

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

**Free or Donation**

**ISSUE 6 JANUARY/FEBRUARY**  
**2010**

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

A Discussion Bulletin for the Anti State,  
Non Market Sector

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

---

## Contents

Page 2: State Socialism: a contradiction in terms?

Page 4: Red and Black Notes. Neil Fettes

Page 7: **Letter**: SPGB Declaration of Principles: a reply to Laurens Otter. KAZ

Page 7: **Letter/article**: Unity not desirable at any cost: a reply From Laurens Otter

Page 9: Capitalism, where war means peace

Page 10: Organisations of the Anti State, Non Market Sector.

---

### State Socialism: a contradiction in terms?

One of my most vivid memories of Kent University, over twenty years ago now, was the discussion in one of my sociology courses with Professor Richard Scase. Along with Howard Davies, Professor Scase had written a book entitled Western Capitalism and State Socialism: An Introduction and we had the task of discussing the differences between two seemingly opposing systems both in a seminar and an essay [1]. As a member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, (SPGB), at the time, I was vocal in the seminar discussion and took 18 typed pages in the essay arguing that the term State Socialism was a misnomer and that what really existed in places such as the Soviet Union at that time was State Capitalism. To his credit Professor Scase was very fair and gave me a decent mark for my essay but instead of telling me, as I expected, that I should have condensed my essay down he suggested I should have gone into more detail and examined the collective works of Lenin. I never had the slightest inclination to take him up on that suggestion having already gone beyond the Trotskyist and Leninist phase of my political education. Why recall this in the pages of The Libertarian Communist over twenty years or so on? Well despite no longer being a member of the SPGB I still firmly hold the opinion that the term State Socialism is a misnomer. The reason I am raising the issue here is that this term is still banded about especially in some anarchist literature [2]. It is not the term State Socialism alone but ones such as Authoritarian Communism or just the term Communism being applied to the former Soviet Union and other similar regimes such as Cuba today.

Apologists for Capitalism will, for obvious reasons, serve up the nonsense that Socialism /Communism means state control not just over the means of production and distribution

but over most aspects of people's lives. A variety of Trotskyist, Leninist, Stalinist groups and organisations such as the Communist Party and its various off shoots and much of the left peddle the same myth. Whilst some of them try to distance themselves from the worst aspects of that system many of these groups argue that state ownership and control is some type of transitional society necessary to obtain a free communist society. Whichever way you look at this it is a nonsensical argument. On the one hand if you want to do away with the state why start off by a further strengthening of it? Meanwhile those who view the dictatorship of the proletariat as using the state to endorse the control of the majority over a minority are equally up the creek with no sign of a paddle whatsoever. If those who wish to convert the means of production and distribution from minority class ownership and control to common ownership are in a majority why would they need a state, which is a body standing above and having control over society, to organise and carry it out for them. Not only is such thinking nonsensical it is highly dangerous.

To return to the main point Socialism/Communism is about the emancipation of the working class, this emancipation must be carried out by the working class itself. Nothing like that happened in Russia in 1917 and therefore what occurred there was not Socialism or Communism or any society on its way to it but it was the development of capitalism through the state under the control of the Bolsheviks [3]. Let's be clear, we do not want to be accused of economic determinism, what happened in Russia in 1917 was probably not inevitable, if groups opposing the Bolsheviks from a communist perspective, many of whom were anarchist, could have spread their ideas enough to have challenged the Bolsheviks than maybe a different outcome would have been possible. I am not sure, (but would welcome an article on the subject). However this event alongside social democratic or reformist parties taking power in many countries distorted the whole meaning of Socialism/Communism. From then on the dominant though distorted view of those terms was that they had something to do with state ownership and control either wholesale or partial alongside private

ownership. This is so much the case and it has been for decades that for a long time we have had to preface Socialism/Communism with words such as free, libertarian, anarchist and others.

State Socialism may just be a method of description and is perhaps nothing to get frustrated about but terminology is important it can divide groups and individuals who have similar objectives and viewpoints. Why support the view of our opponents that there is a relationship between state ownership and control and Socialism/Communism. It is difficult enough to get our message across without creating the idea that there are different varieties of socialism or communism as if they are soap powders. In addition it lets capitalism off the hook. It gets away with perpetuating the myth that the horrors of Stalinism and so on were the result of a communist or socialist society. This terminology has been around so long that there is little doubt that in the foreseeable future we will still have to preface the terms socialism or communism with free, libertarian or anarchist. Some will argue that the problem predates 1917 and goes back to the disagreement between Marx and Bakunin but do we still need to divide ourselves on the basis of a disagreement that took place so long ago? Whilst these two thinkers had much to contribute they both had their negative points. It should be recognised that anti state, non market socialists have a different approach to the writings of Marx than adherents to Bolshevism [4].

