

# **The Libertarian Communist**

---

A Discussion Bulletin:

In Opposition to the Rule of Capital in all its forms and  
for Anti State, Non Market Communism

---

**What was the Soviet system? Part 2**



Flag of the USSR 1923-55



**Analysing the Nature of the System of the Soviet Union?**

**Issue 22: Spring 2013**

**£1.50**

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 us at [libcom.bulletin@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:libcom.bulletin@yahoo.co.uk) or writing to Ray Carr, Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Branksome, Poole, Dorset.

=====

## **Contents**

Page 2: **A summary of Issue 22**

Page 2: **Editorial: "There is no Alternative"**

Page 4: **Letters**

Page 5: **The Impotence of Revolutionary Groups: Sam Moss (1939) [International Council Correspondence]**

Page 7: **What is the Relationship between Activism and Revolution? Ricardo Monde**

Page 10: **Scientists: Co-operation is Natural and Beneficial: Joe Hopkins**

Page 12: **A Life Worth Choosing: Lyla Byrne**

Page 15: **What was the Soviet System? Part 2: In what sense (if any) was the Soviet System Socialist?**

Page 20: **"Marxism" and Anarchism: Ricardo Monde**

Page 23: **Anti State, Non Market Directory of Groups**

## **Summary of Issue 22**

This issue continues to examine the concept of the class struggle via Laurens Otter's comments on our editorial in issue 21 [page 4]: *The Impotence of Revolutionary Groups*: this dates from 1939 by Sam Moss [page 5] and: *What is the Relationship Between Activism and Revolution?* Ricardo Monde [page 7]. Two articles focus on the impact of capitalism on human behaviour. The first of these looks at how this may effect the change to a society based on co-operation rather than competition: *Scientists: Co-operation is Natural and Beneficial: Joe Hopkins* [page 10]; whilst the second examines how property society and in particular the profit system impact on the way we behave; *Lyla Byrne A Life Worth Choosing* [page 12]. Elsewhere Stefan presents the second and concluding part of his analysis on the nature of the system of the Soviet Union *What Was the Soviet System Part 2* [page 15] We conclude with a second article by Ricardo Monde about the relationship between "Marxism" and Anarchism [page 20].

## **"There is no Alternative"**

The horrific consequences of the capital system are all around us. They are constantly projected via newspapers, magazines and on our computer and television screens. This list includes pictures of children and adults starving to death or living lives of either absolute or relative poverty: the effects of war and how it devastates the lives of those innocently caught up in it as well as those who joined the military because they mistakenly thought it was their duty to do so or because the system left them with few other choices. In addition there is the all too visible consequences of the

damage reeked on the ecological system by capital which the system, not so much won't come to terms, with but cannot limited as it is by the inhumane goal of capital accumulation at all costs. That is the fact about all these problems, it is not merely the fact that the capital system will not deal with them, it is the fact that it cannot. It cannot even deal with the problem most close to it, the world-wide economic downturn of which no end is in sight. The truth is that there can be no end to the current economic crisis that would entail a meaningful improvement for the majority. Not only have such circumstances been virtually non-existent throughout the history of capitalism but now there is the contradiction between the very nature of the system and the technology it has created which cries out for a new system based on common ownership and production directly for need/use.

As these problems are so evident why, it must be asked, are we struggling to build even the beginnings of a world-wide mass movement for change? There are the obvious obstacles that we have recognised for some time: the ideas that dominate in society are the ideas of those in power. Related to this concept is social conditioning such as family and education which support the status quo. The system is also extremely good at providing commodities that distract people, dominated nowadays mostly by a range of high technological gadgets. In addition most people's lives are so occupied with earning enough money to provide them with the necessities of life such as food, clothing and shelter with perhaps a few small luxuries thrown in that they have little time to examine the causes of why the world we inhabit is in such a mess.

In addition to the above there are a variety of groups and organisations such as charities, trade unions and left wing political parties, from social democratic type labour to Trotskyist and Leninist who all advocate that something can be achieved within the confines of a reordered capital system. Charities provide much information on many of the problems we have highlighted here but cannot solve these self-same problems as they are not designed to confront the system itself but merely to try to deal with these issues in isolation. Trade unions and the left do more harm than good as they have been successful in convincing many people that there is an alternative short of getting rid of capitalism and view any alternative to a society based on

commodity production as utopian. As much as they participate in the partial class struggle within the capital system they are limited to perpetuating that struggle rather than seeking to end it. As John Crump wrote in the late 1980s:

*"The 'left' and the 'right' are different only to the extent that they provide a different political and organisational apparatus for administering the same capitalist system ...A permanent solution to the problems which are inherent in wage labour... ...can only lie in the abolition of the wages system. Yet the abolition of the wages system is a demand which cannot be located on the 'left' - 'right' political spectrum."* [1]

We in the anti-state, non-market communist/anarchist sector can have no truck with participation in the class struggle in anyway but that which seeks to end it and by so doing ending the working class itself. Our message to the trade unions and left is that it is utopian to try and deal with the effects of capitalism without seeking to do away with the system itself in all its guises. For once we agree with **Margaret Thatcher**, a demon for the left, **"There is no Alternative (Tina)** No alternative that is to ending the rule of capital in all its forms and establishing a humane system that can start to deal with the horrific problems we face, some will be able to be dealt with immediately but many will take time. Common ownership and production directly for need/use will merely provide the base for dealing with the dire situation we presently find ourselves in.

{1}John Crump: The Thin Red Line: Non Market Socialism in the Twentieth Century pp.35-59 in Crump and Rubel Ed Non Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.

+++++

**From Manifesto against Labour Gruppe Krisis**

For this reason, it doesn't matter what is being produced as well as what use is made of it - not to mention the indifference to social and environmental consequences. Whether houses are built or landmines are produced, whether books are printed or genetically modified tomatoes are grown, whether people fall sick as a result, whether the air gets polluted or "only" good taste goes to the dogs - all this is irrelevant as long as, whatever it takes, commodities can be transformed into money and money into fresh labour. The fact that any commodity demands a concrete use, and should it be a destructive one, has no relevance for the economic rationality for which the product is nothing but a carrier of once expended labour, or "dead labour".

**Letters**

The following comments on our previous issue were all included in one letter but we felt it best to divide them into three so as to separate out the three different articles/issues they were dealing with. We hope this will give readers a better chance to comment on any particular issue/s.

**Commenting on Issue 21:**

**'The Inherent Unhealthiness of Hierarchical Systems' Lyla Byrne**

**Dear Lib Com**

Concerning the above article Lyla Byrne, in writing; "that it's wrong to say capitalists are self-interested"; neglects the possibility that they are so caught up with their short-term interests, that the capitalists cannot see that they too would go down when the ecology collapses. It is not of course only an ecological argument; the main reason Tony Turner was forced out of the SPGB in 1953, was that he was arguing that if capitalists could see beyond the short-term, they would understand that creating civil strife is not in their interests, that co-operation is better than competition. We used to have the same argument in the early CND; many, including those Stalinists who, contrary to their party line, were in CND, used to think that saying the bomb was a class issue was sectarian, as it wasn't in the interests of the capitalists to destroy the world; we used to reply that capitalists have always short-sightedly failed to understand their own long-term interests.

Laurens Otter

**What was the Soviet System? Part 1: In what sense (if any) was the 'Soviet' System Capitalist? Stefan**

Regarding Stefan's article, I must comment on his notes: (2) Rizzi was not the first, arguably Zamianski was, Rodzianko, Fischer, Ulanski and Ciliga – inter alia – had come up with a similar analyses; Rizzi's decision to write his book arose out of the debate between Simone Weill and Trotsky; (Trotsky wrote the 'Revolution Betrayed' as an answer to Weill's exposition in 'Revolution Proletarienne of the Bureaucratic Collectivist Analysis). Rizzi detecting a lacuna in Trotsky's argument set out to support and fill this gap, only as he was so doing, did he convince himself of the bureaucratic collectivist case.

Surprisingly for someone who was in the 1970s Libertarian Communist group there was no mention of Castoriadis/Cardan/Chaulieu. Who though not original did promote the thesis in a way that explained it to a whole new generation of libertarians. Less surprisingly there's no mention of Buck Taylor, who had done the same. Unfortunately in internal Common Wealth documents in the late 1940s.

Laurens Otter

=====

***Changes: Editorial in Issue 21***

*Regarding the following Laurens Otter asked us to point out that this was a hurried comment intended to fill, what he felt was, a gap in the editorial in the last issue. This journal would not necessarily endorse all the points made here but it may provide a basis for discussion. Editor*

Reading the editorial on the class war: I think you need to elaborate your position; as it is you leave yourself open to attack and while I think I know what you mean you don't actually say anything of value. Would it not be a good idea to set out a basic LC position on the class struggle? Fair enough that it be an adaption of classic SPGB thought on the matter. Can I suggest the following?

- (a) Marxists and anarchists have traditionally all agreed on the existence of class war; - but this is not something the working class wages to achieve socialism, still less is it a matter to chant about on marches.
- (b) In Marxist and anarchist theory; the class war exists because capitalists have to compete to remain capitalists. Each must aggrandize their capital and this can only be done by further exploiting their employees and/or their customers.
- (c) Therefore the class war is a product of the capitalist class's assault on the living standards of the working class. It isn't something that can be launched or called off at will: we have seen that each individual capitalist has to engage in it to maintain their position as a capitalist, and if the working class lay down and accepted – without a fight – the lower conditions the capitalists would impose, if they take significantly worse conditions, this pro-

duces a slump and so the capitalists as well as the workers suffer.

