

The Ultra Left International

A Manifesto

D.Z. Rowan

7/28/18

Contents

Part 1	3
Communism	3
Bourgeois Ideology	6
Alienation	9
Leftism	11
Part 2	14
Philosophy of Philosophy	14
Alienation in Relation to Bourgeois Ideology	15
Some Words on Civilization	20
On What to Do	21

Part 1

Communism

Communism, the resolution of all social separation, can be thought of as the time in which humanity finds itself back in a vaguely familiar place. Primitive communism will never return, that is in no means to say that technology, as it progresses under capitalism, will continue. However mankind will in a way circle back to where it began; materially speaking at least, not technologically entirely. One root cause of social and material alienation, by setting a universal exchange value, works against individual subjectivity as it demands that in order for one's exchange to be valid they must adhere to the universal standard of value. Does one's perspective matter under capitalism in anywhere other than some dry moral debate? No, our individual perspectives fail us in the pursuit of our everyday sustenance. The alienation created by such a separation from the socially implied idol, that of work, which all value is based upon, the specific type of activity is unimportant under capitalism. Communism abolishes all forms of alienation by abolishing all social separation, why should value exist as a separate institution (namely the economy)? The value one sees in an object is completely subjective, and often non-existent, as the fetishization of commodities and therefore objects also is a conditioned valorization. Communism abolishes the objective pressures of the economy, and with it, the objective perception of material institutions imposed upon the individual.

While subjects such as the value-form (and all of the social abstraction which comes with it) may be more direct causes of alienation, productivity itself creates a more indirect yet distinct form. The ideology imposed upon us by production is an inversion of human life; it corrals individuals into groups designed for its sake, alienating the individual from the progression of society and from fellow people, because no matter how much my society produces, my employer etc., the abstraction of growth will never be my growth, it doesn't benefit me, it is not my satisfaction and I never get any of it. We don't produce to live we live to produce; the promise of well being is continuously held just out of reach, as long as we continue to produce. That promise is never delivered because we live to produce, and a life tied unwaveringly to the promise of safety and convenience through such a sacrifice of seemingly endless expansion is no life at all. Even as we encounter free time or even unemployment, the social pressure to contribute ends up destroying any disappointing enjoyment that might be had when we are not working. We try to relax and have fun only to find that so-called "fun things" are not really rewarding or relaxing, only draining. If I am mimicking such alienation outside of the workplace, how will anybody ever escape its hold? Surely, alienation digs its heels into you well away and apart from the workplace, the productive motive surrounds and controls every part of our lives. It infests every single relation; everything we do has a value decided by a separate body from ourselves. Under communism the means of production are not necessarily managed, because society loses its productive nature, we would own the means of production just as much as we would own clothing, just as much as we would own the ground we walked on. Productivity as the very definition of material inversion, it implies that one only continues to reproduce such relations for the sake of continuing to reproduce them, we live to produce so that we can live to produce. Such an inversion is a sign that we no longer are alienated by natural survival we are alienated by social conditioning. The means of which are not only to be seized but made to be destroyed. This isn't to say, don't make things, this is to say don't live for the machine which estranges you from life itself. The goal of

capitalism is to constantly produce, expand, and progress for the sake of continuing to produce; the goal of communism ranges from those of its individuals to non-existent.