I would argue that when describing the old Soviet Union or similar regimes or the state ownership policies of reformist governments we should call it state capitalist. Those who differ and who believe that we should persist with the term state socialist are invited to argue their case via the pages of this bulletin.

#### Notes

[1] Howard Davies and Richard Scase, *Western Capitalism and State Socialism: An Introduction*. Blackwell 1985.

[2] *The Anarchist Federation pamphlet Basic Bakunin for example has five or six references to state socialism/socialist government in a 15 page pamphlet.*

[3A book which argues why the system developed in the Soviet Union was State Capitalism and not State Socialism is Adam Buick and John Crump's *State Capitalism: The Wages system under new management*. Macmillan 1986

Another book which properly defines socialism/communism is Maximilien Rubel and John Crump *Ed Non Market Socialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. St Martin's Press 1987

The inside of the front cover notes **"In the nineteenth century socialists as different as Marx and Kropotkin were agreed that socialism means a marketless, moneyless, wageless, classless, stateless world society"**

[4] An interesting pamphlet originally published by *Social Revolution and Solidarity* London which gives an interesting analysis of the relationship between the ideas of Marx and those of Lenin is John Crump's *A Contribution to a critique of Marx*.

=====

At the back of *The Libertarian Communist (TLC)* you will find a brief listing of groups of the anti state, non market sector. One of these is *Red and Black Notes* which unfortunately ceased publication in 2006. Ade Dimmick has sent in the following article on *Red and Black Notes* by Neil Fettes. The author lists experiences related to bringing out a small publication which certainly strike a cord with the editor of *TLC*.

## Red & Black Notes

By Neil Fettes

Red & Black Notes was an independent socialist newsletter which appeared from 1997 until 2006. Over the nine years and 22 issues of its existence, the newsletter was published in Calgary and later Toronto, and carried material from a variety of sources in what might loosely be called the genuine "ultra-left" end of the political spectrum (as opposed to those called ultra-left simply because they won't vote Labour). The newsletter ceased publication when the editor joined *Internationalist Perspective* and deciding to concentrate on that project instead. As said editor, layouts co-ordinator, writer, graphic artists, financier etc., Ade Dimmick, editor of *Hobnail Review*<sup>1</sup> asked me

<sup>1</sup> *Hobnail Review: A guide to Small Press and Alternative Publishing from an Anti-Authoritarian*

if I could write a short history complete with reflections about Red & Black Notes. Here, in much more detail than necessary is the piece.

*Red & Black Notes* came about, partly by accident and partly by design, but it was the product of a particular set of circumstances both geographical and political. I've been involved in organized politics since my mid-teens, and during my twenties, I was a Trotskyist. My organisational link with Trotskyism was the beginning of a long political odyssey in which *Red & Black Notes* played a large part.

In the months following my break with Trotskyism, I read and re-read many political books, and journals trying to put my critique of Trotskyism into focus. An issue of the US magazine *Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed* contained a review of the Grand Rapids, Michigan *Discussion Bulletin*. Interested by the description of the contents, I wrote to the *DB* and received a sample issue. The *DB* was published by a former member of the Socialist Labor Party and was a genuine political discussion journal; nothing in the magazine was edited or even re-typeset. People sent articles and the editor, Frank Girard printed them. What was remarkable about this magazine was that not only did it come out as regular as clockwork every two months, but it was amazingly non-sectarian. As long as people belonged to the fairly loose category of "non-market socialism" and adhered to a few basic rules of politeness, Frank was willing to publish their contributions.