**(d)** Ruling/exploiting classes hold their privilege position because individually their members are better at fighting class war than the ruled. The working class is forced to fight a defensive class war, the only alternative being starvation, but it must understand that the odds are always stacked against it; the ruling class have all the best weaponry.

**(e)** The only weapon the working class has in this struggle is solidarity; but in so far as that solidarity "socialism in embryo," it is not only - for survival's sake - an essential part of working class life; but is also a natural way to prepare for a society based on mutual aid.

**(F)** That said - because of the way power is stacked - libertarian socialism cannot come solely from the class struggle; but only when that class war is supplemented by a mass conscious choice of a different form of society.

L O

+++++

*The following is an edited and slightly shortened version of the original which is included because it makes some interesting observations about the class struggle although it comes from a different perspective to the editorial in our last issue. The full version can be found at [libcom.org](http://libcom.org)*

**International Council  
Correspondence (Living Marxism)  
Volume 4 Number 7, June 1939  
On the Impotence of Revolutionary  
Groups (pp. 216-220)**

**Sam Moss**

The difference between the radical organizations and the broad masses appears as a difference of objectives. The former apparently seek to overthrow capitalism; the masses seek only to maintain their living standards within capitalism. The revolutionary groups agitate for the abolition of private property; the people, called the masses, either own bits of private property, or hope some day to own them. The communist -minded struggle for the eradication of the profit system; the masses, capitalist minded, speak of the bosses' right to a "fair profit." As long as the system satisfies their basic needs in the

accustomed manner, they are well satisfied with it and whatever evils they behold in society, they attribute to "unfair bosses," "bad administrators" or other individuals.

The small radical groups - "intellectuals" who have "raised themselves to the level of comprehending historical movements as a whole," and who trace the social ills to the system rather than to individuals - see beyond the objectives of the workers, and realize that the basic needs of the working class can not be satisfied for more than a temporary period under capitalism. They therefore - at least in theory - strive continually to turn the struggle for immediate demands into a struggle against the system. But beside the realities of bread and butter which capitalism can still offer a majority of the workers, the radicals can submit only hopes and ideas, and the workers abandon their struggles the moment their demands are met.

The reason for the apparent difference of objectives between the revolutionary groups and the working class is easy to understand. The working class, concerned only with the needs of the moment and in general content with its social status, reflects the level of capitalist culture - a culture that is "for the enormous majority a mere training to act as a machine."

The revolutionists, however, are so to speak deviations from the working class; they are the by-products of capitalism; they represent isolated cases of workers who, because of unique circumstances in their individual lives, have diverged from the usual course of development in that, though born of wage slaves, they have acquired an intellectual interest, that has availed itself of the existing educational possibilities. Quite frequently cut off from association with their fellow workers on the job, who do not share their radical views, they unite with other rebellious intellectual workers and with other unsuccessful careerists of other strata of society, into organizations of changing society. Their occasional periods of activity can be explained only by their temporary or permanent forsaking of their revolutionary aims in order to unite with the workers immediate demands and then it was not their own revolutionary role that they played, but the conservative role of the working class. When the workers achieved their objectives, the radical groups lapsed again into impotence. Their role was always a supplementary, and never a deciding one.

It is the writer's conviction that the day of the revolutionary party is over; the revolutionary groups under present conditions are tolerated, or rather ignored, only as long as they are impotent; that nothing is so symptomatic of their powerlessness as the fact that they are permitted to exist. We have often stated that the working class which will endure while capitalism lasts, and which cannot be obliterated under this system can alone wage a successful struggle against capitalism and that the initiative can not be taken out of its hands. We may add here after all the conservatism of the working class today only reflects the still massive strength of capitalism, and that this material power cannot be cast out of existence by propaganda but by a material power greater than that of capital. Yet from time to time members of our own group take to task the group's inactivity. They declare that, isolated as we are from the class struggle as it is waged today, we are essentially mere study groups that will be completely out of touch with events when social upheavals do occur. They state that since the class struggle is omnipresent in capitalism it behoves us as a revolutionary organization to deepen the class war. But they do not suggest any specific course of action. The fact that all other radical organizations in the field, through striving to overcome their isolation are nonetheless insignificant Marxist sects like ourselves, does not convince our critics of the futility of any action that small groups can take.

The very general statement that the class war is ever-present and that we should deepen it, is made first of all in the assumption that the class struggle is a revolutionary struggle, but the fact is that the workers as a mass are conservative. It is assumed that the class war aims directly at the weakening of capitalism, but the fact is that, though it serves this ultimate purpose, it is directly aimed at the position of the workers within the society. Furthermore, the actual class struggle is not waged through revolutionary organizations. It is waged in the factories and through the unions.

In America today it is being waged by such organizations as the A.F. Of L. and the C.I.O., and though here and there across the continent arise sporadic strikes that are outlawed by all the existing conservative organizations and that indicate the form the class war may take when all these

organizations are completely emasculated by the State, these workers' movements are infrequent and isolated today. True, the leadership of both the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. is conservative, but then so is the membership of both unions. In order to retain their membership and attract more workers to it, the unions must wrest concessions from the capitalist class for them; the workers remain in the unions only because they obtain such concessions through them; and to the extent that they do obtain such concessions for the workers, the unions are waging the class struggle. If, therefore, we are to plunge into the class struggle, we must go where the struggle is being waged. We must concentrate on either factories or the unions or both. If we do so, we must abandon at least overly, our revolutionary principles, for if we give them expression, we shall swiftly be discharged from the job and expelled from the union, and, in a word, cut off from the class struggle and returned precipitantly to our former impotent state. To become active in the class struggle means, then to become as conservative as the large body of workers. In other words, as soon as we enter the class struggle we can contribute nothing special to it. The only alternative to this course is to continue as we are, clinging impotently to our principles. Regardless of which course we pursue, it is obvious that we cannot affect the course of events. Our impotence illustrates what should be obvious to all: that history is made by the broad masses alone.

Let us for assume, for example, that it is possible for us as an independent group to organize the workers of some industrial area. The fact that they have not moved of their own accord without our aid means that they are dependent upon us for their initiative. By supplying the initiative, we are taking it out of their hands. If they discover that we are capable of giving them the initial impulse, they will depend on us for the subsequent impulses, and we shall soon find ourselves leading them step by step. Thus, they who advocate that we "intensify" the class war are not merely ignoring the objective conditions that make such an act questionable, but are advocating also our leadership over the masses. Of course, they may argue that, realizing the evils of such a course, we can guard against them. But this argument is again on an ideological level. Practically, we shall be compelled to adjust ourselves to circumstances. Thus it becomes obvious that by such a practice we would function like a

Leninist group, and could at best produce only the results of Leninism. However, the impotence of the existing Leninist groups shows the improbability of the success of even such a course, and points once more to the obsolescence of small revolutionary groups in regards to real proletarian needs, a condition perhaps forecasting the approaching day when it shall be objectively impossible for any small group to assume leadership of the masses only to be forced in the end to exploit them to its own needs. The working class alone can wage the revolutionary struggle even as it is today waging alone the non-revolutionary struggle, and the reason that the rebellious class conscious workers band into groups outside the spheres of the real class struggle is only that there is as yet no revolutionary movement within them. Their existence as groups, therefore, reflects, not a situation for revolution, but rather a non-revolutionary situation. When the revolution does come, their numbers will be submerged within it, not as functioning organizations, but as individual workers.

We see that the class struggle is today still conservative; that society is characterized not simply by this single struggle but by a multiplicity of struggles, which varies with the multiplicity of strata within the system, and which so far has affected the struggle between Capital and Labour in the interest of the former. But because we see not merely the immediate situation but also the trends therein, we realize that the difficulties of capitalism are progressively increasing and that the means of satisfying even the immediate wants of the working class are continuously diminishing. As these developments are taking place, the divided objectives of the upper class are converging toward one objective; the preservation of the capitalist exploitative system.

But this question may be raised, why, then, realizing the futility of the act, do you band together into groups? The answer is simply that the act serves a personal need. It is inevitable that men sharing a common feeling of rebellion against a society that lives by exploitation and war should seek out their own kind in society, and in whatever weapons fall to their command. Unable to rebel against the system with the rest of the population, they will oppose it alone. The fact that they engage in such action however futile it may appear establishes the basis for the prediction that when the large masses, reacting to the

compulsives of the objectively revolutionary situation, feel similarly affected, they too will band together out of the same urgency and they too will use whatever weapons fall to their disposal. When they do so, they will not rise from ideological factors, but from necessity, and their ideologies will only reflect the necessities then, as do their current bourgeois ideologies reflect the necessity today.

The view of the revolutionary ineffectiveness of small groups is accounted a pessimistic one by revolutionary organizations. What if this view does indicate the inevitability of revolution? What if it does point to the objective end of a pre-established leadership of the masses, and to the end of all exploitation? The radical groups are not happy with this picture. They derive no pleasure from the prospect of a future where they have no more significance than their fellow human beings, and they condemn a view of such a future as a philosophy of defeatism. But, actually we have spoken only of the futility of small radical groups; we have been quite optimistic as to the future of the workers. But to all radical organizations, if their groups are defeated, and if their groups are dying, then all is dying. In such pronouncements therefore they reveal the true motivation for their rebellion and the true character of their organizations. We, however, should find no cause for despair in the impotence of these groups. Rather we should behold in it reason for optimism regarding the future of the workers. For in this very atrophy of all groups that would lead the masses out of capitalism into another society we are seeing for the first time in history the objective end to all political leadership and to the division of society into economic and political categories.

