

THE
LIBERTARIAN
COMMUNIST

Free or Donation

ISSUE 7 MARCH/APRIL 2010

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

A Discussion Bulletin for the Anti State,
Non Market Sector

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

Contents

Page 2: Twelve Months On

Page 3: Problems of Revolutionary Social Change: is the Ruling Class Able to Change the Nature of the Struggle? Laurens Otter

Page 4: Quote from Maurice Brinton

Page 4: Transition to a Free Society: the start of a discussion?

Page 6: Notes on Science, art and ethics. Lyla Byrne

Page 11/12: Anti State, Non Market Sector, News, What's on, contact details,

Twelve Months On

The first issue of The Libertarian Communist (TLC) came out in March 2008 so this issue marks its first anniversary. The idea of TLC came about when after resigning from The Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB) for the second time at the end of 2008 I felt the need to iron out my ideas and the best way to do this was in discussion with like minded people and it accrued to me that this could best be done via a discussion bulletin for what we term as the anti state, non market sector. I have been asked on more than one occasion about the title, Libertarian Communist. Firstly it is a term that best describes my own position. However it must also be admitted that the title was also very much influenced by a journal put out by a dissident grouping in The Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB) in the 1970s. This started out, I believe, as an internal discussion document entitled, Revolutionary Theory and Theoretical Practice, in the early 1970s and by its fifth issue in 1974 it was known as Libertarian Communism (LC). The supporters of LC were either expelled, (by a party poll) or left the SPGB in sympathy with those that had been expelled. After their expulsion this grouping set up Social Revolution and continued to publish Libertarian Communism but only, it appears, up to July 1976. This was the most influential dissident group to split from the SPGB and has links after Social Revolution to Solidarity, Wildcat, Subversion and probably had some influence on the Anarchist Federation, formerly known as the Anarchist Communist Federation [1].

The Libertarian Communist journal of today shares much in common with its counterpart from the 1970s and the groupings that sprung from it but at the same time its main aim is act as a discussion and news bulletin for the anti state, non market sector (ASNM). World in Common (WiC) does a similar job but its role is mainly as an online discussion forum which TLC would recommend its readers to get involved with, some of the discussions on that forum may find their way into this bulletin but whilst seeing the need for such forums in this day and age we, as did Neil Fettes in his article in TLC issue 6 on Red and Black Notes, would argue for the retention of hard copy publications.

In its first year TLC has not led to the sector being any more influential than it was a year ago. But hopefully it has had something of a positive impact. It is another outlet for a discussion of our views, people have come forward to provide written contributions, this was a minimum requirement for its publication to continue and a few people have also provided some financial assistance which is much appreciated. Hopefully in the next twelve months we will see more people coming forward to provide written contributions as well as retaining those who have already dipped their toes in the LC Sea. Do remember that articles need not just focus on what appeared in the previous issue but can also deal with topics that have been raised in any of the previous issues or, of course subjects fresh to TLC. Although I never read Frank Girard's Grand Rapids, Michigan Discussion Bulletin, by what Neil Fettes wrote in the Red and Black Notes article in issue 6, we are very much along similar lines, if it is something written from the perspective of the anti state, non market sector it will be suitable for publication in this bulletin.

What next? Well what about the formation of local Libertarian Communist discussion groups or something along similar lines? Above all here is to the time when the need for journals such as this is redundant because we have achieved our aim and live in a world free from exploitation and oppression, where poverty and hunger has been abolished and we live in harmony with the planet we inhabit.

[1] If you have further information on the LC grouping in the SPGB in the 1970s or believe that any of the information given here is inaccurate The Libertarian Communist would be pleased to hear from you and publish your response.

The author of the following article has asked us to point out that it should be considered as a "Research in Progress" rather than a complete article as the proposed problem and a solution to it are in the early stages of analysis. The article is prefaced by an autobiographical note as requested.

