door.

8 am: a blockade was organised by students close to the university of Mont-Saint-Aignan. The idea was to block the road from the bottom of the valley, main route of access to the uni from town. Forty people undertook the action: tree trunks were dragged on the road, along with pallettes and tyres and fires were lit. Tracts were distributed to drivers – who turned around – or to people who parked their cars and climbed by foot. The participants left the blockade after about an hour, leaving the barricade and setting fire to the piles of tyres before they left.

11 am: Since the last few days the interprofessional has been systematically attended by lyceens. That is to say where we had to block Mathilde Bridge with 300, now we find ourselves heading there with 2000. A cortege [3] (evidently, like everywhere in France) lively and worked up: that runs, drags, blocks, throws, hurls, leaves the agreed route etc. Nevertheless the demonstrators arrive at Mathilde road bridge (which has four lanes), which they invade. A huge mess right at the heart of the circulation system. From now on the lyceens lead the cortege. Later, at a crossroads, the cops get out of their vans and get their helmets on. Stones are thrown and builder's fences are piled up in front of the police. The order to disperse is given. One lyceen (at least) is arrested by the Bac [4]. The "tense face - off", as they say on telly, carries on for a while.

5 pm: the blockade of the petrol depot still holds on. Now it is expected to be permanent. The blockaders expect to spend the night there, and to take shifts. There's

a fire of pallettes to keep them warm, a tent to keep the rain off, a barbeque.

Footnotes

- 1) The lycee is a specifically French institution, something like our sixth-form colleges or high schools (UK). 15-18 year olds attend. The lyceens, a particular social force in France, systematically have a central role in the development of struggles there.
- 2) French news radio station.
- 3) The word cortege, which exists in English (as in 'funeral cortege') is used extensively in French. It marks a group that's broader in composition than a 'block' but still moving somewhat coherently: and that's more practical than a mere 'demonstration' – with all its political assonances in English – since it's often – as in this context – on the way to some act or another of economic sabotage.
- 4) Brigade Anti Criminalite, a section of the French National Police, a plain clothes unit that acts in the context of demonstrations as a sort of informal skirmishing unit operating fluidly around static lines of CRS riot police. When they intervene they have to put on orange armbands; they often carry helmets, batons, pepper spray etc.

Continuing with the French theme, we reproduce below one of three leaflets related to events in France in October. This one and another, "**Down with Social Peace**" were posted on the World in Common forum. Another one, "**What's this Life**", is also available on the main link given at the end of the leaflet.

We are ONE, let's be ALL!

Like workers, unemployed, students, pensioners... in Greece, Spain, Portugal, China, Bangladesh, South Africa, Algeria, Peru and many other regions in the world, we also take to the street in France.

We are the "infection in action"... the one that all governments of all countries and from all political tendencies are afraid of! Our specific demands are nothing but the expression of ONE AND THE SAME MOVEMENT: AGAINST SACRIFICES that Capital's managers try everywhere to impose on us.

AGAINST SURVIVAL CONDITIONS (housing, health...) everywhere

always more deteriorated;

AGAINST OUR WAGE SLAVERY everywhere more increased (rise in work pace, in working time, work always more destroying...).

Obviously the exploiters and their union lackeys already try to neutralize our demands on the field of reform: negotiation, revision, rejection of the law, or even a change of government... to better satisfy Capital's needs!

To satisfy OUR HUMAN NEEDS there is no low-key solution possible:

Economy is in crisis? Let's finish it off!
LET'S BREAK UNION AND SOCIAL PEACE!

Let's spread and deepen our movement!
LET'S SELF-ORGANIZE OURSELVES AT ALL LEVELS!

LET'S PREVENT THE RETURN TO NORMALITY BY ALL MEANS!

NOW, LET'S BE ALL!

Internationalist Proletarians

proletairesinternationalistes@yahoo.fr
<http://proletairesinternationalistes.wordpress.com/>

+++++

Writing, as we are, at the end of October another general strike is due to take place in France. However with the legislation on pensions having gone through parliament, although the bill still faces a legal challenge, reports from several sources seem to suggest that support for the protests are beginning to wane. A report on libcom.org seemed to indicate that the situation was somewhat confused as some groups of workers had been striking for reasons not linked to the pension reforms. Whatever the immediate future holds these problems are not going to vanish and it is to the sort of protests we witnessed in France in October and also in Greece, Spain and elsewhere that could form the beginnings of a fight back; Solidarity to all

workers in France and across the world in the struggles to come.

The following was sent in by Laurens Otter.

“There seems to be a common semantic misconception among the media writers of politicians’ profiles. Because a vegetarian is one who eats/consumes vegetables, they assume that anyone who destroys/consumes humanity should be described as a humanitarian.”

+++++

The Libertarian Communist is sent out by post or email, free of charge. A big thank you to those readers who have made donations, either by money or postage stamps. Such donations help keep this discussion bulletin going and hopefully will achieve, in time, a bigger and better publication. If you wish to make a financial contribution please make cheques payable to **(World of Free Access)** and send them or stamps to, **c/o Ray Carr, Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Branksome, Poole, Dorset, BH12 1BQ.**

+++++

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

worldsocialistmovement/SPGB:

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

=====

World In Common:

www.worldincommon.org

Email

worldincommon@yahoogroups.com

Very good for discovering groups that do, or have made up the Anti State, Non Market sector. Some of the news and articles featured in TLC are

sourced from this website. So join the forum and help take it forward.

Anarchist Federation:

www.afed.org.uk: Postal Address BM Arnafed, London WC1N 3XX. Email info@afed.org.uk

The Manchester website is well worth a visit for looking at texts from former organisations such as Solidarity, Subversion and Wildcat.

=====

The following three groups are anarcho syndicalist or revolutionary industrial unions and offer an anti bureaucratic alternative to trade unions.

Solidarity Federation.

www.solfed.org.uk or PO Box 29, South West P D.O Manchester M15 5HW Email: solfed@solfed.org.uk

Industrial Workers of the World: www.iww.org Or P/O Box 7593, Glasgow, G42 2EX Email: rocsec@iww.org.uk.

Workers International Industrial Union.

www.wiiu.org or 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 viewpoint. Also has a Library, History and Gallery sections as well as active online forums.

+++++

Wrekin Stop War

This can be found at www.wrekinstopwar.org or contact **Duncan Ball, 23 Sunderland Drive, Leegomery Salop, TF1 6XX** email: 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)**.

+++++

Red Anarchist Action Network (RAAN)

www.redanarchist.org

Notice from Andy Cox.

I'm planning to create an accessible 'socialist database' which socialists may draw upon for writing articles, planning speeches etc. I have devised a sort of categorisation schema for ease of reference, but it's not set in stone and can be revised as the need arises. To get the data base, simply click on the following link:
<http://andycox1953.webs.com/database>.

Basically what I am asking for is:

Any snippets of information (as well as details concerning their source – html links and the like)

Any ideas as to how the database may be expanded.

Many thanks

Andy

The Libertarian Communist now has a few pamphlets and journals related to the anti state, non Market sector. 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.

Another place to get your books/Literature.

Looking for books, pamphlets or Journals from the Anti state, non Market perspective; try the following: STIMULANTS at www.radicalbooks.co.uk