+++++

### **What is the relationship between Activism and Revolution?**

#### **Ricardo Monde**

One debate which has raged on for years is the relationship between theory and activism. Whilst some believe that the two must be combined others argue that sitting around talking and theorising is all very well but we need to get out on the streets and engage with the "masses" whilst for others activity is of very little use if it lacks a theoretical base. In the last few years we have seen much

activism with the onset of the latest economic crisis for capitalism and this bulletin has concerned itself with a fair amount of what has been going on with articles related to the class struggle and direct action, various aspects of the anti cuts movement, the Occupy movement and related issues such as workers' assemblies, industrial unionism and workers' self management.

The first issue of The Libertarian Communist carried the following quote:

*" Meaningful action for revolutionaries, is whatever increases the confidence, the autonomy, the initiative, the participation, the solidarity, the equalitarian tendencies and self activity of the masses and whatever assists their demystification". [For Workers' Power: The Selected Writings of Maurice Brinton, Ed by David Goodway, AK Press, 2004].*

The above quote seems to favour activism over theory and involvement in the "class struggle" but ends by arguing that our activities should assist the process of demystification. This presumably means enlightening the "masses" as to what is the underlying cause of their problems. Has the activism we have witnessed in the last few years aided the process of demystification or could we have done with a little more theoretical base to our contact with people who are confronting the system? So let's take a look at what the activism we have witnessed in the last few years was based on, in the knowledge that this was undertaken not just by leftists such as the Socialist Workers' Party but also groups within our own sector. Ever since the onset of the latest capitalist economic crisis the main critique has focused on "greedy bankers", deregulation of the financial sector and "corporations who do not pay enough tax" and a host of headlines about "cruel Tory or Tory/Lib coalition cuts", as if a Labour government would have acted any differently.

Taking the concept of "greedy bankers" first: is this a serious explanation of the causes of the current economic turmoil? As has been noted, [Mattick, 2011, p.8, Kilman, 2012, p.1] greed is an ever present feature of capitalism and a particular crisis can hardly be explained by something which is ever present and normal. Likewise the dismantling of regulations is hardly a adequate explanation, for even if this did have a part to play in promoting speculation to an unsustainable level, it was

these self same means that was responsible for the period of expansion that preceded the crash [Mattick op.cit, p.5] As regards new regulations for the financial sector, that many favour, there are reasons why these would have little effect. Firstly such regulations would be designed to correct what has previously gone wrong and it is highly unlikely that a future crisis would have the same causes [See Kilman op.cit, p.193]. Secondly no matter what regulations are put in place ways will be found to get around them [ibid]. Looking at the financial sector alone does not explain the cause of the crisis. An article we featured in issue 17 showed a more theoretical base:

*"It is not the "speculators" and the financial markets that are the problem, but the utter absurdity of a society that produces wealth only as a waste product of the valorization of capital, whether as a real or a fictional process. The return to a seemingly stable capitalism, kept standing by the onslaught of massive armies of labor, is neither possible nor anything worth striving for". [Krisis, 2008]*

Very often attempting to deal with the effect of the problem rather than explaining its cause is counter productive and has unintended consequences. Take the campaign to shame certain corporations into paying more taxes. The argument here is that cuts are having a devastating affect on those on benefits and leading to thousand of job losses whilst some large corporations are getting away with paying very little tax. However if all the tax supposedly owed by these corporations was paid in full would this result in a major reductions in the cuts that are being imposed? That seems very doubtful. Secondly what one is getting involved in here is a debate on how capitalism is being administered rather than a critique of the system itself. This is a sort of analysis, if, an analysis at all, that suggests that a fairer capitalism is the answer. This is something people have been campaigning for since its establishment, the present campaign will have no more success than all the previous ones. All companies seek to cut their costs, if they don't they will go out of business, so if they can get away with paying less tax than they should, they will. If they then have to pay up they will seek to recover that money from somewhere else. An obvious example of this is the Starbucks case which hit the headlines in December of last year. After a campaign by UK Uncut and other pressure groups Starbucks agreed to pay £10 million in taxes over the next two years, as their



business was being affected by all the bad publicity. Just days before this announcement was made it came to light that Starbucks was introducing new contracts for its 7,000 staff in the UK. The new contracts which employees (sorry partners) had no choice but to agree to if they wanted to retain their jobs included cutting out paid lunch breaks, sick leave and maternity benefits and an end to cash incentives for being manager or partner of the year, (some partnership). Starbucks, as one would expect argued that the new contracts were unrelated to the discussions they were then having with HM Revenue and Customs and the Treasury. Unconnected or not this will offset some of the costs due to the new tax arrangements. One worker saw the connection:

*"Colleagues were "really upset" at the changes and said it appeared relatively low paid staff were being forced to help bear the cost of the company's potentially increased tax bill". He continued: It's really convenient for them to say we're going to pay more taxes, when they're going to save money with us, the staff". [The Guardian, December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2012]* As for UK Uncut they are still not satisfied they want something more in line with parity between Starbucks and their main competitor Costa Coffee. A spokesperson for UK Uncut said: *"The £10m that Starbucks have estimated they may end up paying is £5m less than that paid by their nearest competitor Costa Coffee". [The Guardian, December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012]*

The question that must be asked is how is this type of activism aiding the process of demystification? It does seem that all these protests are simply going round in circles with little idea of direction and little effect regarding giving people involved in these struggles a grounding of what it is that they are confronted with, that is if the activists themselves have this type of knowledge. There is little problem with engaging with people confronted with the horrors of life under capitalism and seeking to help them fight back but a line has to be drawn between engaging in struggles within capitalism and seeking to build a movement to end it and groups have to be clear and make it clear which activity they are engaged in. It cannot be argued that struggles within capitalism are designed to create the advanced consciousness needed to end it unless part of that involvement includes imparting to others a theoretical understanding of the system they are confronting rather than just burying

oneself in the struggle as an end in itself. Unless the struggle is linked to the need to change society, any action is likely to reinforce the view that there is no alternative to capitalism; consciousness does not arise from struggles through a magical process.

Much of the activism in recent years has been in the form of various movements that have questioned various aspects of capitalism the most notable of these has been the Occupy movement that has sprung up in many countries. Perhaps it could be argued that both the strength and weakness of this movement was its diversity. Strength because it encouraged debate and a certain amount of openness. Weakness as diverse movements can be fractured by internal strife especially when they come under pressure. Perhaps it also shows how difficult it is to maintain a movement which gains momentum due to people becoming angry and frustrated very quickly but who may be more certain of what they do not want than what they do want, perhaps an educational theoretical base could be of service in this situation. An article in *The Nation*, **September 24<sup>th</sup> 2012** made some interesting observations regarding the problems facing the Occupy movement in the USA. At the time the article was written the movement in the USA was facing a wave of evictions, their meetings and actions were being infiltrated, the police were more willing to use force to prevent fresh occupations. There was a backlash against the movement not just from the state but also from the media with allegations against it that whilst unproven tended to lessen its support. In addition the movement was plagued by internal divisions. One of the most positive aspects was the practice of direct democracy in the general assemblies. Meanwhile in London to celebrate the first anniversary of the Occupy camp at St Pauls the London Occupy movement held a series of New Putney Debates in October and November 2012 but in these meetings the most radical ideas seemed to be confined to a different way of organising capitalism rather than genuine anti capitalist ideas *[Socialist Standard, December 2012]*

In Past issues we have included articles about the Occupy movement, (see issue 18) and about fractions within it. It seemed a positive development and despite its problems and limitations, its diversity and seeming endorsement of open debate suggests that it could play a role in helping to develop a forum

for increased theoretical understanding of the problems we face including a genuine critique of capitalism itself. Maybe, on the other hand, the occupy movement will prove to be a false dawn but one thing is for certain we do need a forum for turning the discussion from how we can rearrange capitalism into one that concentrates on understanding it and discussing how we can move beyond it. It is this sort of analysis that we hope can be developed in future issues of this bulletin.

**References:**

*For workers' Power: The selected writings of Maurice Brinton, edited by David Goodway: AK Press 2004.*

*Paul Mattick: Business as Usual; Reaktion Books, 2011.*

*Andrew Kilman: The Failure of Capitalist Production: Pluto Press, 2012.*

*Krisis: The collapsing of the financial bubble, 'greedy bankers' and why there can be no going back to social welfare capitalism: 2008.*

*The Guardian, December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012. The Guardian*

*December 6<sup>th</sup> 2012. The Nation: September 24<sup>th</sup>*

*2012. Winstanley, Marx and Henry George, Socialist Standard, December 2012.*

+++++

**Scientists: Cooperation is natural and beneficial** *Posted on the WSPUS website*

Joe Hopkins

An article in *Scientific American* (July 2012) by Professor of Biology and Mathematics Martin Nowak entitled "Why We Help" goes a long way in providing Socialists a scientific argument to refute the idea of "red in tooth and claw" evolution that is supposed to have spawned — on even a genetic level — the strictly competitive "Devil take the hindmost" character of human nature: the product of capitalist society.