Autobiographical note

I didn't have at 18 enough courage to go to prison rather than obey call-up; while I was on release leave from the army (1950) I went, with the younger brother of a friend, to sit a set of exams, (he asked me to go and back him, I didn't

fully realise what the exams were, we were expecting hard physics ones and easy maths and chemistry ones, which would have been right for him, it turned out the other way round - right for me.) I had not known in advance that these were national scholarships for Harwell (let alone that they would involve some work on nuclear weaponry) still less that Edward Milner (my friend wasn't even hoping to be in the first dozen; that there were two people regarded as certain winners, - both since household names, - one had already got an Oxford starred First in chemistry, the other was a child genius, (8 years old, even then in a wheelchair;) because I was not seen as a serious contender (and had just been an army medic, I was - for the first three exams - asked to push the wheelchair; then as my marks were level with his they must have assumed I was cheating and separated us; anyway I came top and pushed both future Nobel prize winners into equal second place. I then learnt what it was for and had to refuse it. Fifteen months later I went to TCD where Prof. Walton (a pacifist Nobel Prize winner) convinced me that I had to give up being a promising scientist and become a third rate historian.

Problems of Revolutionary Social Change: Is the Ruling Class able to change the nature of the Struggle?

By Laurens Otter

We (the Libertarian Left) whether in posing an impossibilist electoral platform, or a syndicalist or similar strategy; have not spelled out the degree to which the ruling class can apparently change the nature of the struggle, so as to make the aim of the social revolution appear irrelevant, unless one first engage in a campaign that seems to be less than the pure social transition to which the revolutionary is pledged.

Sixty years ago, it was the start of the cold war, the nuclear (and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) arms' race, before that fascism, more recently the so-called war on terror. There can be room for argument as to what extent in each of these there was a genuine new development, to what extent, indeed, there was a real issue; but the fact is in each case the capitalists or whatever one else wishes, the Establishment were able to shift the basis of mass consciousness, so that only those whose policies immediately addressed these issues appeared to have a position relevant to that age.

It was (and is) possible in each case to tackle the issue concerned, saying from the outset, "it is necessary to do A, but such is the nature of politics, (no ruling elite ever gives up power/its major weapon of coercion/) A can only be done, certainly only be done with any assurance or permanency, if we go on from there to change society totally; if only because it is the nature of existing society that it constantly produces such problems."

But this means that constant restatement/updating of the revolutionary position is necessary, (if we are not to appear irrelevant,) making our fidelity to our original position less apparent; and of course this engenders splits.

British research on nuclear weapons started during World War 2; not surprising that - under wartime conditions - this was not known. What does become interesting is that at the end of the war the AWRE was built at the south end of Aldermaston Airfield and yet nowhere did its building, its research, its staff, the houses for its staff, its raw supplies, . . . , figure anywhere in the defence estimates until Churchill announced in 1952 that Britain was making the bomb. For some of the intervening time the minister of war was Emmanuel Shinwell, he was - as he subsequently said - totally unaware of this development.

Obviously interesting in terms of democratic theory; electorate, parliament, the cabinet (including the theoretically responsible minister) did not know of this major military expenditure. But also consider this, during the same period, in popular consciousness the Soviet Union was being turned from being our great ally, so ably led by "Uncle Joe", to a vile tyranny, about to tackle us at any moment with nuclear weapons. *(I am not suggesting that the war-time or the post-war picture was any more accurate than the other; in the perverted thinking of the powers they were both logical and anyway both had elements of truth underlying larger falsehoods.)*

Consider the expenditure, the provision of falsified information that went into building up these two conflicting positions; how much of that would have appeared in the annual budgets? Were there ever votes in parliament (let alone the country) to say; "Government, its departments, and government supporting agencies shall over the next year of two spend £X million convincing the electorate that the Soviet Union and Stalin are totally benign/utterly malignant?" I think not. But then think of the impact of these changes on domestic politics?

Think of the number of times SPGB members ILPers, Common Wealth founders, pacifists and anarchists were defamed as pro fascists during the war and pro-Stalinist after it; and how the defamers had switched back and forth.

No doubt in practice we all find ways to rebut the propaganda, we all argue that such twists and lies are all symptomatic of the general evil of class-divided society; but our theories and propaganda do not warn the working class in advance that such new developments of governmental propaganda will inevitably happen, indeed I am not, as yet, certain that we could give such warnings without appearing paranoid, but I fear that without such warnings, there may be something lacking in our arguments.