Fuck your private property in which you so graciously allow me to populate. Property, a medium in which we live our entire lives in, living on somebody else's terms takes away my control and puts up a barrier between myself and others. Disappointment follows everybody throughout their lives as they are time and time again let down by the promises that progress and innovation make. We live in the era of disappointment, nothing is special, we complain about how "jaded" and apathetic the younger generations are, yet we've seen it all, we have seen everything the spectacle has to offer and that offer is nothing much a nagging disappointment, a feeling that perhaps life really isn't all that great after all. All the creativity which makes life so interesting and exciting is dead, we had to sacrifice it to standardize not only every commodity but every social relation. We created an ideology of relations to be consistent with commodity production, everything must be standardized in order to appeal to the widest range of people on the market. Of course, no economy can run without a clear set of distinctions, binaries, and especially such an efficient system as capitalism is must maintain such binary thought in order to better organized the hierarchical positions of class. Like most side effects of capitalism, it has spread like the plague to most social relations. But you are not a goddamned coffee maker, you are much more than any box, reject all social dichotomy, do not allow yourself to be defined by anything other than yourself. Male or female, friend or lover, family or friend, introvert or extrovert; all binaries snuff out any hope of creativity among ourselves. If you try every category you find that they all become unrewarding, have you tried perhaps, not allowing yourself to be a binary? Is something your property or not? The answer to that is yes, I can do whatever I want here, I occupy this place and it is mine. Communism will make all such binaries and property irrelevant and nonexistent; this place is just as much mine as it is yours, I can do what I want here.

The constant expansion of capitalism creates its own ideology manifesting itself in every individual relation, proclaiming itself as the collective goal and the common good, namely the spectacle; it enforces objectivity onto every individual, contradicting their own subjective reality. It shouts loud enough to be heard everywhere by everyone. At this point, all we can really do to combat this is to overpower it ourselves, but subjectivity overpowering ideology is not the totality of communism, under communism subjectivity stands alone. The alienation which manifests itself in every outlet of society throughout history resolves itself by abolishing itself. The analysis of society, of the masses, leads to the abolition of what it seeks to analyze. Considering the flexibility of definitions, however, communism will only abolish society as we know it. We do not stand for any of communism's achievements, only for ourselves and the process which brings us there. We hope to define ourselves without definitions, to control our lives without the necessity of institutions, to mold our life to once again be creative.

It is not within our power and therefore not our cause to spark a revolution; we see revolution as a societal tendency naturally coupled with capitalism's exponential expansion. The road towards communism accelerates just as capitalism's progression does; because as capitalism continues to A. expand to encompass more areas of life and institutions, something which has greatly accelerated in the past 50 years most obviously in the first world. (the third world has always had a relatively high prevalence of this, the tendency, however, becomes more obvious in the first world). To be put simply, institutions and services which were once government owned and therefore not impacted by production as profoundly are not being impacted in such a way by

these institutions becoming privately owned. B. Progress technology that drives down production costs, therefore further depriving the working class of their means of subsistence; C. the tendency of the rate of profit and value to go down over time; D. the finite nature of all resources in contradiction with an ever-expanding need for more of such; which creates with it E. also exponential alienation among the proletariat as both their survival and promise of reward under capitalism is being threatened and destroyed. A hopeless generation is left in limbo between a precarious future under capitalism and the reality of a non-existent utopia ahead, even after capitalism's inevitable collapse. But what we do realize is that despite the myth of perfection, great improvement and realization of individual progress is not; the will to not only survive but also to live grows both more beaten and angry within every person at this time, and has been ever since the dawn of humanity. Even under primitive communism alienation from the natural world was arguably the seed which evolved into societal alienation. Insurrections have always occurred, the proletariat has increasingly become more agitated as capitalism progressed. Every tiny insurrection that occurs, every call for one, is a natural reaction which always has and always will happen as long as capitalism continues to move towards resolution. There is no opportunism, only an increasing agitation which every now and then bursts only to quickly dissipate; all fail to bring large-scale change, but all are bound to happen anyway. We won't convince the entire proletariat to our cause, the collapse of capitalism will demand that communism be spontaneously instated. All forms of previously known alienation and separation will be abolished, implying that communist relations are practiced in place of capitalistic ones; this is the revolution.

