

THE
LIBERTARIAN
COMMUNIST

Free or Donation

ISSUE 5
NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2009

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

A Discussion Bulletin for the Anti
State, Non Market Sector

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

Contents

- Page 2: Capitalism and global warming: an inescapable truth
- Page 5: Letters: KAZ from last issue: a reply from Laurens Otter
- Page 5: Should the Anti State, Non Market Sector support a new party left of Labour?
Anarchism and co-operation with the left: Tom Cullen
- Page 6: A comment on Tom Cullen's article: Laurens Otter
- Page 6: Unity not desirable at any cost
- Page 8: Anarchist Federation leaflet: Why we Are Not On The Left.
- Page 9 : Corporations: rhetoric and reality
- Page 10: Organisations of the Anti State, Non Market Sector.
-

Capitalism and Global Warming: an inescapable Truth.

A recent news article claimed that many people were cynical about the threat that global warming poses to the future of the planet. There could be a variety of reasons for this but several spring to mind. For a start, politicians and other apologists for big business cannot face, let alone tell the truth, that there is no solution to the problem within capitalism so what is offered to people is a list of changes they can make to their personal lives: this creates the impression that the problem cannot be as serious as is being suggested, alongside this is the fact that there is a powerful lobby of businesses self interest who cast doubt on the serious nature of the problem and argue that the climate change we are witnessing is just a natural cycle the earth is going through. Lastly is the point that the current economic crisis has taken the sting out of the issue as people concentrate on more immediate problems.

Despite this there is plenty of evidence to show that the problem is both real and serious. It is predicted that in the current century, on average, the temperature will increase from 2.5 to 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit. On a global scale such an increase will be devastating and if fundamental action is not taken soon, will be out of control. Global warming is causing a rise in ocean temperatures which in turn is leading to a change in weather patterns. One of the results of this is an increased frequency in hurricanes, typhoons, heat waves, droughts and tornados. The results of these can already be seen in certain parts of the world. This change in weather patterns will also impact on agriculture as droughts affect the water supply and lead to disruption to the growing of crops. This is likely to lead to increased conflicts and wars over land, water and food. In addition rising ocean temperatures will also cause a disruption to the eco system as coral reefs, an integral part of the ocean, bleach and die owing to an increase in water temperature. Another effect of global warming is a rise sea levels resulting from melting ice. If all the polar and glacier ice melt the water levels will increase by 230ft globally and by the end of the century cities such as New York, Miami, Tokyo, Mumbai, Venice, Shanghai and many others will be affected.

A vast majority of climate scientists agree that human activity has and is having a major impact on global warming which has increased significantly since the Industrial Revolution. This impact results from the burning of fossil fuels, the cutting down of trees and a high consumption of red meat. The release of carbon dioxide and methane gas into the atmosphere has a major impact on global warming. Compared to carbon dioxide, methane gas is twenty times as potent over 100 years but a hundred times more potent over 10 years. Methane has a relatively short life span in our atmosphere but it is responsible for 20% of the current warming trend it is released in the production of coal, oil, natural gas and from the stomachs of grazing animals such as cows, sheep and goats. Levels of methane fell between 1990 and 2004, probably due to droughts in wetland areas and better management of landfill sites and oil and gas wells. From 2007 it has increased and this may be due to the thawing of the arctic tundra. It is feared that a feedback loop may be occurring where the thawing of the arctic tundra causes a rapid release of methane gas which would accelerate global warming.

The largest cause of carbon dioxide emissions is the driving of motor vehicles, in the USA it is responsible for 20% of emissions and 60% world wide. In the USA the transportation sector overtook industry as the largest producer of carbon dioxide emissions as long ago as 1999. Flying accounts for only 3.5% of global carbon dioxide emissions but these have a greater impact as they are released high in the atmosphere where the effect is more potent than those released closer to the ground. A further point is that air travel is increasing every year. [See Facts about Global warming Website.]