Professor Nowak writes: "While on retreat with some fellow students and professors in the Alps, I learned about a game theory paradox called the Prisoner's Dilemma that elegantly illustrates why cooperation has so flummoxed evolutionary biologists."

The Prisoner's Dilemma is that if two people are arrested on suspicion — the criminal elements of motive and opportunity being present — the first of the two to turn State's evidence against the other one stands a good chance of getting off scott free. Because after

being arrested "suspects" are held and questioned separately, neither one knows if the other one will keep quiet. In such a situation, the self-interested thing to do might be to snitch and beat the other one to the punch, so to speak. But if both snitch then they both get convicted and go to prison, as opposed to the "Solidarity Solution" of both of them clamming up and both going scott free because they *co-operated*. This is a "real world" formulation of the Prisoner's Dilemma, but substantially the same as the longer and idealized version cited by Nowak.

"The Prisoner's Dilemma," Novak says, "seduced me immediately with its power to probe the relation between conflict [i.e., self-interest and competition] and cooperation... I developed techniques to run computer simulations of the Dilemma using large communities rather than limiting ourselves to two prisoners." Novak watched as the computer simulations, starting from a random distribution of self-interested individuals and cooperators, cycled through several generations. Through the series of a few generations, the number of individuals belonging to each cohort alternately grew and declined. The offspring of the initial cohorts generally followed the strategy of the parents, but within a few generations all the individuals were changing until a new strategy emerged. "Players would start by cooperating and then mirror their opponents moves, tit for tat. The change quickly led to communities dominated by cooperators... Within 20 generations the initial tit for tat strategy had given way to a more generous strategy in which players might still cooperate even if their rival defected. We had, in essence, witnessed the evolution of forgiveness — a direct reciprocity strategy that allows players to overlook the occasional mistake."

Direct reciprocity is the mechanism for the evolution of cooperation among individuals who encounter one another repeatedly. Direct reciprocity is observed among vampire bats, which live in stable groups and come to know one another. If a vampire bat fails to find prey and misses dinner one day, the chances are good that one of its roost mates will provide a snack by regurgitating a blood meal into the hungry bat's mouth — evolved cooperation.

In addition to **(1) Direct reciprocity**, Nowak later identified four other mechanisms for the evolution of cooperation. He claims that in the thousands of published papers scientists have produced on how cooperators could prevail in

evolution, all the scenarios they describe fall into one or more of these five categories.

**(2) Spatial selection** — the forming of clusters of cooperators, neighbors or friends in a social network. These helpful individuals can multiply, grow and spread from their clusters to extend their territory and radiate their cooperative influence through social mimetics.

*Spatial selection* is observed to operate among yeast cells. Cooperative yeast cells, at a biological cost to themselves, produce an enzyme used to produce sugar; competitor yeast cells, meanwhile, mooch off the cooperators' enzyme rather than making their own. Studies conducted by Jeff Gore of MIT, and independently confirmed by Andrew Murray of Harvard, have found that among yeast grown in well-mixed populations the moochers prevail. In populations with clumps of cooperators and moochers (competitive yeasts), by contrast, the cooperators win out.

**(3) Kin selection** "concerns cooperation among genetically related individuals... In this situation, individuals make sacrifices for their relatives because those relatives share their genes." J. B. S. Haldane was the first to mention the idea of kin selection and put it: "I will jump into the river to save two brothers or eight cousins," referring to the fact that our siblings share 50% of our DNA and first cousins only 12.5%. Martin Nowak admits: "It turns out that calculating the fitness effects of kin selection is a rather complicated task that has misled many researchers." I agree! We all know what great lengths we'll go to for family members and those we've accepted into our socially extended family.

**(4) Indirect reciprocity** — when one individual comes to the aid of another to bolster the needy individual's social reputation. This behavior can benefit both participants' social reputations, building up the helper's as an intended or unintended outcome — provided that others are aware that the helper helped.

*Indirect reciprocity* can be seen as low-ranking monkeys in a tribe of Japanese macaques get an "upgrade" directly from grooming monkeys of a higher rank — they receive more grooming themselves.

**(5) Group selection** — Individuals perform selfless acts for the good of. Darwin noted in his 1871 book *The Descent of Man* that "a

tribe including many members who... were always ready to aid one another and to sacrifice themselves for the common good would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection." Biologists have long debated whether this idea of natural selection fosters cooperation to improve the reproductive potential of the group. The Socialist Tribe, united by solidarity rather than genetics, offers an alternative (and perhaps isolated) explanation — our group being that of the tellurian, without distinction of difference, and the planet.

Group selection can be observed in the wild (putting all mathematical gene distribution modeling aside) any time a member of a group of critters yaps, howls, barks or squeaks at an intruding predator. Whether the individual is calling for help or sounding a warning, he or she alerts the predator to its own location and may be volunteering to become lunch.

Nowak writes: "This universality [detailed above] suggests that cooperation has been a driving force in the evolution of life on earth from the beginning... Humans are the most cooperative species — super-cooperators, if you will... Humans, more than any other creature, offer assistance based on indirect reciprocity, or reputation." Nowak says that it is "because only humans have full-blown language... The interplay between language and indirect reciprocity leads to rapid cultural evolution, which is central to our adaptability as a species."

A rapid cultural evolution — at such speed that it would be called a cultural revolution — is desperately needed, and right now! The Earth cannot withstand the onslaught of capitalist culture for very many more years. We are already close to some irreversible tipping points (if we haven't already reached them). Only a few more years of production for profit, using cheap energy such as coal, will usher in catastrophic global changes. We will have annihilated beyond comprehension vast areas of arable land needed for growing vegetables, despoiled and polluted the supply of fresh water. We are on a march towards planetary suicide.

Comments may be addressed to the author by email: [joe-hopkins@verizon.net](mailto:joe-hopkins@verizon.net)

## **A life worth choosing**

### **Lyla Byrne**

The evolution of consciousness is clearly an amazing and immensely enjoyable, but also extremely painful and dangerous affair. It perhaps can only evolve – or continue to evolve – in the context of community; that is, interactively with developing culture. That is our story anyway.

Charles Darwin noted that being a social animal is a primary feature of human beings. He thought that our more deliberate considerations about compassionate moral issues have origins in and are influenced by more automatic responses (which he calls impulses) of empathy (which he calls sympathy). He also noted that our more automatic or impulsive (or we might say *emotional*) - caring responses to others have a lot in common with those of other animals, especially the more intelligent ones. He called this kind of response 'social instinct'. He thought it 'highly probable' that any animal with 'well-marked social instincts', evolving a mental capacity such as in humans would inevitably acquire a caring moral sense or conscience\*1.

More consciousness would certainly be needed for more conscience. In a social animal, more potential for consciousness in general would tend to involve more consciousness of social thoughts and feelings; and indeed for these to be variously more complex/subtle/profound/extensive.

Charles Darwin wrote: 'I fully subscribe to the judgment of those writers who maintain that of all the differences between man and the lower animals, the moral sense or conscience is by far the most important. This sense, as Mackintosh remarks, "has a rightful supremacy over every other principle of human action"'.

It seems from Darwin's work in general, that this conscience is so important because 1) Concomitant to human consciousness is a distinguishing feature of the species, and 2) It is intrinsic to the movement to act to avert or alleviate suffering and to bring health and comfort. Other social animals can be observed performing such services for each other in more simple ways, but human beings can apply extra faculties to it. Also, with the further

experience of choice that comes with further intellectual development, the choice for social animals of helping each other, is in general direction, to choose to contribute to the health of the community, and thus to survival. So it is helpful if we have an automatic response that moves us to make that choice.

Neurophysiology has been recently providing conclusive evidence that Darwin was 'on the money', as empathy is proved to be instinctive or innate in humans as in other animals - meaning that we have genetic potential for it\*2. The experience of cognitive psychologists also confirms these findings.

But as we know, human beings do not only have potentials for high levels of empathy and the consequent workings of conscience, but also for huge range of mental/emotional/behavioural states; some of which, (in terms of health) are very harmful indeed to others/our environment/ourselves.

But there is another but: We evolved to be hunter-gatherers, and communities have taken this form for most of human existence. Anthropological evidence strongly suggests that this form of society tends to minimize the development of our harmful potentials, and to maximize the development of helpful ones such as appreciation and cooperation. This seems to have a lot to do with the absence of financial property rights, which are perfectly suited to the establishment of wealth inequality and thus power/control inequality.

It must be noted that there was more free space to migrate into then, away from any on-going problematic situation. However, exiting H.G. societies, despite present day pressures are still usually non violent in character, and have high levels of equality and democracy. This comes in association with working closely together and sustainably with their environment.\*3. I am not suggesting that these societies are all perfect; but it shows that a basically different form of society is possible; and one which arises from and enables the full flowering and further development of our social nature.

Class divided society and patriarchy may have been a direct result of the more prevalent use of money, along with more settled agricultural practices and the beginning of cities 10-20 thousand years ago; more recently culminating in capitalism. Although the cultural touch-

stones of truth (as in scientific practice) and health, *for their own sake*, still survive, economic hierarchy makes a fundamental break with these as principles, replacing them with hierarchy for hierarchy's sake. One of the ways in which truth and health survive as principles is that they are exploited by rulers in the pretence that the rule *is for the sake of truth and health*; that the rulers are *acting for the good of the whole community*.