The first issue of the *DB* I received had a reprint from *Collective Action Notes* from Baltimore. The clear and straight forward tone of the article really impressed me, and I wrote

\_\_\_\_\_

*& Libertarian-Left Perspective* was published between 2003 and 2008. It is currently in a state of hibernation. The son of Hob was reborn as a radical pamphlet review column, entitled *Hob's Choice*, which currently inhabits the pages of the class-struggle anarchist magazine *Black Flag*. Ade Dimmick, editor of both, describes himself as a libertarian communist with a penchant for council communism. He is a publisher of radical pamphlets, a member of the *Black Flag Collective* and the *Anarchist Federation*.

to the magazine for more information. *CAN* eschew labels, but was often described as

council communist. The editor of *CAN* sent me back issues, pamphlets and computer disks with texts from the Dutch and German left communist movements from the 30's and 40's. (In 1996, it was nearly impossible to obtain these texts, and it felt a little like samizdat!).

The same year I moved from Toronto to Calgary, a city in Western Canada with no ultra-left activity. A few members of a Stalinist group, and a nearly defunct branch of the Communist Party, along with some social democrats were the only visible organized left (I later meet a group of Food Not Bombs activists, all of whom were at least 10 years younger than me and into the punk movement).

In Calgary, I began an intensive correspondence with like-minded individuals and groups. *CAN* led me to the French group Echanges et Mouvement and the French Ultra-left (with whom I had limited contact as I could not read French.). I also received correspondence with Subversion, the Anarchist-Communist Federation, Kamunist Kranti (I received then read their "Ballad against Work" while I was working as a substitute teacher), the International Communist Current, and many more.

In the Spring of 1997, the main grocery chain in Calgary and Edmonton, Safeway, went on strike. Although, Alberta has a reputation as being the most pro-business and anti-union province in Canada, Albertans generally seem to like rooting for the underdog; so in a confrontation between a big American grocery chain and its little group of underpaid workers, the strikers received far more support than they might have imagined possible. The Calgary and District Labour Council called a solidarity march for the strikers on May 1<sup>st</sup> 1997, and I decided that if I was going to be active in politics, this would be a good opportunity to do something. I wrote a short 'pro-worker' solidarity leaflet. At around the same time, I came across an IWW piece on the origins of May Day. This seemed to be a good idea, so I put the history piece on the back of my leaflet. However, now my I

leaflet ran to almost three pages. Looking over my bookshelf, I found a copy of Solidarity (UK)'s pamphlet "As we Don't see It." I picked the theses I liked best, and then

put them on the back. In a fit of inspiration, or desperation I don't know which, I put a title on the thing: Red and Black Notes. It seemed that everyone was publishing something with "Notes" in the title; that plus the red of Marxism and the black of anarchism and I was set. I handed the thing out at the demonstration, and I also mailed copies to about thirty people I thought might be interested. Later that month, I wrote a leaflet about an election urging people not to vote. *Red & Black Notes* was a go!

The first issue of *R&BN* was quite primitive by aesthetic standards. The most technically advanced part of the leaflet was that I had put columns in it, but with only left justification. The fact I was using a dot matrix printer where I fed in the pages one sheet at a time then photocopied it, didn't help much either. Still, the response was positive. People liked the idea of a new publication, and a number of people in Calgary and elsewhere made suggestions for the next issue. It became clear to me then, that this newsletter could serve a real purpose. There was nothing like it in Canada, so it did provide a useful forum for these issues. It was a great way to make contact with people, and it was also a way for me to work through these new political ideas.

Issue #2, which was published the following month, went smoother. I had discovered Word Perfect had a newsletter programme, and the issue ended up looking much nicer than the first had. The issue was still free, but I did ask for donations. It was four pages long. Just prior to issue #2, I began to consider renting a post office box. Now it was a real newsletter. Issue #2 also marked the arrival of graphics - albeit stolen from the same Solidarity pamphlet I used in the first issue.

With *R&BN* #3, things really began to change. It was the first issue that had a price on it, as well as subscription rates which remained ridiculously low to the end of the newsletter's run. The biggest single expense was postage, to the extent that every issue I posted cost me more than the cover price and

I lost money on every one - such are the joys of self-publishing! Number 3 also marked my attempt to set up a subscription list of some kind, but it was fairly haphazard. Although I had a data-base programme, I never managed to input all of the subs. I simply

typed in all of the names in a document and added it to every issue (when I stopped publishing, the list ran to about eight pages, with lapsed subs crossed out). I also never got the hang of address labels, and simply wrote them by hand.

People who had received the first issues as freebies were kept on the list - mostly because I wanted those people to read *R&BN*, and also hoped that they would either contribute an article at some point (or something rare from their archives), or feel a pang of guilt at getting something for nothing and send me some cash; some did both, some did neither. But then self-publishing isn't always about the money is it? (We all know it's really about getting stuff in the mail). If I lost contact with people, I did eventually drop them from the list.