"We live here and now, not in Petrograd in 1917, nor in Barcelona in 1936. We have no gods, not even revolutionary ones. Paraphrasing Marx ("Philosophers have only interpreted the world; what is necessary is to change it"), we might say that revolutionaries have only interpreted Marx (or Bakunin), what is necessary is to change them."

Maurice Brinton - Introduction to Paul Cardan's Modern Capitalism and Revolution. Reprinted in "Workers Power" Selected writings of Maurice Brinton, Edited by David Goodway. AK Press 2004

Transition to a Free Society: the start of a discussion?

Last November the Socialist Standard (publication of the Socialist Party of Great Britain) carried an interesting article entitled "The Fall of "Communism": Why so peaceful? The main purpose of the article by STEFAN, was to explore the collapse of the state capitalist regimes in Eastern Europe in 1989 and 1990 and why change had come about so peacefully. The final section, "Implications for the transition to socialism" was worthy of note as it outlined the policy of capturing state power and using the coercive forces to defend the revolution against any violent opposition to it. To make matters clear we are reproducing the last few paragraphs in full.

"Above all, we reckon that in any violent confrontation with the capitalist state the working class face the near-certainty of defeat and massacre- and the odds grow steadily worse as military technology advances.

It would be unnecessarily risky to count on all of the soldiers defecting to the side of the revolution. Special precautions will surely be taken to insulate the armed forces from the contagion of socialist ideas and bolster their discipline – that is, their readiness to obey orders.

Under these circumstances it is a foolhardy and dangerous anachronism to conceive of the socialist revolution in terms of a popular uprising. Of course, a popular movement is essential, but that movement must constitute itself as the legitimate authority in society through the democratic capture of the state. Even then it is conceivable that some people will try to take violent action against the socialist majority, but it will be much easier to thwart such people – if necessary by using the armed forces against them." (**STEFAN Socialist Standard November 2009**)

In response to what I perceived was a contradictory statement about the use of the armed forces in a revolutionary situation, I sent the following letter to the Socialist Standard editorial committee.

November 26th 2009
Dear Editors

No doubt STEFAN, "**The Fall of Communism**": **Why so peaceful**", Socialist Standard November 2009 is putting the case of the SPGB when arguing for the capture of state power by parliamentary means but there

seems to me to be a contradiction in this line of reasoning.

True enough if faced with the strength of the armed forces we see today in, for example, Britain, the working class would face a massacre if an armed uprising were to be attempted. I do not know who is suggesting such a strategy. The real contradiction in the article is where on the one hand it is argued that it would be risky to count on enough of the armed forces defecting to the side of the revolution and suggests, probably quite rightly in the suggested circumstances, that members of the armed forces would be insulated from socialist ideas and then going on to argue that if a socialist movement were to gain power legitimately via parliamentary elections they could then count on the same armed forces to defend the revolution against any violent action taken against it.

This analysis is based on the assumption that in a situation where a socialist movement gained a clear majority in an election but there was a minority prepared to use violence against it the armed forces would side with the socialist movement because they were the legitimate force. I think this is a rather risky assumption. The error is in viewing the revolution as a single event, in this case a socialist majority in parliament, rather than as a process. Viewed as a process, whilst it has to be admitted that none of us know how precisely this would develop, we would expect vast changes to take place during such a period. It is likely that one of these would be that few people would be joining the armed forces whilst many would be deserting it. Thus by the time socialist ideas have spread to the point of us dissolving power rather than taking it there would be little left of the armed forces as we know of them today. Hopefully parliament itself would have given way to far more democratic forms of making decisions based on direct rather than representative democracy.

If you so wish this discussion could continue in the pages of The Libertarian Communist unless you would consider opening up the pages of the Socialist Standard to such a debate to include all groups within the anti state, non market sector.

Yours for Libertarian Communism

Ray Carr (The Libertarian Communist)

Unfortunately, for reasons they did not explain, the SPGB failed to print the letter in the Socialist Standard but replied to me by personal email. As The Libertarian Communist exists to discuss such issues we are publishing their reply and invite our readers to respond to this discussion.