Economic hierarchies and perhaps especially Capitalism are inherently unhealthy however, because the only real principles are *getting ownership/control for profit*, and *using profit for ownership/control* – i.e. regardless of facts about wellbeing. So real benefits for health have occurred despite rather than because of these arrangements.

Although there have been appearances of affluence in capitalism for many, these have been mainly based on war and other inhuman and unsustainable methods of production. Plus capitalism is anyway unsustainable as a financial system. Its principles inevitably manifest as increasing social and environmental damage, which, although denied, after not very long becomes undeniable.

Along with brute force, economic hierarchies use various methods to maintain their power. The stories of history and scientific studies tend to be selectively presented, along with fallacies, in order to justify and maintain the system. In modern times these methods have been augmented by the application of modern psychological understanding and techniques to the promotion of conformity, individualism and consumerism. Social instincts themselves are exploited such as the need to feel that we belong - which is particularly useful for getting people to conform to a system once it is established.

For healthy survival it is necessary for us to cooperate for mutual benefit; however, capitalist propaganda says that we need rulers to preside over us, and we need to work for them, and kill for them, and die for them as they compete for private profit.....If this latter is true then human beings are a hopeless case. I mean I think we are doomed. Looking at much of human behaviour in capitalism we might well be tempted to believe this; but most of this behaviour is produced *by the effects of the system*.

Of course there has to be some empathic development for us to not be completely retarded. But empathy gets channelled only in certain directions. Empathy for some groups of people has been restricted to being expressed only in certain ways, or feels forbidden like some kind of taboo.

There is a discernable trend for human empathy to extend with communications technology and global travel; as our knowledge of other lives, places and cultures becomes more detailed. It may be that the ruling class has had to make increasing efforts to limit and misdirect empathy to counteract this, particularly in connection to mass starvation and bloody imperial oppression in other countries, and child neglect at home.

However it is not enough to just point out that capitalism or any systemic hierarchy has a corrupting effect. We also have to look at what in our nature is susceptible to that corruption; and moreover, what in our nature contributed to/allowed the formation of these kind of hierarchies in the first place. Understanding and managing that is going to be as fundamental as supply of food and shelter etc. if we are to survive.

For although the advent of hierarchical systems did not produce harmful potentials originally, these systems have certainly enabled us to explore our full potential for doing harm. The present capitalist phase is the ultimate expression of this, as it has wreaked the most wide spread economic dispossession of populations, deforestation, war and toxic contamination, and now threatens the existence of the entire biosphere. In capitalism all the horrors have been cultured and hot housed big-time.

So we are right to be afraid of what human beings are capable of, but clinging on to capitalism will not protect us from ourselves; it is Capitalism that has facilitated us being put to sleep or drugged and taken over by sociopaths and ecopaths.

It is capitalism that has made the world as dangerous as it can possibly be. This is because it tends to minimize self, social and ecological awareness and creative involvement. It prevents the efficient use of resources and the development of our honest, kind and cooperative potentials. Mean while it breeds, trains and unleashes the deceiving, despotic, abusive and psychotic.

Domineering, violent, apathetic and cruel potentials will be there in any kind of society; *but we can choose a system of society that minimizes their manifestation, and maximizes the manifestation of our healthy and sane, aesthetic and sympathetic potentials.*

To supply for ourselves sustainably we have to learn how to manage ourselves to maximise our self, social and ecological awareness and responsibility; which involves maximizing our enjoyment of ourselves, our communities and our wider environment. This tends to naturally happen with sustainable projects *because of their nature*. Replete with positive feedbacks this is a process which is likely to get progressively stronger and immune to the growth/takeover of any unhealthy and bullying regimes.

The book 'Human Givens' very usefully points out that *given our biology/psychology* – we need certain qualities in our personal and social relationships for our healthy development. I think that this extends to our environment in general, not only in terms of needing air and food etc., but in terms of needing intellectual understanding and emotional appreciation of it. This is enjoyable in itself and necessary for creating sustainable relationships. By also recounting the sad litany of the harmful aspects of society today, the book also – without realizing it perhaps – makes a big contribution to the biological/psychological case against capitalism.

Human relationships are going to be difficult enough in any kind of society. We have to give ourselves the best chance we can of managing ourselves for our own good by getting out of this (seemingly long, but in evolutionary terms, quite brief) phase of human existence.

It seems to be common sense like Darwin's that it is necessary to create spaces of economic equality and democracy within capitalism, in order to develop the *way of being* that creates *more commonly owned and democratic space* and so on. This has already begun in a variety of ways; in intentional communities, coops and collectives and activist groups including the occupy movement. Many if not all of these groups are to some extent practicing forms of common ownership and democracy, and are becoming more consciously committed to using techniques for 'inter-relating horizontally (and therefore anti-oppressively)', 'displacing the

state through autonomous, community facilitated conflict resolution' 'reclaiming public/democratic space', and 'reviving participatory democracy'. And wherever possible we need to combine this with healing and regrowing our environment and generally developing sustainable modes of life. In terms of maintaining rather than reclaiming, this is the kind of stuff that the sane San have been doing forever.

The development of such skills is essential if common ownership and democracy are to work – and to have a living environment to work with. This may be the most efficient way of managing our nature and cooperating for mutual wellbeing that we have come across so far – and may be not only the best we will ever find, but the only way. . We don't have time to wait for definitive proof this time before we act – because if we do, it looks like that proof will take the form not only of further horrific human conflict and abuse, but further catastrophic ecological devastation ending in the utter annihilation of the biosphere.

History has plenty of repetitions, but it also has plenty of new departures. It is a species characteristic, along with our social instinct, to be innovators. We rely upon evidence from the past; but we also rely on our creative abilities. One lesson of the history of life as a whole, or of *natural history*, is that surprising and wonderful developments do occur. It could be said that in the evolution of life this is the norm rather than the exception, so we really ought to get used to it.

In evolution the strongest trends are for efficiency for health (fitness). Since culture is a product of evolution, then efficiency for health may well be a strong enough inherent value to triumph.

Although the economically powerful in hierarchical systems purvey moralities of various sorts (often hypocritically) for maintaining their rule; still we have never completely lost the health based morality that as Darwin pointed out is *for the good of the community*. David Graeber, referring to common ownership and democracy, says "Communism.....It's the way most of us act with people we really care about all the time"

But our peaceful, socially and ecologically appreciative nature has been and is up against

the most terrible forces that would destroy it just to keep control. Hierarchical organization has been one of the results, in ongoing circumstances, of our evolutionary heritage of potentials. But there is another but: we have other potentials that can overcome and control that tendency. The main potential of human consciousness is that we can become more aware and learn how manage ourselves and our situation for healthy, enjoyable life.

Evidence from sociology and psychology and the personal experience of many of us, shows that working cooperatively as equals promotes critical and creative thinking; information sharing, exchanging ideas, sorting out errors refining and combining ideas; general understanding and communication; and *is thus far more satisfying* than having to function in hierarchical power structures. I think it is highly probable that it is also absolutely necessary for sustainable living.

The importance of the new evidence from modern science about our social potential, for those who need it, is that it is proof of what is possible, if we want it. This joins evidence from anthropology; intentional communities etc., and from our own direct experience.

Anthropology has documented a huge range of variation in the mores of societies; but it is common to both pre-capitalist type cultures and to various communities within capitalism, that high levels of economic equality and democracy are associated with high levels of peace and wellbeing; and this corresponds to findings in the study of child development and human behaviour about our psychological needs. Where people feel respected and valued as an equal they tend to have far less anxiety, grief and irrational anger; and generally work together more effectively and happily to supply for their needs. Whereas increasing economic inequality is accompanied by increasing waste, violence on all levels of society, mental problems, drug addiction and general illness.

Evolution has gifted us with a certain amount choice about how we continue to evolve. Informed by the knowledge that we have, we can choose systems of organization that allow for the further cultural development and evolution of our healthy, enjoyable social potentials. Evidence about ourselves, our social systems and our ecology – which is also evidence *about how these interact* - all points to the fact that choosing life is to choose a different

way of being than has been imposed by the abusive hierarchies of civilization so far. So it involves some fundamental differences to 'choosing life' as described in Trainspotting.

### References

1 [http://darwinonline.org.uk/converted/published/1871\\_Descent\\_F937/1871\\_Descent\\_F937.1.html](http://darwinonline.org.uk/converted/published/1871_Descent_F937/1871_Descent_F937.1.html) The Descent of Man Charles Darwin p70-73

2 <http://www.zcommunications.org/hard-wired-for-moral-politics-by-gary-olson> Hard-Wired for Moral Politics. Gary Olsen

3a **The Forest People** Colin Turnbull 1961

3b **The Bushmen** by [Alf Wannenburg](#), Peter Johnson and [Anthony Bannister](#) 1999

[From The Environment Book, Part Three. I have a few other references to put with this piece when it is added to the following website: [stephenshenfield.net](http://stephenshenfield.net)]

+++++

## WHAT WAS THE 'SOVIET' SYSTEM?

### PART 2. IN WHAT SENSE (IF ANY) WAS THE 'SOVIET' SYSTEM SOCIALIST?

**Stefan**

#### Introduction

In Part 1 we considered in what sense the 'Soviet' system might be considered capitalist. The question in Part 2 is whether there is any sense in which that system might be considered socialist or communist. And just as I began Part 1 by clarifying the meanings of "capitalist" (capital, capitalism), so it is now necessary to start by clarifying the meaning of "socialist" (socialism) and "communist" (commune, communism).