The second group were the exchange subs. I think at some point I received about thirty different magazines from around the globe (I even accepted non-English language magazines, out of a sense of internationalist duty - Kamunist Kranti still send me their Hindi language bulletin, which my Indian-born wife *still* refuses to read to me). Generally exchanges went well, although sometimes people just stopped sending material - the Anarchist Federation apparently dropped me from their exchange list without a word of notice, and never replied to my requests for information.

The third group was the paid subscribers, who were always the smallest group of the three. Some people sent money for single issues or a four-issue sub, while others remained faithful to the end (one or two of the regulars even sent letters saying how much they would miss *R&BN* when I announced the end of publication).

Issues #3-15 were the most regular periods of the newsletter's existence. *R&BN* was generally eight pages per issue, and came out three times a year. It was in this period, I

grew more confident as a writer. As the magazine continued, I wrote more of the articles and relied less on reprinting historical articles. People also began to submit articles for publication. At one point during this period, I began to realize that *R&BN* had an influence and a name beyond my little internet circles. The publisher of *Collective*

*Action Notes* told me that the reason he began to publish was that he was tired of waiting for a new issue of *Echanges*. Later, people began to mention *R&BN* along with *CAN*. And finally, the short-lived *The Bad Days Will End* appeared, in part, due to *R&BN*. The newsletter was referred to in other publications, several publishers sent books for review and other periodicals sent sample copies for inclusion in the "Worthwhile Projects" section (many readers wrote to say this was the section they read first).

Letters from prisoners were generally polite and respectful when they asked for free copies (which I always sent) although one or two were ultra-nationalists or advocating bizarre conspiracy theories (One spent the better part of three pages railing about circumcision). And I eventually had to write a disclaiming at the front of the magazine noting that submissions were welcome, except for poetry!

The scariest thing I ever received was in the months after the anti-globalization riots in Seattle. I got a little package addressed to *R&BN* filled with Nazi propaganda. No threatening note was included, but it seemed like a warning. (Several other people I knew received similar packages). That's why it's a good idea to get a PO Box and use pseudonyms (and I used several throughout *R&BN* history).

Issues #16 to 22 saw the final transformation of *R&BN*. The newsletter format was replaced by card end pages (which looked much nicer but it cost more on postage). The articles were also longer and the magazine came out once or twice a year. I did raise the subscription price, but it made no difference to the financial end of the newsletter. I also bought a new computer and switched to Word, although I never used the newsletter programme - my technical skills had increased too (I now do the layouts for the

magazine *Inter-nationalist Perspective* so you be the judge).

*Red & Black Notes #22* appeared in May of 2006, the final issue. When I began to publish *R&BN* in May of 1997, it was to work through new political ideas, and to connect with others who shared them. In November of 2005, I joined a group called Internationalist Perspective. I had corresponded with them

for several years, and been to their conferences on a number of occasions. Finally, I thought it was time to move on. After I joined, I decided that *R&BN* had served its purpose and it was time to wind it up.

It may just be reactionary nostalgia, but I like the printed word as opposed to the blog. I like the pamphlet and the booklet. Small publishing still represents something important. And maybe I'm being arrogant here, but I do think that small, independent presses and publications will continue to exist and may even survive in the age of the blog. *R&BN* was time consuming. I had a few nasty fights with people whose articles I didn't publish (I wasn't like Frank Girard!). I sunk a lot of money into the project. Overall...., I had a great time. Maybe, just maybe, *Red & Black Notes* will be remembered for its nine year history. I encourage everyone to try.

Let a hundred ultra-left magazines appear!  
Let a hundred schools of ultra-left thought contend!

**First published Hobnail Review. No.10.  
August 2007**

---

### Letters

**The first letter is a continuation of the exchange of views between Laurens Otter and KAZ on the DOP of the SPGB.**

Laurens Otter (Lib Comm 5) clearly mistakes my mood re his views on the SPGB D of P. Not anger but Amusement is my reaction to his and others comments. That a considerable number of otherwise rational (?) human beings can seriously deliberate on the precise wording of a hundred year old document from a small and insignificant

group to which none of them belong is frankly hilarious. Doubly amusing (but also very sad is that the said document has absolutely no relevance to the said group's theoretical or practical actions but is treated as a piece of historical baggage to which but lip service is due. Otter (from his reply to Cullen) is clearly ignorant of the basic premises of his own "current" and he would be well advised to study these before commenting on those of others.