The Capitalist Response to Global Warming

That the capitalist system has no solution to the global warming crisis is evident in the proposals it advances to deal with the problem. Firstly there are the various proposals agreed to by the leaders of the major economic powers which attempt to reduce carbon emissions by setting various targets that some opt out of, others are immune from and the fact that they are sidelined or completely ignored when they are in conflict with the major priorities of economic growth or recovery. The main response seems to be to urge people to behave differently in their everyday lives. Here people are urged to make sure they switch off their lights, use energy saving light bulbs, turn off their television sets and/or computers rather than leave them on stand by and to recycle things rather than throw them out. Of course in itself there is nothing wrong with this advice and we should be doing these things but let's face it, on its own this is not going to make a dent in the problem, let alone solve it. As to such advice such as use your car less, cycle, walk or use public transport more, all well and good but capitalism has created a situation that has promoted the use of motor vehicles to the point where many people have almost become totally dependent on them. People tend to work miles away from where they live, supermarkets and large shopping centres are situated miles out of town to the point where in many towns there are more shops closed down than occupied. For years the motor car was promoted to the detriment of public transport which was subject to cuts and ridicule to the point where today many people find it difficult to get to and back to places by these means. In addition to all this,

transportation of goods by road has grown enormously over the last thirty years or so.

As for the advice; buy fewer things, consume less, given the priorities of the profit system, they must be having a laugh. Nevertheless this is said to be one of the most effective things you can do to reduce your share of global carbon omissions. Everything we buy has to come from somewhere and in its production it is using up energy and omitting more and more. Throw out that three piece suite or something else and replace it with something from one of the never ending sales of furniture, beds carpets and so on that we are constantly bombarded with. Nothing wrong with your television, computer, mobile phone or so on but never mind just replace it with the latest model which will probably be out of date in another six months. Under this insane society if the mass of people decided to cut out just the unnecessary consumption we are urged to engage in the whole system would go into meltdown and unemployment would be many more times what it is today. If we had the mass consciousness necessary, including agreement on what should replace capitalism this might not be a bad way of bringing about the change in society we seek.

Due to its incessant drive for economic growth capitalism is forced to create demands that are not based on real need which, in many cases, remains unmet as needs without purchasing power must within the profit system but the point is that this incessant drive can only make the ecological crisis worse. Murray Bookchin emphasises this point when in he discusses the concept of scarcity and needs. There is a point, he argues, when society intervenes and produces a special type of scarcity, one that is socially induced. As capitalism is about production for production sake so it induces consumption for the sake of consumption.

greenhouse gasses. Transportation requires more energy and yet more energy is being consumed to transport objects that may be discarded, by the newer item, to the landfill site. Once again this is not bad advice but it is completely in contradiction to the inherent nature of the system we live in. Countless adverts in the form of T.V and volumes of paper via adverts in newspapers, magazines and leaflets put through your front door encourage us not to buy less but to consume. There is a point, Bookchin suggests, when just as the production of commodities are no longer related to their function as use values, so wants are no longer related to a human sense of real need. Commodities and needs acquire a life of their own, a fetishised, irrational dimension that determines the destiny of those who produce and consume them [Bookchin:M, *The Ecology of Freedom*, P.136].

The vision that sees green capitalism based on smaller units of production replacing large corporations is nothing but an impossible dream. Such a change could not override the economic laws of capitalism where producing commodities cheaper than your competitor and therefore being able to sell them cheaper on the market is of vital importance in the quest for profits. The end result of this process is that large capital will swallow up smaller capital leading to ever larger units of production. Whilst many of us would prefer to buy “environmentally friendly products” we have no way of knowing to what extent such products really are just that or are merely promoted as ‘green’ through hype and advertising gimmicks. As McKay suggests many so-called “green companies” use expensive public relations firms and produce adverts to paint a picture of them as being ecologically friendly and this aids their profitability. [See Iain McKay: *An Anarchist FAQ Volume 1*, pp.467-8] The same author adds; ***“The market does not provide enough information for***

consumers to determine whether a product is actually green or not - it just gives them a price supplemented by (often deliberately misleading) advertising designed to manipulate the consumer and present an appropriate corporate image". [ibid] Of course this shows the weakness of market economies, despite the god like status the market has in the profit system. The impossibility of continuing with capitalism and dealing with the ecological problems we face is summed up by Bookchin in the following quote.