In this section of the article I view the 'Soviet' system from a new vantage point. In Part 1 the point of comparison was capitalism as analyzed by Marx – a system contemporaneous with the 'Soviet' system and similar in terms of production technology but dissimilar in structure. The point of comparison here will be a system that dates from an earlier epoch and had its basis in agriculture but was similar (though not, of course, identical) in structure – the system of



state despotism that Marx called the "Asiatic mode of production" (AMP). [1]

So I shall be discussing the character of the AMP and its place in world history – in particular, the related questions of whether it was a "class society" and whether it contained any elements that might be regarded as socialist or communist. This will prepare the ground for comparing the 'Soviet' system with the AMP and asking the same questions in relation to the 'Soviet' system. That will finally place us in a position to consider the relationship between the 'Soviet' system and socialism/communism.

### **The meaning of "socialism" and "communism"**

The word "socialism" was first used in its modern sense in France about 1830 in reference to the doctrine of Henri de Saint-Simon. [2] Subsequently it was applied to the ideas of Fourier, Owen, Lassalle, Marx, Engels, and many others. The common threads that linked all these thinkers were a focus on society (in contrast to liberal individualism) and advocacy of social ownership of the means of life, cooperation in place of competition, and production for use not for profit. Socialism was a reaction against the newly arisen order of capitalism, its negation and alternative.

In other respects, however, there were deep divisions among socialist thinkers. Some had frankly elitist and authoritarian conceptions of socialism. For Saint-Simon, in particular, socialism was a statist order, governed by an elite of industrial managers. Lassalle, whose ideas had at least as strong an influence on the German Social-Democratic Party as those of Marx, [3] also had a statist conception of socialism, inspired by the imperial ethos of Bismarckian Germany. Fourier had a much more libertarian approach. The mainstream of the social-democratic movement was in the middle of this spectrum, combining formal adherence to democracy with a cult of discipline and a tendency to dogmatism.

A neat example of the same division in the Anglo-Saxon world was the contrast between Edward Bellamy's socialist utopia *Looking Backward* (1888), with its military organization of labour, [4] and the arcadian vision of *News from Nowhere* (1890), which

William Morris wrote as a conscious riposte to Bellamy.

Thus, it cannot be said that socialism originated as a fully democratic and libertarian doctrine and later degenerated. Rather, the tension between libertarian and authoritarian tendencies existed within socialism from the very start. Given this historical background, it seems arbitrary to call one strand "real" or "true" socialism and label the other "sham". I prefer to define socialism in terms of the anti-capitalist ideas that are common to all these tendencies, while acknowledging the importance of the differences among them. (This still allows us to reject the socialist credentials of those who call themselves socialists but seek only to reform capitalism.)

A similar argument can be made regarding the term "communism", which came into use in its modern sense about 1840, although the idea itself can be traced much further back – at least to Thomas More's *Utopia* of 1518 and the "Digger" and "True Leveller" Gerard Winstanley (1609–1676). I might note that although Winstanley was undoubtedly progressive for his times his conception of communism was fairly authoritarian and the attempts of present-day libertarians to claim him as a precursor involve a considerable degree of self-deception. [5]

### **The character of the AMP**

There is great diversity among the civilizations that have been described as "Asiatic" or "semi-Asiatic". The essential structure common to them all consisted of numerous local agrarian communes and -- "towering above them" -- a centralised despotic state served by a hierarchy of bureaucrats.

The commune had its roots in the primitive communism of pre-state times. It was originally a self-enclosed and self-sufficient local community of social equals who exercised collective control over the land. That did not necessarily mean that the land was farmed collectively, though it might be; but even where farming was carried on by separate family households, the commune was free to allocate and reallocate land among the households on the basis of need. The rise of state power undermined the original autonomy and democracy of the commune, but rarely destroyed them completely.



Who "owned" the land under this system? In a sense the land as well as the people belonged to the despot, because only practical considerations limited his power to extract resources from the land and levy forced labour (for armies and to build dikes, roads, walls, palaces, temples, pyramids, etc.). However, as the communes were mostly left to their own devices provided that they submitted to the state's exactions, we might regard them as retaining some degree of ownership. It can also be argued that – in contrast to Roman antiquity, feudalism and capitalism – ownership and property are not relevant concepts for understanding the AMP.

What, if any, was the technological basis of the AMP? In his 1957 classic *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*, Karl Wittfogel analyzed the AMP as a "hydraulic society" – a system that arose in river valleys where periodic flooding and drought compelled the communes to pool their labour in order to build hydraulic works (dikes, dams, reservoirs, irrigation canals etc.). Designing these installations, coordinating their construction, and maintaining them were the crucial functions of the state bureaucracy.

The hydraulic theory can help to explain the appearance of the AMP in riverine civilizations such as Egypt, Sumeria and China, but obviously it is of no use in cases where the AMP arose on other types of terrain. In fact, the AMP assumed its "purest" or most highly bureaucratized form in the Andean empire of the Incas. [6] The Inca empire was a total "command economy": all production was managed by the bureaucracy; output was distributed from state storehouses in accordance with set rules (e.g., each peasant received two sets of clothing upon marriage); money was used only for foreign trade. The AMP in China, for example, was always much less centralised, with developed domestic trade.

### **Marx on the place of the AMP in world history**

It is of interest to trace the evolution of Marx's thinking concerning the place occupied by the AMP in world history.

At first Marx listed the AMP as the first in a single sequence of four class societies, succeeded by the slave-holding society of Greco-Roman antiquity, then by feudalism and finally by capitalism. Marx referred to this

single line of development of class society as "the socio-economic formation".

Later, after closer study of the subject, Marx concluded that the AMP was *not* the first stage of the socio-economic formation, but rather the second stage, following primitive communism, in a quite separate line of development that he called the "archaic" or "primary" social formation.

In this view of the late Marx, the fate of the agrarian commune is very different in the two lines of development. The private property relations of the socio-economic formation are antagonistic to the commune and eventually destroy it. By contrast, the AMP and the commune are symbiotic: their interaction can continue until the entire formation is destroyed by some external force such as conquest or climatic disaster.

Thus the late Marx brings the AMP closer to primitive communism and distances it from the sequence of class societies based on private property relations. This finds reflection in his view of the state. The state in the socio-economic formation is basically an "executive committee" of the exploiting class. The state in the AMP, however, is:

*a superstructure erected on the basis of directly communal property and the commune. The ruler is neither a private property owner nor a feudal lord but a personification of the collective, the personified single foundation of the commune. [7]*

In effect, the late Marx no longer treats the AMP as a class society or its state as a class state. This state serves not an exploiting class but the communes, by performing a coordinating function that they are structurally unable to perform for themselves.

Nevertheless, many analysts of the AMP who take a broadly Marxist approach align do treat the AMP as a full-fledged class society in which the state bureaucracy (the mandarin in China, let us say) is the ruling and exploiting class.

I am critical of both these positions. On the one hand, there is surely something metaphysical (idealist in the philosophical sense) in viewing the imposing edifice of the AMP state purely as an emanation of the local agrarian commune. And while hydraulic works

may well be in the interests of the whole society, the same can hardly be said of some of the other state projects that devoured the labour of the common people – the temples, palaces, pyramids, etc. On the other hand, to call the state bureaucracy in the AMP a ruling class is to use this term in a special sense that ignores the supreme position of the despot, who enjoys unlimited power over the very lives of the members of this “ruling class”. We need a third position that recognises the full distance separating the AMP both from primitive communism and from class societies based on private property relations.

### **Did the AMP contain any ‘socialist’ elements?**

Even if the AMP is defined as an exploitative class society, it cannot be denied that it contains certain elements that seem to have something ‘socialist’ or ‘communist’ about them by contrast with class societies based on private property relations.

The first such element is the agrarian commune itself, which embodies a collective and egalitarian ethos at odds with the hierarchical and highly inegalitarian world of the despotic state.

The second quasi-socialist element is a paternalistic quality often if not always manifested by the ideology and practice of state administration. In Confucianism, for example, the state has a duty of benevolence toward the common people: its exactions should not be so heavy as to threaten their survival. The Pharaohs and the Incas stored food for distribution in the event of temporary or local crop failures. By contrast, the rulers of other class societies, by and large, have felt no responsibility for the fate of the lower orders.

### **The connection between the ‘Soviet’ system and the AMP**

There is an obvious family resemblance between the ‘Soviet’ system and the AMP as societies in which a state bureaucracy controls the main means of production. Even though the ‘Soviet’ system nowhere emerged directly out of the AMP, there are plausible grounds for positing an indirect connection. Russia and China both have a cultural legacy that is at least ‘semi-Asiatic’ and in both countries this legacy facilitated the consolidation of the

‘Soviet’ system – we need only recall how Chinese peasants worshipped the portrait of Mao as their new ‘emperor’.