**KAZ**

**The last issue carried several points of view on whether anarchists/anti state, non market socialists should support a party left of labour. The following letter/article by Laurens Otter is mostly a response to the in house contribution "*Unity not desirable at any cost*".**

**Dear Lib Com**

I think we are talking (in at least part of your article) about different subjects; I think Tom Cullen, (and certainly I,) was/were talking specifically about mass parties. It didn't at the time seem to need definition but in retrospect perhaps it did.

It may be that I should start by distancing myself from the AF leaflet. I do believe there is something worthwhile to be called the Left. Its members may have all sorts of Stalinist and reformist illusions, but there is a large sector of the working class - which sees itself as the Left - that knows it is exploited, that has some knowledge of the workings of capitalism, and how it makes exploitation inevitable, - knows that there is a class system, knows that the fact that there is exploitation is neither a necessary product of science or a divine rule, and so knows that things could change. Every so often, it moves, more or less spontaneously, though generally in the early stages putting unremitted trust in a new set of leaders, just how far depends on the circumstances; but when such spontaneous movement occurs, there are a lot of workers seeking new ideas about changing society, and it behoves revolutionaries to be there.

During the Miners' strike there was a spontaneous formation of solidarity committees in all sorts of industries, there were all sorts of benefit concerts hastily staged by a mass of differing amateur

entertainers, there was mass self-tithing as groups throughout the labour movement, miners in market places all over the country were able to collect largish sums in local markets with no one asking too many questions; ( no doubt a few crooks posed as miners and the SWP, as perhaps other vanguardists, collected and pocketed money;) but the evidence of spontaneous determination to be involved was manifest. In the aftermath of the strike, it was still spoken of as a struggle to change society and young radicals wished they had taken part. So when Scargill called for a party, there was still a

large sector of the working class for who that struggle was inspirational, who had believed that a miners' victory to further working class struggles would have ended with social revolution. No doubt this was over optimistic, but it was testimony to a sincere wish for change amongst a large sector of the class, and thus it contained enough truth to be worthy of consideration.

There was at the time of the launch of the SLP, very considerable discontent with the Tory government, and dissatisfaction with Labour's response to it; that could have meant that a significant upsurge might have been the response to Scargill's call. No doubt it would have had to evade the Stalinist - derived party rules that were to be imposed, and would have had to push past the confines that following the various Leninists factions would have involve; but in the inchoate conditions of the time that was still a possibility. I don't in fact think that the RMT's secession is or could be as significant, but if Freedom had printed my letter that would have ushered in discussion on precisely that point.

A movement based on direct action is one that is refusing to delegate decision-making to a government; whilst such a movement may for a time vest too much power in a committee, the belief that rank and file action is what counts will inevitably lead to challenges to that committee if it departs from the ultimate aim. That is not the same with a party based on electoralism, which by definition means you are ready to delegate to your M.P. the job of making day to day decisions. I know that the SPGB says somewhere that its M.P.s would be subject to

party decisions, but it has never explained how this would be achieved; and as it insists that it will always be constitutional, that is crucial. There was a case as far as I remember in the early 50s - when Labour constituency officials tried to hold their M.P. to his electoral pledges. The M.P cried "breach of parliamentary privileges," the officials were summoned to the bar of the House of Commons, threatened with life long imprisonment, and it all ended with a humiliating apology. **There is no constitutional way of keeping M.P.s honest.**

The crucial factor is the upsurge of activity, consciousness and desire to consider new

ideas which happens in the formative days of new mass movements, before policy is spelt out. The favourable circumstances only last more than a few months when revolution is really on the cards. Obviously the SPGB is neither a new party nor a mass party, so it is not really relevant to the discussion; but since it has been mentioned in the context it is worth pointing out that the very basic "impossibilist" theory though it embraces belief in spontaneity in attaining socialism, rejects it for the party itself; for understandable reasons, the SPGB has guarded against reformism by insisting that every potential member has to be fully conversant with socialist ideas, there is no room for the half hearted enthusiasts who make up such upsurges. The SPGB may no doubt help prepare the ground for such spontaneity, and conceivably, when it happens, all the members of the party may participate, but the SPGB itself could never spontaneously become a mass party.