Thank you for your thoughtful response to Stefan's article "**The Fall of Communism: why so peaceful?**" (Socialist Standard November 2009) It is very difficult for any of us to envisage the situation that may prevail around the time of the socialist revolution, so a great deal of uncertainty is unavoidable. Moreover the situation may evolve in different ways in different countries. So it may not be feasible to use the armed forces to thwart the socialist majority, just as it may or may not be feasible to use them on behalf of the socialist majority. Historical experience also shows that not only the armed forces of the state but also unofficial paramilitary forces may pose a physical threat to a growing socialist movement.

Generally speaking we in the World Socialist Movement believe that it would be wise for the socialist majority to assert its will officially through parliamentary and other representative institutions where they exist. However, this does NOT mean that we envisage preparation and implementation of the transition to socialism occurring solely or even mainly through such institutions. Many other institutions will not doubt play important roles, from the local up to the global level, for example, community assemblies, democratized trade unions, research networks, and reformed United Nations agencies. Direct democracy will probably be used where feasible, but it may not be feasible at all levels and in all contexts. We do not object to representative democracy in principle.

Any comments?

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

=====

The movement for a free society, Socialism, Libertarian Communism, whatever term we use, is based on a class analysis of society. However do concepts such as ethics, morality, justice, play a role in this movement? Human experience of the conditions around them leads to the development of ideas and judgments of what they regard as acceptable and unacceptable. From the mainstream tradition of Scientific Socialism there was little room for such concepts. Kautsky, for example, argued that scientific socialism was about the inevitability of the development of a classless society developing due to economic laws but it cannot erect this, he argue into a moral purpose. In opposition Jean Jaures saw Marxism as the modern theoretical expression of socialism and viewed it as a moral notion, a value concept, above all it was related to the longing of humans for freedom and justice. (1)

[Source: Leszek Kolakowski: *Main Currents of Marxism, 2 The Golden Age*, Oxford University Press 198, pp.35-39]

The relationship between the concepts of ethics and the movement for a free society will be explored in a series of articles to appear in the next few issues of TLC. Here is the first of these.

Notes on science, art and ethics 1

By Lyla Byrne

Perhaps it is possible that everything that happens could, as it is comprehended, be catalogued and discussed without using concepts of right and wrong/good and bad in a moral sense. These concepts can be regarded as human constructs. The term 'human construct' is sometimes used in a way that suggests 'merely human construct' as if 1) constructs cannot also be described as discoveries of useful ways to understand and to communicate about reality. In connection to this: we are products of conditions than just being products of capitalism. Human evolution is pre capitalist and we have evolved as a

social animal, and language development is mainly pre capitalist as are concept and precursors of the words for) ethics, morality and 'justice' [For more on this see:

<http://www.szura.org/meryn/origins.html>

2) anything that has been made by humanity must remain questionable – so is the whole of language along with science and art in question? – Are we then questioning our concept of a catalogue and of a discussion and all our ideas about existence including democracy and socialism?? It is healthy to question things but if we doubt the truth value of all concepts then we must doubt the concept of truth, and therefore existence itself. It is a philosophical dead end, but with a chink of light in it that says 'climb through here and we can carry on thinking, feeling, talking and living with some commitment; because although we can't be sure about reality, never-the-less it *may* be there and it *may* be expressible by our language - and if it isn't, well we might as well carry on anyway as if it is, *because our sensing and expression of it seem to work!*' So we come full circle and are faced with the same work, if we care about anything, of using concepts. If we then say 'No, I just doubt *some* constructs – the concepts of morality/ethics/justice' (or as has been put forward 'just *socialist* morality/ethics/justice'), then we need a reason why we should doubt these and not others.And it has not just been doubted that concepts of socialist morality/ethics/justice are valid but it has been flatly denied that they are, so I presume that those who do so have some thing that they believe to be proof of this.