"To speak of 'limits to growth' under a capitalistic market economy is as meaningless as to speak of limits of warfare under a warrior society. The moral pieties that are voiced today by many well-meaning environmentalists, are as naïve as the moral pieties of multinationals are manipulative. Capitalism can no more be 'persuaded' to limit growth than a human being can be 'persuaded' to stop breathing. Attempts to 'green' capitalism to

Letters

In issue 4 we included a letter from KaZ which was in response to a letter in the previous issue sent in by Laurens Otter on the subject of the hostility clause of the SPGB. KAZ response began as follows;

"Cox and Otter and just about everyone else in the Lib Comm seem obsessed with the SPGB's Declaration of Principles. This is ironic since most party members could not give a stuff about it. . Rather than some more navel gazing (it's not even your navel you pervs!), I only want to comment about Otter's remarks in Lib Comm 3 as to the early use of the 'hostility clause'."

We have received the following reply from Laurens Otter.

make it 'ecological' are doomed by the very nature of the system as a system of endless growth." [Remaking Society pp.93-94, quoted in McKay Ed An Anarchist FAQ, p.387]

Despite the worldwide economic crisis, the threat to the future of the planet that global warming represents is the most pressing problem, for if we delay it could be too late. The question this poses for the anti state, non market sector is; are there sections in the more radical elements of the ecology movement we whom we share a common vision for the future?

The Libertarian Communist is sent out by email or post, free of charge. Some readers have made donations either in the way of money or postage stamps. Such donations help us to keep the discussion journal going and hopefully over time to improve it. If you wish to make a financial contribution please make your cheques payable to World of Free Access and send them C/O Ray Carr to Flat 1, 99 Princess Road, Poole, BH12 1BQ

KAZ seems under the impression that non-SPGB members have no right to discuss the basis of the SPGB. (I wonder if he would lay down a similar rule against SPGB members discussing the basic view of other organizations?)

Those of us who wish to attain a change in society may believe: that one organization can perfectly represent the movement for change; that it is therefore all sufficient, & all other organizations are therefore by definition distractions, which can only divert from the true path; others hold that such perfection is unattainable, that real revolution can only come from the inter-play of a variety of revolutionary currents; & therefore consideration of such other currents, (as well as one's own), is essential.

I do not claim to be always consistent, nor always rational, but if some basic aspect of

an anarchist organization to which I belonged could be shown to actively detract from the promotion of anarchism, I hope I should be grateful, rather than angry that this was pointed out; & that I wouldn't assume that because I had not noticed it, and that whoever was not an anarchist had, that [s] he had been navel -gazing.

Laurens Otter

Should the Anti State, Non Market Sector support a new party left of Labour?

The September 26th issue of Freedom included an article from Tom Cullen entitled "Is this the way forward?" Anarchists and co-operation with the left. Whilst Cullen's article focuses on the anarchist position we believe this discussion is vital for the whole of the anti state, non market sector. Below we reprint an edited version of the article followed by a reply sent to Freedom by Laurens Otter and our own comments; finally, as it is very relevant we reprint a recent leaflet by the Anarchist Federation.

Anarchists and co-operation with the left.

Tom Cullen.

Over the last few weeks there have been various initiatives from the left to woo a larger anti- Labour Party front to fight the elections.