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



## Capitalism where war means peace.

It was not only recently that capitalism entered the world of double speak, the world of George Orwell's 1984. That happened long before 1984 and long before that novel was ever written. However as 2009 was coming to an end the relationship between the profit system and double speak was brought clearly into focus once again. This occasion was President Obama being awarded the Nobel Prize for peace and his acceptance speech just after announcing that he was sending 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan. Of course Obama was not the first person in charge of mass murder to receive this award and if

capitalism is allowed to continue he will not be the last. The fact that something called a peace prize exists within a system that is itself the cause of war says much about the hypocrisy of the world we inhabit.

The day before Obama announced he was sending more troops to Afghanistan Michael Moore made, by way of an open letter, what was always going to be a hopeless appeal to someone who was elected, as every candidate is, to administer a society of near perpetual war. The letter started off in the following way; ***"Do you really want to be the new "war president"? If you go to West Point tomorrow night (Tuesday, 8pm) and announce that you are increasing, rather than withdrawing, the troops in Afghanistan, you are the new war president. Pure and simple. And with that you will do the worst possible thing you could do - destroy the hopes and dreams so many millions have placed in you. With just one speech tomorrow night you will turn a multitude of young people who were the backbone of your campaign into disillusioned cynics. You will teach them what they always heard is true that all politicians are alike."*** (Monday Nov 30<sup>th</sup>)

That piece of the letter says several things. Firstly if Obama did not want to be the new war president he would not have been standing for election. Michael Moore has done a lot of good work in exposing many aspects of capitalist society and one would like to think that he is really more, (excuse the pun), than just a muddle headed reformist.

Does he really believe that any one person is going to be able to challenge the nature of the capitalist system even if he or she wanted to? If he does it makes one wonder. Was he one of the reasons that millions of people placed their hopes and dreams in one man? After all these people were asking one person to do rather a lot, even if Obama had been a socialist, which of course he is not, he would have to be better than superman, being asked to bring vast changes to America and the whole world. Impossible for any one person and impossible for the whole of humanity if we remain within a system that creates not just war, but also poverty, mass starvation, and the very destruction of the planet we live on. And it creates this not because it is badly run and others could prevent such catastrophes but because it is inherent in a system that exists for one

reason to promote the profit of the few no matter what the consequences for the majority, or for that matter the planet.

In his speech Obama declared that he would not hesitate to wage war if it was **"morally justified"**. (yahoo news December 11<sup>th</sup> 09) How do you morally justify the murder of thousands, hundreds of thousands and eventually millions of people? Only a politician can answer that. However we would have to persuade those millions who put their faith in Obama not to believe a word, politicians are all alike. The war in Afghanistan is just as much a war for liberation as was the war in Iraq. That was a war if not just directly for oil then about control over oil supplies to increase America's quest for dominance. At around the same time that Obama was receiving his Nobel Prize it was also announced that Shell had won the right to develop one of the world's largest remaining untapped oil fields. As giant oil corporations battled it out for a slice of Iraq natural resources. More than 40 companies were involved including BP ExxonMobil, Chevron, Total and an array of Chinese and Indian firms. (yahoo news December 11<sup>th</sup> 09)

The anti democratic nature of the capitalist system along with its wars and other forms of destruction will go on until the working class of the world brings that system to an end by means of Self organisation and direct action.

**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](http://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>**

Red and Black notes was an independent socialist newsletter that lasted from 1997 to 2006. *For further information read the article in this issue on pages 4-7.* The site lists periodicals and details of like minded groups. The sections on articles, reviews and history/theory are well worth taking a look at. The reference to it can be found on the World in Common website under "Links".

**World Socialist Movement/SPGB: [worldsocialism.org/spgb](http://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](http://www.worldincommon.org).**

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.

**Industrial Workers of the World: [www.iww.org](http://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.

Along similar lines is the **Solidarity Federation**. Further information can be found at [www.solfed.org.uk](http://www.solfed.org.uk) or at PO Box 29, South West D.O Manchester M15 5HW

**Libcom.org.**

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, Gallery and Forum** sections. There are various forums to get involved in. Well worth a visit.

**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**

This can be found at [www.wrekinstopwar.org](http://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** and there is the **Worker Solidarity Movement** at [workersolidarity.org](http://workersolidarity.org). To round up in a more Marxist direction there is **the Socialist Labour Party of America.**