Is morality held particularly in question because it is particularly a matter of opinion as to what is good and bad etc.? Because it is thought of as private? So - language is a construct, but we experience it functioning for us to communicate; and the concept of a catalogue, for example, has been constructed, but we experience it being useful outside of making a mental

list.....But morality is not just private either, we also experience morality in action in society. Besides which, is it not useful and necessary to have ways of describing our inner state, and in particular concerning matters of conscience? These also exist, they have causes and they have effects. [For more on this see:

<http://www.szura.org/meryn/marx.html>

-which i hope to have available by April '10.]

General ideas/judgments of good and bad constantly function in a useful way, for awareness and communication of thoughts/sensations/actions [a good idea/feeling/shot] and events/things [it was a bad earthquake/school/year for tomatoes]. Moral ideas/judgments are a subset of these, specifically to do with awareness and communication of ***attitudes (beliefs/ thoughts / emotions) and actions that affect the welfare of sentient life***, and as such they are equally functional and useful. It is not the point that there are disagreements about what is morally right or wrong; the point is that moral attitudes and actions take place. There is however broad agreement over large areas. Our basic morality is so much part of us that it is perhaps often taken for granted.

The criteria for accepting or rejecting conceptual constructs should surely be to do with efficiency and accuracy in understanding, developing our ideas and representing our experience (expressing ourselves, communicating). Language naturally functions to test concepts according to these criteria, as the concepts of morality/ethics/justice have been tested by use over many millenniums from when they were first conceived, and this testing has contributed to their development. This is not to say that we should only rely on this as proof of worth – but it is essential to take into account. It is also essential to take into account that the process of development continues. The present human malaise is not due to language failing us. Ideology, political

structure, concepts and language originally developed together and although early cultures may not have been ideal in certain ways, they certainly were not capitalist. As for today, it is true that in any age the dominant political ideology and structure will have a powerful influence on the moral codes and language use of those who are brought up in it, but within the capitalism as a system there are different ideological movements. There is dissatisfaction with, horror at and revolt from its methods, and there are those who think and feel much the same, but believe (I think correctly) that to get rid of these methods we have to get rid of the system altogether. 'Dominant' does not mean 'only'. The inheritance of language and the innovations that we are able to invent/discover with it at least allow for, and I believe are functional in producing dissent.

The power of language has always been recognized by elements of the ruling class and efforts have been and are made to harness it. For example: Charles Pierce, advisor to William James and John Dewey, architects of Compulsory State Education in the USA wrote, in the mid 1800s:

"Let the will of the state act, then, instead of the will of the individual. Let an institution be created which shall have for its object to keep correct doctrines before the attention of the people, to reiterate them perpetually, and to teach them to the young, having at the same time power to prevent contrary doctrines from being taught, advocated or expressed. Let all possible cause of a change of mind be removed from men's apprehension. Let them be kept ignorant, lest they should learn of some reason to think otherwise than they do. Let their passions be enlisted, so that they may regard ... unusual opinions with hatred and horror. Then, let all men who reject the established belief be terrified into silence.... Let a list of opinions be drawn up to which no man of the least independence of thought can assent, and let the faithful be required to accept all these propositions in order to segregate them as radically as possible from the influence of the rest of the world."

Attempts at such indoctrination have of course since been extended to much of the rest of the world.

Capitalism has extended itself by means of economic and military force and by indoctrination. Subsequently the ideology of capitalism has gained momentum (up to recently anyway), passed on through generations, largely accepted and supported by rulers and workers alike despite dissatisfaction with it, as the best of all possible of worlds. This is not a language problem, it is a political problem. – Nor is it a problem of people having too many concepts – but rather too few, having perhaps lost some from the past, and/or lacking access to new ideas or having ideas insufficiently developed because of the capitalist setting. As people become more aware of the situation and of how things could be different they find all the language that they need, and opinions that they held previously are reassessed in the new context. Language is adaptable and with class consciousness our concept of morality and justice adjusts.