We need to start a process of debate within our anarchist communities to understand where we are, how we can build working class solidarity and move forward for the future in order to bring our anarchist ideas into the present. We need to do this as soon as we can or else, once again, developments would have passed us by. We need to reach some agreement for an anarchist federation/umbrella, whatever you want to

We as anarchists have historically not got involved in the election machine as we have always seen it as irrelevant and divisive. But there have been developments which mean that, in the current climate, we as anarchists should re-examine our position.

Once such development is the break from the Labour Party by the RMT and the proposal that the RMT would support a pro-working class alternative to the Labour Party. If the RMT called for a united left front, would we not be mad not to get involved?

Would it be more palatable for anarchists if a trade union called for a party of class unity rather than another socialist party? Maybe, but the real issue is a working class organisation is asking for real working class support and we should back this call.

Secondly the current economic crisis has made the ground fertile for anarchists to argue that the system can't be changed, it is corrupt to its core and can't be overhauled but must be put out of its misery.

Finally being involved in an election campaign would allow us to get our anarchist ideas out there to a wider audience. This is not the converted types that pass through anarchist book fairs, but real people who, during an election, are more likely to talk to you about issues than at any other time. Can we let such an opportunity pass by again? call it, to stand as a joint anarchist block in any call for class unity at the election.

A Reply from Laurens Otter

To The Eds - Freedom

Comrades

Tom Cullen reverts to an interesting point, a perennial question for anarchists. We cannot

afford to allow ourselves to be distanced from rank and file workers' militancy. If there is a genuine workers' movement, to stand aside would not be a matter of principle but one of dogmatism. So is this disaffiliation of the RMT from the Labour Party and the call for a working class alternative to the Labour Party evidence of such a movement? He could have added that the mere fact that the call is in its infancy makes a difference. When such a call goes out the exact parameters are usually not yet fixed, the movement may not yet have decided whether it is direct actionist or parliamentary or whether it is a potential government, a pressure group or even perhaps a revolutionary grouping.

Something of the same position arose just over fifteen years ago when Arthur Scargill first announced the remnant of the NUM was forming the Socialist Labour Party which was to be a direct actionist party, (he was then calling himself a syndicalist,) embodying the ideas of James Connelly and Daniel De Leon. I think my experience may be relevant.

Though the miners had been defeated they still had a mythical status which embodied the aspirations of militants in the unions and labour movement. Had Scargill been able psychologically to let the SLP live up to that aim; there might well have been a movement in which anarchists could have worked. Certainly in the time between the original announcement, and the official launch, there were enough unanswered questions to make anarchist participation possible; and it seemed to me then - despite Scargill's past Stalinism - that revolutionaries could not stand aside.

The direct actionist aspect of his proposed party was really being pushed when Scargill spoke in Birmingham, and I gather elsewhere; (*obviously I had my suspicions so when I resigned from the Northern Anarchists, I*

said I expect to be expelled in six months, and I will then be back, but I think for now, ;) and so I applied to join. The form inter alia - said "I have read the constitution and approve of it," (I later found out that the first draft of the constitution was written a fortnight after I joined, it wasn't adopted for a further two years,) so I crossed this out, saying I had not been able to get a copy and then wrote a statement of anarchist beliefs saying that as an anti-parliamentarian I would not be canvassing at elections, but I would gladly be involved in all direct action activities.

In the next few months I made some useful contacts, some of whom are now anarchists; but in the SLP I did not last the six months I had expected, I was expelled and barred from the founding conference, not in fact by Scargill, but by a Trot faction which was itself expelled two years later.

Fraternally
Laurens Otter

Unity not desirable at any cost

First of all it needs to be stated that Tom Cullen's contribution to Freedom is very welcome because it provides an opportunity to discuss very important issues for all groups opposed to capitalism in all its forms summed up correctly by the term associated with our comrades in World in Common as the anti statist, anti market sector. This debate is of concern to all such groups and not merely to those who come under the heading of anarchism.