Communization is the revolution, it is a process in which the relations which once made up capitalism are transformed entirely into communist ones, not instantly, but not through distinct stages either. While other revolutions of the past were followed by state-mandated stages in which one component of capitalism is transformed into state capitalism and so on; the communist revolution, communization, will see all components of capitalism being transformed at once, not entirely instantly, but universally over a period of time. The revolution is not separate from the transformation, it is the transformation. This process will not be done by a state or even some benevolent party, however a communist organization, because they are more educated on this process, would most likely in viable conditions be able to do this faster and with less confusion, they could possibly lead by example. The same sort of relationship will be seen among the rest of the proletariat, some may find better and more rewarding ways to transition, which others will learn from. The proletariat will revolt out of both practical necessity and psychological unrest, however so far, they have never been in a position where material conditions made their seizure of power possible and have never reached a technological capacity able to sustain communism. There will soon come a time where that is no longer the case until then we do what we can to study the process of communization.

Communism is not a system as we think of one, communism is an activity which requires statelessness, classlessness, a lack of currency, and a lack of property (the capitalist notion at least). It operates according to the interest of those involved. It is the resolution of all previous stages of societal development, in this, it abolishes all hierarchical meditations between persons. It nullifies all ideology by destroying morality's current use. The proletariat will only communize when an understanding of their condition pushes them to negate themselves. Communism marks the end of a philosophical era and the beginning of another one, and in a world which lacks the fruits of life what else can we do for ourselves but take the plunge?

Bourgeois Ideology

No analysis of capitalism is complete without acknowledging that capital's domination of our material relations and conditions extends into our psychology as well. A mediation between individual desire and expression and society is primarily influenced by the material conditions of such society. Everyday we are confronted with a censorship by ourselves, even our own conversation, like nearly everything else this sickening life has to offer us, is separated and organized all into its place, caged up and tucked away for most of the day with nothing more than a hollow and alienating representation of real expression in its place. While at work, school, or even in the home, certain topics are simply too inappropriate to talk about, but why? In most situations at work, an expression is limited to what would be "work appropriate" in other words, encouraging of people to consume. A wider scope can be taken to the political sphere in general, particularly more mainstream ones, in which every stance apparently has a say, but only one is really heard, that of whatever stance best supports capitalism, in this case, liberal democracy. Play-pen politics in which two sides of the same ideology are made look as though discourse is being made when in actuality nothing really changes materially or psychologically. Both liberals and conservatives play by the same rules of rationality as long as it supports production, and morality which is said to be equated with reason always, that which is moral is also that which is reasonable or rational, and the most rational is the most moral. Morality can be simplified down to a label used to better justify aspects of capitalism in the eyes of individuals, "reason" as they call it, the common sense of it all, can be defined the same way, with which is which in a stance being dependent on what that stance is and who holds it. In the end, both end up intertwining so much that they become nearly indistinguishable from each other. While naive communists continue to ask themselves whether or not what they are going to say is morally acceptable what form of morality are they using other than that of liberal ideology? If morality really was subjective then why don't they just makeup what is right and wrong themselves, and everybody must understand that they do so? No, that would just be irrational, nobody would understand you, they would call you immoral or whatever. Well played indeed, to attempt any other morality than that of one based on production geared reasoning is never listened to, the leftist's desperate cries for justice are never taken seriously no matter how dire the situation is, they're always too crazy. Morality, without justification by material conditions, is an illusion. Your morality has no status quo to justify therefore it is useless and obviously seen as such, especially when you claim to challenge the status quo. The advancement of conditions has never been brought about by a mere change in moral opinion, it was the material conditions that did on their own, and those who practice such relations, both thesis and antithesis, do so out of primarily amoral self-interest. Morality has and always will be the societal void in which all dissenting ideologues go to die. Liberalism will try to entice you into fighting for the good of humanity, if only you could just change things a bit, but there is no cause for such because there is no united humanity. Whether this cause falls right or left wing, it's the same liberal democratic bullshit, as if there has ever been a progression which hasn't fucked over a good portion of people in the process. Nothing will get done non-violently, some people will not get a say, there will be no moral justification for it and no need for justification. As a communist, I might as well shoot myself in the foot if I am to be delusional enough to believe I'm fighting for the good of humanity. The bourgeois is a part of humanity, and I want them dead just like every other proletarian whether they lie to themselves or not, you want your boss dead. Our communism is not for the good of humanity, it is for the good of ourselves as caged animals