For example, many people call for capital punishment and flogging as a solution to certain problems because they have been conditioned *by the system* to blame others *not the system*. Workers are of course also conditioned to blame themselves rather than the system – which helps to keep us self hating/depressed/addicted and generally with low self esteem and thus more easily controlled. Of course individuals and groups do have a certain amount of responsibility, but once we recognize that capitalism imposes controls, pressures, scarcity and war that are *necessary only to maintain a ruling class*.....once we realize that we can much more efficiently and enjoyably raise healthy sociable children (thus avoiding all sorts of problems), help each other with difficulties and generally create a far more abundant and safe society with common

ownership and by organizing ourselves democratically without leaders.....Once, to summarise, we realize that the class system harms us on a massive scale rather than helping us, our opinions about 'crime' and about our own moral worth will be profoundly and radically altered.

This will happen *because* the majority has a basic commonsense morality based on knowledge of what we need for health and well being; *because* we have a sense of true justice – not because we don't. One danger when thinking about these things is over simplification. Human beings are complex. Individuals can sustain (and pass on to their children) two or more different, and sometimes conflicting outlooks – indeed the (often repressed) conflict within is probably one of the salient features of our age. There may, for example, be a cultural heritage of prioritizing appreciation and respect for members of the community, for the community as a whole and for the life giving environment, but the priorities imposed by capitalism – and belief in capitalism as a necessary or 'safe' system may be overlaid on this. Things that are buried in the psyche and the culture, however deep, can still affect us – and tend to grow and find a way out.

If the majority only have capitalist morality, then why are those suffering from the effects of capitalism world wide calling for justice? – And why do others – including large organizations – also call for justice on their behalf? If there were only capitalist morality people would accept that they, others, other animals and the ecosystems of the planet have to suffer for the capital accumulation of a minority. People of course presently tend to cry for justice as they see it within the capitalist system – for more democracy and an 'ethical capitalism' wherein legal controls are effectively put on those who would harm the environment and go to war to increase their business empires for example, and in which financial wealth is more shared out. This is perhaps entirely due to two factors:

a) It is not yet sufficiently understood that capitalism in its nature *cannot be ethical in this way* because *that is not capitalism*. Certain companies can adopt one or more ethical practices in terms of environmental friendliness/fair trade/responsible advertising/quality products/becoming a cooperative – and the occasional reform that is beneficial to workers/animals/the environment may, after huge efforts, scrape through into law, but whilst the capitalist system remains dominant these changes will be minor in comparison to the forces of capitalism, and can be gradually eroded, watered down, got around or swiftly swept away again by financial pressures/ takeovers/ war etc. At present, despite the heroic efforts of many, the damage inflicted on human beings, other animals and the environment by the profit motive is increasing in many ways world wide.

b) It is not yet sufficiently understood how an ethical society in terms of equality, human rights and the environment can be achieved. Once people understand that the only way that they can achieve what they want is with the community autonomy of common ownership and a moneyless economy that can therefore supply directly for need rather than profit (profit which is simply to maintain a disconnected but self important ruling elite who make life much more boring, unpleasant and difficult for us) – then hopefully that is what they will work for; that will be the new justice. There is a growing anti-capitalist movement that it seems does not yet have a clear enough concept of/enough consensus about a workable alternative system. It might be said that this is at least in part due to lingering capitalist morality – but at the same time this movement is growing out of ethical grounds of a different sort; it is growing out of the recognition that the capitalist system is damaging individuals, communities and the biosphere. In other words, although there is capitalist style ethic and a capitalist justice system, this is not because there is a fault in the basic concept of ethics, morality or justice, or

because morality and justice are essentially capitalist, because these concepts can be put into other contexts.

The wholesale claiming of morality by capitalism and establishment religions to justify capitalist law to us and to make us feel bad, guilty, powerless and subservient so that we can be controlled by a ruling class is false. And we must be wary of a legacy of prejudice against concepts because of how they have been misused, *in the sense that* they have been used to deceive and to harmfully exploit. The concept of justice has been used in an unjust way *in the sense that* it has been used to support a system that gives inordinate power to a minority, which has come to hamper development where it does not pervert it, arrest it or destroy it.

Capitalism is now a direct cause of most of the suffering experienced world wide. Capitalist morality involves justifying mass starvation, and deprivation of even basic medical care when there is plenty for all; it justifies war for capital expansion, it justifies enslaving the majority to the will of a minority owning class. Characteristically capitalist justice involves unsympathetic and unforgiving harsh judgment based on false premises and often involving false accusations being held over us.