Tom Cullen asks; *"if the RMT called for a united left front, would we not be mad not to get involved?"* In his letter of reply to Freedom Laurens Otter states *"If there is a genuine workers' movement, to stand aside would not be a matter of principle but one of dogmatism."* At a glance this might suggest that they are in

agreement on the issue but it is not clear they are talking about involvement with the same thing. This is of course is not surprising because the suggestion of a party opposing the Labour Party from a left perspective seems at present to be little more than talk and speculation. Although Laurens Otter seems to think this might be an advantage we would have to have some idea of what is being proposed before even considering involvement. However what Tom Cullen seems to be suggesting is that we should consider involving ourselves in the development of any new united front to the left of labour. Laurens Otter seems to rule out involvement with any organisation that involves itself with elections but thinks we should consider joining such a movement that is based on direct action. If I had to choose between the two I would opt for the latter. My answer to Tom Cullen's question would be that we would be mad to get involved in such a venture.

To an extent Laurens Otter's contribution makes clear the pitfalls of getting involved with a so-called left united front but there are other factors that make Tom Cullen's proposals dangerous if we allowed ourselves to be dragged in. Firstly what matters would not be what it was called but its objective and how it proposed to get there. Having said this we do not need yet another party with the title "Socialist" when we all ready have more than enough most of whom have state capitalism as their objective. Secondly Tom Cullen argues that involvement in an election campaign would enable us to get our ideas over to a wider audience that would be more open to alternative ideas during an election. There are several reasons why this is extremely doubtful. A party that is likely to be created by trade union leaders and officials, ex prominent members of the Labour Party and so on is most likely to be one based on

gaining parliamentary seats. Such a party is likely to be leadership based and with a programme inclined to get as many votes as possible as such it is hardly likely to entertain the idea of having people like ourselves as members let alone arguing on the doorstep about the need for a classless, moneyless and stateless world wide society that transcends the market with production for use and free access. As advocates of an anti state, non market society we would have to hide our views to obtain membership and then campaign for a programme we do not believe in. In addition most of our sector oppose the idea of elections and for anarchists in particular to be involved in such a movement they would have to stand what anarchism means on its head. If you really want to contest elections it would surely be better to go and campaign for the Socialist Party of Great Britain at least they stand for a society that transcends both the market and the state.

From our standpoint where we are in a tiny minority and do not seem to be getting anywhere it can be very tempting to look towards a movement that is somewhat larger and would have more support from the working class. As Laurens Otter points out we do not want engage in dogmatism, but to involve ourselves in some left of labour united front is not just about principles it is about losing our identity and with it the only real clear alternative to capitalism. It is likely that any new left party that is set up will be initiated by left wing trade union leaders and officials in association with disaffected members of the Labour Party. Where else but the trade union movement is the financial support going to come from? Perhaps it will also be supported by parties such as Respect and by Trotskyist and Leninists such as the Socialist Workers Party and the Socialist Party (Militant) if even they are allowed on

board. Are these the elements we in the anti state, non market really want to be seen supporting and campaigning for. Such a party, whatever it is called, has nothing to do with the alternative we stand for, it will advocate another form of capitalism based, probably, on increased state intervention. We do not stand for a left wing version of capitalism but a society free from all the social relationships that it is based on. It is in any case very likely that any movement

towards a free communist society is going to come from a variety of groups co-operating together but maintaining their separate identities and ways of working.

As a final to this debate we are printing an edited version of a recent Anarchist Federation leaflet which outlines the fundamental gap between the left wing and what groups in the anti state, non market sector stand for.

Anarchist Communism, neither left nor right but social revolution

Why we are not On the Left

Capitalism's temporary mask of invincibility has once again fallen. Ten years of relative growth and alleged prosperity has led us to where capitalism always leads us, crisis, unemployment, environmental disaster and war. The illusion of sustainability and the absence of recession in the west until now have been bought by the ruthless exploitation of the working class in China, India and other parts of the 'developing' world. The historic question has never gone away, though at the moment becomes clearer by the day: capitalist barbarism or its overthrow; war or revolution.

