

AGAINST ANARCHISM—FOR COMMUNISM

October 1, 2003 by Floyce White

When I tell people that I cannot see green, they always grab something green and ask “What color is this?” Deuteranopia is rare enough that I cannot expect others to understand why I say “Grass is orange.” I have the responsibility to learn to distinguish color by association.

Petty capitalists have a sort of self-induced color blindness when it comes to politics. They would rather not see any harm in the claim to own things used by others. They would rather not see the violence behind property exchange. As with Bible beaters, persons who deceive themselves also deceive others. Upper-class people never live up to the responsibility to speak about red and black with the same meaning as does the lower class.

In this series of articles I expose the petty-capitalist deception about communism. When capitalists claim to support communism, they always mean Marx’s hypothetical “lower order of communism,” which Lenin labeled “socialism.” This “lower stage” or “transitional period” was achieved in Russia and China, and turned out to be no different from capitalism in other countries except for more nationalized big business. Petty-capitalist-led socialists overthrew those states and built much stronger ones that could own and manage big business. To petty capitalists, “socialism is communism” just as “capitalists” means only those capitalists richer than themselves. Petty capitalists talk trash about capitalism and private property, while turning a blind eye to their own business properties.

Some petty capitalists take a different tack. They want to eliminate their bigger rivals, but try to do so by eliminating every currently-big organization. To increase the social power of petty proprietors, they want to break up corporations and privatize state lands, roads, and schools. They seek to overthrow the state and immensely weaken and destabilize its successor regimes. In this way, they hope both to grab state property and to diminish the ability of the state to protect big proprietors. As with socialism, anarchism ignores the combined effect of masses of small exploiters and fights only the few big ones. Socialism tells working-class people that nationalized businesses are “not capitalism,” and alleges that any opposition to socialism is “anti-communism.” Likewise, anarchism tells the dispossessed that co-ops, syndicates, and other temporary asset combinations are “not capitalism,” and warns that any opposition to anarchism is “authoritarianism.” To petty capitalists, “anarchism means no hierarchy” above their rule, just as “property” means any claim of possession but their own.

Property claims are made by individuals, but the property system is not a matter of personal initiative. Classes of rich and poor were created and maintained through generations of organized violence. Private property and public property are complimentary co-methods to maintain the dispossession of the lower class. The state owns everything not claimed by families or other institutions. It is just as ridiculous to speak of property exchange without its armed guard as it is to speak of a state without exploitation to defend. Independent or collective, forms of possession and dispossession cannot exist without the state.

Many working-class activists are disgusted with “lower-order-of-” “communism.” They never heard the word “communism” used to promote anything else, so they advocate anything but communism (ABC). They discover that they merely replaced one dummed-down theory with all the others. Socialism and anarchism are mannequins that substitute for any reasoning beneath today’s fashionable slogans. As with all anti-communism, ABC is used to divert working-class action into passive support of liberal causes. ABC is also a rationale for conservative “lifestyle politics.” The anarchist wears black as if a sulky clown—in the same way that gangster rap portrays the stereotypical angry clown. Discussion and action are replaced with narcissism. As with socialism, anarchism has its taxonomy, euphemisms, and clichés that reinforce its struggle for petty-bourgeois semantics—and therewith, the petty-bourgeois outlook.

Some working-class activists understand that “Marxism” is not communism, yet persist in calling themselves “anarchists” or “socialists.” To these comrades I say: your candor is needed now, not sometime later when speaking up is easy. How can you advance the goal of a stateless, classless society with the theory and practice of petty-bourgeois hypocrisy?

With its explicit rejection of communism, anarchism is always *tres chic*. It remains a perennial pole of attraction to the petty bourgeoisie and a staple of leftism. A discussion of anarchism is not important because of capitalist interest or lack thereof. It is not important because of anarchist writings; they dogmatize the slogans of the bourgeois, anti-feudal revolution. For example, anarchists yearn for freedom as if it meant something other than the coexistence of slavery. Chaining workers to the work was despicable, but freedom from chattel slavery was not the end of servitude by the lower class. The upper class gained the freedom to exploit in all the other ways such as land rent, merchantry, and wage labor. Sowing illusions is one way that anarchism is used to recruit working-class activists to a great variety of pro-capitalist causes. Anarchist dual-class organization is also used to forestall the self-organization of the dispossessed. In the absence of a mass, working-class party, it is necessary to discuss the many obstacles to working-class unity—one of which is anarchism. Instead of repeating the wording and thinking of the petty bourgeoisie, our slogans must be:

SHARE NOT TRADE
ABOLISH EMPLOYMENT—END WAGE SLAVERY
NO RENT—NO MORTGAGE—NO HOMELESSNESS
COMMUNISM IN OUR LIFETIME

This article is the tenth in a series, available at <http://www.geocities.com/antiproperty>