The socialist analysis exposes the truth about our situation and the potential for changing it; it reveals, or more fully reveals the context. This is done by a scientific understanding of history and economics, but also by a scientific understanding and aesthetic appreciation of human well being in every sense. Effects that capitalist conditions have on human beings and the environment are frequently exposed in socialist material as a *bad thing*; and it is scientific understanding and aesthetic appreciation of human well being in every sense that produces the will to change the economic conditions and begin a new phase of history. It is according to the criterion of

what is in our interests – *i.e. what is good for life* that capitalism is an example of a human construct that we need to get rid of as something that is active in society. We need to de-activate it. We do not do this by denying that there can be a different morality or refusing to use certain words, *but by helping to bring awareness and change. It is part of the revolution that moral concepts will be revolutionized.*

We might be fine just cataloging and discussing things without desire, but as soon as we start having a belief that something is or even just might be better or worse for us as individuals or groups, for others, for workers or for all of us – and we actually care about this - as soon as we have such a context then the concepts of good and bad/right and wrong take part in useful understanding and expression of what are generally referred to as our ethical or moral beliefs and behaviour; our ideas about and forms of justice.

Lyla Byrne

The following was posted on the World in Common forum in January, it had previously appeared on the money-free.ning.com/forum.

Crazy Consumerism or how capitalism can drive you mad and kill you.

“A shopaholic pensioner was crushed to death under a mountain of unopened items she was hoarding, it emerged today. Joan Cunnane, 77, who had suffered a 16 year shopping addiction, was found after police spent almost two days searching her cluttered bungalow. The spinster, a devout Catholic who lived alone, was buried alive under a 3ft deep mound of stuffed suitcases after they fell on top of her. Her home in Stockport Greater Manchester, was crammed so high with possessions that an expert search team and environmental health officer had to be called in. Miss Cunnane had to clear a 2ft wide path through her collection of brand new consumer valuables to get around her £180,000 bungalow” (Original source Daily Mail, Jan 8th 2009)

From this issue, if it works okay, we are changing the section dealing with the ASNM listings so as well as giving contact information there will also be news and what is going on in the sector, meetings/activities and so on. This is likely to take up the two pages rather than just one so when necessary TLC will be 12 rather than 10 pages. So send in your news of what you've been up to and what you are planning.

What's Happening?

World Strike 2012

This is something that has been featured on the World in Common forum quite a bit. Opinions on it seem to differ from it being something completely utopian to an event that is worth publicising and supporting even if only to get our message across to greater numbers of people.

Here is what World Strike 2012 has to say.

Would you like to live in a world where money does not exist? A world where everything is free? A world without rich or poor? A civilization where all human needs are met by society working together as a whole? A world without boundaries where people live together in peace and harmony?

Because all human beings are basically socialist anarchists at heart, most people will say "yes". But, they will ask, would it be possible?

The only way for the plan to work is for the message to be spread.

Tell people about the 2012 strike for a moneyless world. If they like the idea, tell them to tell their friends. Those friends will tell others, and by the year 2012 everyone on the planet will know about the strike and decide whether they are for or against it. On that day a new moneyless system will begin which will change the world completely.

Here is the content of their flyer which they want people to distribute. This is available in a host of different languages.

World Strike 2012.

If you agree the abolition of money would be a fine solution to most of our problems, and that

we would create a much better system where **EVERYTHING** - Food and drink, clothing and housing, water, heating, education, health-care and entertainment - shall be **FREE** for **EVERYONE** - why not join the world-wide strike on the opening day of the Olympic Games in 2012?

The strike will begin the moment the symbolic Olympic flame is lit - the signal for all who support the abolition of money to stop work and demand a new fair world of true freedom and justice.

WE WANT A MONEYLESS WORLD

To Contact put world strike 2012 in your search engine or get on to the World in Common forum.

We're all in it Together.