The left feels resurgent, and is rallying with a sense of urgency and vigour, calling for unity to combat capitalism's excesses. We are not with them, because we are not part of the 'left' wing of capitalism. Capitalism is not our enemy because of its excesses; conflict, exploitation, famine, and destruction are its inevitable symptoms, not exceptional, but central to its functioning. Capitalism

threatens us all because of its normality. Its reduction of us to individual producers and consumers, smashing our collective instincts, exploiting our work, our created isolation and our dreams. How better to oppress and manipulate us for all its other self serving aims, nationalism, profit and the state?

For all its apparent anger and clarity, whatever the noble intention (real or otherwise), the left will be capitalism's last hope. Its belief that the working class can never reach more than a trade union consciousness, that we need the leader(dictator)ship of the party, that by getting us involved in the charade of democracy it will get to lead or seize power and create the workers state, then watch it 'wither away', actively opposes the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

Capitalism is not a system of management, it is a social relationship based on the operation of the law of value, the pursuit of profit through

exploitation, the accumulation of the labour of others. Its structures: the nation, corporation, wage labour, state and government are its means to this end. Revolution is not a change of management; it is the utter rejection and destruction of that relationship and the dispossessing of those who benefit from it. Anything that allows the state, money, the operation of the law of value to continue is counter revolutionary.

As anarchists, we reject the right and the left of 'capitalist management'. We believe that revolutionary demands can not be diluted. Reformist demands are dishonest and derail the class struggle. We believe that only the working class is capable of developing a revolutionary consciousness through its autonomous self activity in the course of its class struggle. We are part of this class, not separate from, or outside it. We do not 'intervene' externally as leaders; we participate in solidarity as equals. The state is not reformable, nor usable, it is the political instrument of bourgeois class oppression, its abolition is central along with the abolition of money, the market and the wages system.

We are neither on the left nor of it, and calls for unity are calls to save capitalism in another guise. Only social revolution offers humanity the last chance to create a truly human society, neither left nor right, but liberated and free.

Corporations: rhetoric and reality.

Most major corporations issue things such as mission statements and promote

an image of themselves as being good for their customers, employees, the environment and so on. But when you look a bit deeper, (and very often you do not have to delve that deeply), you find that there is a deep gulf between the image they present of themselves and reality.

A prime example of this is presented on the International Union of Food workers, (IUF) website in relation to Nestle. The Nestle Corporate Business Principles claim that they are committed to; "**respect the right of employees to form representative organizations and to join- or not to join trade unions.**" In addition they state that they will; "**refrain from any action restricting the employee's right to be, or not to be, affiliated to a union.**" The very same business principles also state their commitment to form a "**constructive dialogue**" with unions.

The reality is somewhat different. At their factory in Panjang, Indonesia the union has been trying since December 2007 to come to an agreement with Nestle that wage increases should be negotiated through collective bargaining and that the wage scale should be included in the collective bargaining agreement. The response of Nestle management was that it was not company policy to negotiate wages and that wage scales are "**confidential**". However Nestle went further than just refusing to negotiate wages they created a fake union and tried to coerce workers to join it. When union members resisted, management faked their signatures on union membership documents. This dispute is now the subject of an IUF submission to the OECD for serious violations of OECE

guidelines on multinational enterprises which states that companies adhere to international conventions on trade union rights. Nestle claim that they are acting within these guidelines.

In India Nestle went to great lengths not to enter into a “**constructive dialogue**” with trade unions. The federation of All India Nestle Employees representing workers at 4 factories presented a collective bargaining demand for a wage increase in line with inflation. After informing the union that it would consider this request it then told the court that it was “**totally unreasonable, unjustified and untenable.**” It then sought and obtained an injunction permanently banning workers from “assembling outside the gates of the factory” and “holding any meetings”. Nestle went on to claim that there was no need to negotiate on wages because they had conducted a “scientific study” last year to determine appropriate pay. The IUF has filed a submission to the OECD pointing out Nestle violations of international conventions. Nestle denies it has violated workers right to freedom of association..