The possibility that the AMP might be revived in Russia in a new form was foreseen by Plekhanov (who did more than anyone else to make Marxist thought known in Russia). At the Bolshevik party congress of 1906, Plekhanov opposed Lenin’s call for nationalisation of the land on the grounds that it might lead to restoration of ‘our old semi-Asiatic order’:

Plekhanov was warning of the danger for Russia of despotic and bureaucratic collectivism *à la Inca*. Russian despotism had been built upon the binding of the peasant to the state. [8]

The striking parallelism between the ‘Soviet’ system and the AMP was one of the main reasons why Stalin banned all study of the AMP in the USSR or even references to the concept. [9] After Stalin’s death scholars were again permitted to study and discuss the AMP, but only as a specialised area of historical research – they were not allowed publicly to assert that the topic had any contemporary relevance. Privately, however, they were very interested in the issue of the connection between the AMP and the ‘Soviet’ system, as became clear when Gorbachev broadened the limits of free expression.

Andrei Zdorov, whom we met in Part 1 of this article, describes the AMP as ‘state feudalism’: ‘Both the feudal and the capitalist class formation can exist either in private-property or in state form’ [10]. Just as he expands the meaning usually given to ‘capitalism’ in order to include the ‘Soviet’ system as ‘state capitalism’, so he expands the meaning of ‘feudalism’ to include the AMP as ‘state feudalism’. At the same time, the use in both cases of the qualifier ‘state’ highlights the parallel between the ‘Soviet’ system and the AMP.

A more radical approach is that of Yuri Semyonov, the most original and prolific contemporary Russian Marxist historian. [11] Semyonov views the AMP and the ‘Soviet’ system as merely two distinct forms of a single ‘politary’ mode of production – its ‘agro-politary’ and ‘industrial-politary’ forms. Both forms of the politary mode of production are marked by ‘class-wide private property’ as distinct from the ‘individual private property’

of the slaveholding, feudal and capitalist systems. Semyonov analyzes property relations in the AMP in terms of 'two storeys' – the commune and the state. This seems a more balanced approach than that of the late Marx.

### **'Soviet' society and modern conceptions of socialism**

Above I noted the presence of two 'quasi-socialist' elements in the AMP. Given the parallels between the AMP and the 'Soviet' system, can we find any corresponding elements in the 'Soviet' system?

The agrarian commune was already a thing of the past in Russia when the 'Soviet' system took shape, but its psychology had not completely disappeared. This may help to explain the 'socialist' qualities that some observers have detected in the basic cell of the 'Soviet' system – the work collective. It may also be relevant that in the mature system of the post-Stalin period there was a high level of job security and low turnover, with the same people working together over many years. This led (in varying degrees) to genuine solidarity and mutual aid – as, for instance, when people got together to help a colleague move to a new home. Many people in the former USSR now bemoan the loss of this feeling of closeness within the work collective, however stifling and oppressive they may have found it at the time. A case in point is the Russian writer Alexander Zinoviev, who placed the work collective at the centre of his analysis of Soviet society.

The nature of a particular work collective depended to a considerable extent on the personality of the person appointed to manage it. An enterprise or institute director who was loyal to "his" collective could (up to a point) defend the interests of "his people" – protect them from persecution, conceal their shortcomings, resist excessive demands from above, etc. This enabled the collective to develop a measure of autonomy. The authorities often brought in someone from outside as director for the purpose of restoring effective control over a collective, though this did not always work as the new director might "go native". If all else failed, however, they could – and sometimes did – use their power to break up a collective altogether.

Thus in both the AMP and the 'Soviet' system there was tension as well as symbiosis between the collectives at the base and the superstructure of the bureaucratic states.

The rulers of the 'Soviet' system also shared the paternalistic approach of their AMP counterparts – in some countries and at some periods. When the 'Soviet' system was dismantled in Russia, ordinary people felt abandoned. Oppressive as the system might be, there were people "up there" who were responsible for making sure that your most basic needs were met. Now suddenly you were on your own. The same shock was experienced by many migrants from state-capitalist to private-capitalist countries (from the USSR to the USA, from Vietnam to Hong Kong, etc.).

It bears emphasis that only the mature form of the 'Soviet' system exhibited this paternalism. It would be absurd to talk about paternalism during the periods of forced industrialisation in Stalinist Russia or Maoist China, when millions perished in man-made famines and at forced labour. Both Stalin and Mao exported grain while 'their own people' were starving. Both were determined to build up heavy industry at any cost in (non-market) competition with rival capitalist powers (see Part 1).

Thus, there are both significant connections and major differences among the AMP, the 'Soviet' system and authoritarian tendencies in modern socialist thought. The differences stand out much more sharply when we compare the AMP or the 'Soviet' system with democratic and libertarian tendencies in socialist thought, but even in this case let us not be too hasty in dismissing the possibility of some sort of connection out of hand.

### **Notes**

*[1] Marx's focus on Eurasia - India, China and Russia in particular - led him to call this system "Asiatic" despite the occurrence of the same system in pre-conquest America (especially the Maya, Inca and Anasazi civilizations). The AMP label has stuck due partly to inertia and Marx-worship, partly to the difficulty of agreeing on a substantive (rather than geographical) name for the system.*

*[2] One source gives 1827 as the date of first use, another source 1832. The person who introduced "socialism" was Pierre Leroux, but Leroux was a publicist for Saint-Simon and used the word to describe his ideas.*

*[3] Arguably Lassalle's influence was stronger, as reflected in the SDP's concept of the People's State*

*(Volkstaat), which was not abandoned despite Engels' criticism (in Critique of the Erfurt Program).*

*[4] Bellamy envisions industrial hierarchies organised as "armies" - one for men and the other for women. He developed his utopia further in a second book: Equality (1898).*

*[5] Should you doubt this, please read Winstanley's Law of Freedom in a Platform (1652). Pay special attention to Chapter 4: "What Are the Officers' Names in a Free Commonwealth?" (bilderbog.org/land/lawofree.htm).*

*[6] This is at least true for the well-understood cases. Another "pure" case may be the Minoan civilization of ancient Crete.*

*[7] On the evolution of Marx's view of the AMP, see the articles by Vadim Mezhev and Andrei Maidansky in the Autumn 2012 issue of Russian Studies in Philosophy (published by M.E. Sharpe of New York). The passage cited is from Maidansky.*

*[8] Milorad Draskovic, Marxism in the Modern World (Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 63.*

*[9] This was probably the most important reason, but there were others. In particular, theories of the AMP were associated, rightly or wrongly, with the idea that having an 'Asiatic' legacy made a country especially backward, and this offended nationalist sensibilities in both Russia and China.*

*[10] Andrei Zdorov, State Capitalism and the Modernisation of the Soviet Union: A Marxist Analysis of Soviet Society (in Russian; Moscow: URSS, 2006), p. 21.*

*[11] For a survey of Semyonov's life and work, see Wikipedia (the Russian-language Wikipedia). Semyonov reached his conception of 'Soviet' society as 'politary' (or 'neo-politary') at the beginning of the 1970s, although the conception does not appear in his official publications.*

+++++

## **"Marxism" and Anarchism**

**Ricardo Monde**

### **Introductory comment**

The development of a unified group within the anti state, non market sector is dependent on bringing the two main strands of thought within it "Marxism" and anarchism closer together. From time to time you come across an article which seems to be attempting to synthesise these two bodies of thought, and so it was when I begin to read with interest "**Libertarian Marxism's Relation to Anarchism**" by Wayne Price but disappointment soon developed. This is not a critique of Wayne Price, (WP) or this particular article in isolation

but a critique of the sort of argument that sees the two theories as distant cousins who have hardly met and therefore completely misunderstand one another rather than close relatives who often meet up to explore what they have in common. Unfortunately the type of argument produced by WP and worse has often been repeated by Anarchists and "Marxists" alike.

### **Price's Criticism of Marxism**

The basis of WP argument is that there are two strands of "Marxism", mainstream or orthodox and libertarian. The former is the bad guy, the latter is well intentioned but try as it may it cannot rehabilitate the offender from its authoritarianism and deterministic ways as these are inherent in the theory itself. It seems that the terms mainstream or orthodox are intended as another term for real and according to WP the main fault with this brand of "Marxism" is it views history as a process of inevitability, it happens to people and socialism is the inevitable outcome of certain stages which society passes through. Price states

*"Often referring to socialism as "inevitable" the mainstream theorists of Marxism see socialism as the invariable outcome of the automatic processes of social development." WP then goes on to argue: "The attempts of the libertarian Marxists to shake free of Marxist automaticity (as I shall refer to it) have not been fully successful. They cannot be fully successful given that it is not a misinterpretation of Marxism but a central part of Marx's Marxism. The whole point of Capital is that socialism must happen."*

This automaticity and what he regards as the amoral within Marxism are for WP directly related to the events of Russia 1917. Price states:

*"For the Bolsheviks it became the rationale for tyranny. Believing the party knew the absolute truth about what must happen (that is, having correct class consciousness), and sure it was only implementing historically necessary tasks, they felt justified in killing or oppressing others – for the sake of human liberation, of course."*

True near the end of his piece WP does state that anarchists can gain something from "Marxism" in relation to capitalism and how it creates a working class capable of the self action needed to bring about a revolutionary transformation. But then, he adds:

*". . . Marxism, is not just a collection of concepts, which can be taken or left in bits. . . it stands or falls all of a*

*piece. As it turned out, Marxism was not the program of the working class as intended, but the program of a state capitalist ruling class." WP ends his article in the following way: "So too, while there is much to be gained from Marxism, socialists who believe in liberation are better off being anarchists."*

So he is not really in favour of drawing the two strands closer together.