Class war groups from London, Leeds, Halifax, Bristol, Hereford, Norwich, Cambridge, Brighton and Southampton along with individuals from Freedom Press, Liberty and Solidarity, IWW, Anarchist Federation and others have come together to plan a campaign to coincide with the forthcoming General Election. A march is planned for March 20th on Goldsmith House, followed by a rally on March 31st in Trafalgar Square to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Poll Tax riot, raising the question which is more effective the ballot box or direct action. The campaign is due to go up a gear or two as the election draws nearer.

Meanwhile a Red and Black Co-ordination Network has been formed in London. Groups so far involved include London Solidarity, Anarchist Federations, local Camden, Whitechapel and Walthamstow groups, Autonomy and Solidarity, Queen Mary Autonomous Group and London Anarcha-Feminist Kollektive. Structure will be based on a robust delegate system and the plan is to address the need for a wider combative and more effective means of supporting ongoing social struggles with the aim of making anarchist politics a real challenge to capitalism and the state. (See **Freedom January 16th, Page 12**).

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

Forthcoming Meetings

All to be held at the above address

Saturday 27th March 4.00 pm
"The Road to Socialism Kropotkin, Morris and Marx".
 Forum with **Brian Morris** (Author of "Kropotkin: The Politics of Community" and "Bakunin: The Philosophy of Freedom".) And **Adam Buick** (co-Author of "Marxian Economics and Globalization" and "State Capitalism: The Wages System Under New Management".)

April 2nd and 3rd from 10.30 Am **SPGB Annual Conference.**

Saturday April 17th 6.00 p.m **Election Forum: "Can Politicians Save the Planet?"**

Northern Anarchist Network (NAN)

Supporters of NAN have been active across the north since the New Year: In Wellington, Shropshire there has been regular group meetings; in Manchester we attended the Right to Work rally supporting several syndicalist speakers such as Dave Chapple, President of the National Shop Stewards Network, and Colin Trousdale of the campaign against the blacklist; in early February several of us joined with the Yorkshire Anarchist groups to hold a regional rally. On the 16th February. Northern Voices photographer was challenged and threatened by security guards with the Terrorism Act while on a support protest backing the blacklisted electrician Steve Acheson at Fiddler's Ferry. The next issue of Northern Voices will be out in March.

The next conference of the Northern Anarchist Network is on, Saturday March 27th 2010. If you want further information on the conference or the group contact: **Brian Bamford, 46 Kingsland Road, Rochdale, Lancs OI1 3HQ**

=====

No news from the following groups but hopefully they are still around and giving capitalism the kicking it deserves.

World In Common: www.worldincommon.org

As stated previously very good for discovering groups that do, or have made up the Anti State, Non Market sector. Like all discussion forums it sometimes suffers from discussions that go on too long but it is well worth exploring as some of the posts give out information you might not have picked up elsewhere. Some of the news from this section has come from this source. So join the forum and help take it forward.

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

No news received from them but we are sure they are still involved in plenty of activities, putting the heat on the profit system and promoting Anarchist Communism. The Manchester website is well worth a visit for looking at texts from former organisations such as Solidarity, Subversion and Wildcat.

Industrial Workers of the World: www.iww.org
Or P/O Box 1158, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE99 4XL.

Get in touch if you want advice on employment law, if you want to join as an individual or if there is support for organising at your workplace but you do not wish to pay high dues or get involved with large bureaucracies.

Much the same applies to the next group.

Solidarity Federation. www.solfed.org.uk or **PO Box 29, South West D.O Manchester M15 5HW**

www.Libcom.org:

Another place to keep up with news from around the world from a Libertarian Communist view point. Also has Library, History and Gallery sections as well as active online forums.

Wrekin Stop War

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

Red and Black Notes

The geo cities site that used to host RBN has been out of action for some time. You can obtain some RBN items from libcom.org as listed above. If you want to know more than read issue 6 Of The Libertarian Communist and the article by Neil Fettes pp.4-7. Recommended site if you can still obtain the full listings.

See also Institute for **Anarchist Studies**, the very similar but separate **Anarchist Studies Journal, Anarchist Archives, Red and Anarchist Action network redanarchist.org.** And Socialist Labor Party of America www.slp.org. (Not to be confused with the Scargill mob).