In July 2008 there was a strike at Nestle in Hong Kong and after this the company made a series of commitments to rectify abusive labour practices which had shocked and disturbed public opinion. Despite this Nestle still refuse to recognise the union and has tried to undermine union organisation by suspending the union president, this prompted another strike which proved

successful in gaining his reinstatement. (IUF website September 15th 2009)

Of course corporations saying one thing and doing another is nothing new or surprising within a system where profit comes before human well being or anything else. We can all take action now of course in refusing to purchase Nestle products but as well meaning as this may be, the only real solution is to do away with the system that creates such behaviour.

Below is a list of groups/organisations of the anti state, non market sector. Where possible we are providing postal as well as online addresses. Some of the groups listed do not seem to be active any longer but this should not deter people from checking them out as the ideas they contain remain relevant. If you know of any other group that you think should be listed please let us know and we will try to include it.

Anarchist Federation: www.afed.org.uk. Postal address BM Arnafed, London WC1N 3XX.

The site includes texts from former **libertarian socialist or communist groups such as Solidarity, Subversion and Wildcat**. This is all well worth reading as much can still be learned from it and used in the light of our experiences in the last twenty to thirty years and also in the context of the present time.

Red and Black Notes: <http://ca.geocities.com/red>

This group which was based in Canada is interesting but unfortunately is no longer active. The journal is listed from May 1997 to the spring of 2005. The last reference seems to be an anti war leaflet handed out in Toronto which was produced in 2005. The leaflet concerns the war in Iraq and is entitled “**What’s Going On?**” It lists periodicals and details of like minded groups. The sections on articles, reviews and history/theory are well worth taking a look at. I found the reference to it via the World in Common website under links.

World Socialist Movement/SPGB:
worldsocialism.org/spgb. **Postal address: 52 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7UN.**

Apart from all the information about the SPGB This site contains a section entitled “other useful links” and through this you can find **Marxist Internet Archive, Labour Start, John Gray for Communism, Interactivist Info Exchange, Riff Raff, New Internationalist and Counterpunch.**

World in Common: www.worldincommon.org.

Industrial Workers of the World: www.iww.org
or p/o Box 1158, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE99 4XL.

Here is an alternative for organising at your workplace. The dues are fairly cheap and based on monthly take home pay. The IWW is not based on full time officials trying to control the way you organise and do things. No one in the IWW is going to tell you to go on or not to go on strike. So if you are fed up with paying substantial dues to a bureaucratic organisation that does not seem to represent you all that well and prefer to get together with workmates to sort things out amongst yourselves but need support, this could be for you. The IWW is an industrial organisation and whilst members can have their own political or anti

political affiliation and views these should be kept separate from IWW business.

Libcom.org.

Gallery and Forum sections. There are various forums to get involved in. Well worth a visit. This is the online place to keep up to date with what is going on in the world wide struggle against capitalism. Apart from the news section it has **Library, history,**

Northern Anarchist Network

If you are interested in getting in touch and participating in this group than please contact Brian Bamford, 46 Kingsland Road, Rochdale, Lancs., OL11 3HQ.

Wrekin Stop War: www.wrekinstopwar.org

Anarchist Archives

This features information and thoughts of all the great Anarchist theorists and it also has information on pamphlets and periodicals and a section on Anarchist history.

Other Anarchist sites that you might want to visit would include **Red and Anarchist Action Network** This is one of the best sites for finding out about both present and past groups that do, or have made up, the anti state, non market sector via the links page. It is well worth visiting the theory and archive section and there is an active discussion forum to join. and there is the **Worker Solidarity Movement** at workersolidarity.org. To round up in a more Marxist direction there is **the Socialist Labour Party of America.**