Many might argue that articles like Wayne Price's have a point there are strands in Marxian thought that seem to have a link with authoritarian state capitalist regimes but it can also be pointed out that there are also more strands that are in complete opposition to so called "Marxist"-Leninist thought. True in outlining what he brands as Libertarian "Marxism" he lists several theorists and strains of "Marxism" which, he claims, are trying to free themselves of "authoritarian Marxism" but then he goes on to suggest that they are doomed to failure since determinism and authoritarianism is inherent in Marx's body of thought. To begin with we would part company from the type of analysis offered by WP on the idea that there are two distinct and perhaps disconnected strains in "Marxism" an authoritarian strain and a libertarian strain rather like some view there is a separation between Marx's early and latter writings. As **David McLellan** wrote in his introduction to **Marx's Grundrisse, [1971, p.25]:**

*"Marx's intellectual development is a process of 'self clarification' (to use his own expression), which cannot be split into periods or treated as a monolith".*

So there may be changes of emphasis in Marx's writings over time but does this apply only to Marx? Could the same not be said of Bakunin or to use a later example Bookchin, maybe we should be more worried when a writer shows no sign of change when s/he starts off with a point of view and dogmatically refuses to vary that view no matter what the circumstances.

### **Enlightening the problems with Marx's thought.**

Some of the variations in Marx's thought can be partially explained by the time at which he was writing and this was very well explained in **John Crumps** pamphlet "**A Contribution To The Critique of Marx**". In this work John Crump argues that whilst Marx had a clear understanding and commitment to communism he lived and wrote at a time

when bourgeois rather than communist revolution was the order of the day as the material conditions were not ripe for the latter. Marx was a fierce opponent of utopianism and also wanted to be active in the working class struggles of the time rather than theorising about a society that was not a practical possibility at that point. He therefore had the problem of being a communist who was partially restrained by realism but there were points when his zeal for communism led to that rhetoric being mingled with what could only be movements for ends that fell far short of genuine communism. In his pamphlet John Crump picks out two examples of this **The Communist Manifesto 1848** and **Critique of the Gotha Programme 1875**. In **The Communist Manifesto** Marx avoided utopianism by not using the language of genuine communism in the coming revolution which he thought was a genuine possibility. But Crump stated;

*"instead of an out-and-out utopian (but not particularly harmful) projection of socialism, what we get is a semi realistic recipe for state capitalism which was fraught with danger because its relation (or non relation) to socialism was left unclear." [1971, p.8]*

So Marx includes in this work the possibility of the proletariat taking power and exercising its rule within the confines of a continuing capitalist system. So while Marx was right in his view that in the middle of the nineteenth century an immediate advance to communism was not on the cards, the belief that the working class could hold on to power without a minority ruling class reappearing and that this process could transform itself into communism was, Crump suggested, not only misguided but dangerously so [ibid].

Moving forward to the **Critique of the Gotha Programme 1875**, Crump noted that this had plenty of points that are valid statements of communist principles but he argues that Marx in an attempt to convince himself and others that he was engaged in activities related to communism ends up by mixing up a proletarian administered state capitalism with a genuine image of communism. It is in this image of a proletarian run state capitalism that provides a link between the thoughts of Marx and Lenin. This link is brought out when Marx describes what he terms as the first phase of communism, a system that he admits still suffers from the effects of the capitalist society it has emerged from but the problem is he still refers to it as communist. After a brief description of why this first phase is

capitalism rather than communism, Crump states the following:

*"No matter how insistently Marx might have applied the label 'first phase of communist society' to the society which he describes in the Critique of the Gotha Programme (CGP) as soon as we examine it in any sort of depth we can see that it is a form of capitalism".*

So why take issue with the sort of argument presented by Wayne Price? There is a distinct difference between the type of argument presented by WP which in many ways simply dismisses "Marxism" as authoritarian and deterministic and the sort of analysis presented by John Crump which is an appraisal of how inconsistencies in Marx's thought due, in part, to the period he was writing and living in, enabled Leninism to make the claim that their body of thought, which proved disastrous for the development of genuine communism was based on "Marxism" as developed by Marx himself. Within the sort of honest critique offered by Crump, there is a strong indication that there is a divergence between "Marxism" and Leninism even in the two works under review. For example in *The Communist Manifesto* Marx concluded that the revolutionary act would be carried out by the working class as a whole whereas for Lenin it would be limited to a revolutionary vanguard party. It should be noted here that for Crump the main error was the notion of a proletarian administered state capitalism. However to this we can add that whilst the term "*Dictatorship of the Proletariat*" can be seen as having dire consequences for genuine communism there is a world of difference between the dictatorship of a majority class to the dictatorship of one party or even more of a central committee and finally of one person. To speak of the dictatorship of a majority class is really a contradiction in terms owing to the very concept of the impossibility of a proletarian administered state capitalism in the first place. Whereas the dictatorship of a single party and so on and so on is a recipe for a totalitarian state. In regards to *CGP*, Crump wrote of Marx's commitment to communism as a theory and suggests that this is:

*"just what provides the theoretical discontinuity which exists between Marx and Lenin."*

In Lenin's writings, Crump argues, there is not a trace of an explanation of socialism which comes anywhere near to the excellent explanations provided within the writings of Marx. Lenin lacked any grasp of what socialism was and merely identified it with

proletarian, or in his case, a vanguard party administered state capitalism.

Perhaps the real problem is that Price is arguing against the concept of "Marxism" and "Marxist" and these are terms that we, as supporters of the ideas of Marx, should dissociate ourselves from. This was identified some time ago by Maximilien Rubel when he argued that the terms "Marxism" and "Marxist" have done much to bring to ideas of Marx into disrepute. Rubel stated the following:

*In view of the impossibility of rationally defining the meaning of the concept of Marxism, it seems logical to abandon the word itself, yet it is so commonly and so universally employed. This term, degraded to the point of merely being a mystificatory slogan, carried from its birth the stigma of obscurantism. Marx struggled hard to undo this when, in the last years of his life, his reputation had broken the wall of silence which surrounded his work, and he made this categorical declaration: "ce qu'il y a de certain c'est que moi, je ne suis pas" (Roughly translated) "if that is the case I am certainly no Marxist"*

He later argues:

*When Engels decided to appropriate the terms 'Marxist' and 'Marxism' from his adversaries in order to change a hostile name into a name of honour, he could hardly have expected that, through this gesture of defiance (or was it resignation?), he would become the godfather of a mythology destined to dominate the twentieth century.*

There is little doubt that Rubel had a point and maybe we should either be more careful in using those terms in the future or replacing them with the term Marxian. However that said whilst some writers from both camps continue to seemingly have a vested interest in keeping ideas that have much in common separated into two distinct and opposing sectors then the concept of anti state, non market communism will struggle to assert itself against the capitalist left.

#### References

1) Wayne Price: **Libertarian Marxism's relation to Anarchism**

2) John Crump: **Contribution to the Critique of Marx.**

3) Maximilien Rubel: **The Legend of Marx, 'or Engels the Founder'**

[www.marxmyths.org/maximilien+rubel](http://www.marxmyths.org/maximilien+rubel)

4)

**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

**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.

=====

**Visit <http://Stephenshenfield.net>** contains all issues of The Libertarian Communist and a host of useful articles for the ASNM sector.

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

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

=====

**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 E17QX

**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, (please note the changed email address [libcom.bulletin@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:libcom.bulletin@yahoo.co.uk))

The Libertarian Communist is now available from **Housemans Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, London N1 9DX** email [shop@housemans.com](mailto:shop@housemans.com) <http://www.housemans.com/>

**Chronos Publications**  
BM Chronos, London WC1N 3XX

**The Life and Death of Capitalism Series No.1**

**No Revolution Anywhere By Robert Kurz**  
Available now

**The Substance Of Capital by Robert Kurz**  
This was due out in January of this year but we now understand it will be out in June

**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 and Marx Myths and Legends [www.marxmyths.org](http://www.marxmyths.org)

**Direct Action Industrial Unions**

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

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

**International Libertarian Socialist Alliance: Formerly called the *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.**

Email: [radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com](mailto:radicalhistorynetwork@googlemail.com)

**The following publications have recently been brought to our attention.**

**Mayday.** Issue 6, Winter 2010 stated: “Mayday is an attempt to learn from critical Marxists, Anarchism, and to criticise the Ultra leftist streak which taints some anarchism. It is not often that anarchism is criticised from within, but Mayday has done just that, identifying an anarchist inability to think political growth and work with other groups who are not like them.”

**Cl@ss War Classix..** “is a new initiative to reproduce seminal publications of the class war , and by doing so e.g. with new introductions, or previously unavailable texts, providing up to the date political commentary.” [Class.war.classix@googlemail.com](mailto:Class.war.classix@googlemail.com)

For details of both of these contact : Trevor Bark, 18 Walker Drive, Bishops Auckland, Co Durham, DL14 6QW or email [dr\\_trevorbark@fastmail.net](mailto:dr_trevorbark@fastmail.net) or visit : <http://workingclassbookfair.vpweb.com>

Last but not least: North East Anarchists at [WWW.neanarchists.com](http://WWW.neanarchists.com)