in a system that throws us into monotonous servitude. I don't care about the glory and cause of communism, I just want something that gives me the maximum freedom that I want, a freedom in which I no longer have to worry about my actions being mediated because I have to justify my actions to make sure I'm not stepping on bourgeois toes. What will be there to justify after communism? What kind of domination will occur in a society in which domination isn't necessary for reproduction of the condition? Capitalism needs a state in order to stop the proletariat from rebelling once conditions inevitably become too unbearable for them, it needs an owning class and a class that owns nothing because it needs a large population of workers in order to maintain its increasing rate of production. What does communism need? To reproduce its conditions, nothing. There is no need to work, no need to mediate power between classes(politics), no need for socially enforced productivity to occur because a higher degree of production has been reached, classes and the state and with it, all existing forms of hierarchy, are unnecessary. Morality also becomes useless, because there is no systemic domination or authority there is no need to justify anything as morality exists today. Perhaps, once we reach that point, morality will become based on something else or disappear altogether. As communists we might as well acknowledge that possibility and move on from morality, start thinking about things in terms of not what is right or wrong, but what is best for you or what is best for whomever you want it to be. Nevertheless, the proletariat continues to pretend as though, in a desperate grasp for control even if such control comes about through a seemingly higher power, to pretend to be moral and reasonable in a politics in which both notions are pitted against them. Feeling as though the side you're rooting for is just and rational is great despite you being trampled by that very side in the real world. You are not in control, you never were, there is no beacon of power and light for you other than that which exists in yourself and the progression of the material conditions, which couldn't care less about you.

You may then ask yourself, why is bourgeois morality bourgeois? When we look at the beliefs of many in the working class we see in fact the opposite, the phenomena of the conservative worker, and these workers call for their own oppression! Who is it then? The proletariat or the bourgeoisie who enforce and reproduce morality? The upper classes during the feudal period tended to take a more managerial role in enforcing moral standards and codes, via the church and its marriage to the state; it was enforced upon the lower classes then. Now, the bourgeois has left, for the most part, that job to the proletariat who took it on without much fuss. The old feudal, traditional Christian values, were continued into capitalism with humanism and new atheism continuing that tradition itself, as essentially the bourgeois version of Christianity. Humanism, liberal values, and new atheism almost mirror capitalism's method of domination by the empty promise of freedom which acts as a carrot to the individual, the stick, of course, being that you have to waste your life in somebody else's society but we'll get to that later. Humanist atheism prides itself on being without a mystical god, god as a being anyway, but they clearly still hold on to the idea of there being a god separate from themselves, whether that take the form of Mankind(instead of themselves), reason and rationality, or human rights. Despite not calling these ideas the holy trinity they continue to treat these concepts as though they are above themselves and are to be adhered to; a characteristic of nearly every form of totalitarianism, not just the capitalist one. Even the conservative workers have taken a liking to many of these values, life, liberty, and the pursuit of property they say, as they're caged in cubicles every 6 to 5 day. The promise of secure state-sanctioned freedoms has enticed the proletariat into an eternal negotiation between the illusion of state power separate from bourgeois power and the freedoms

they had been promised. As the proletariat finds that the rights they thought were supposed to be safe are in fact not safe, that their online activity, for example, is, in fact, being monitored by the authorities, or that their theoretical freedom in conducting business may be threatened despite not owning a business themselves; there is usually two courses of action taken, the proletariat reacts by clinging more to the liberal capitalist ideology, the green party, constitutionalism, other libertarian right ideologies, even some “radical” leftists are examples, the proletariat then both attempts to rebel against the state on a merely theoretical level and at the same time, reinforces the state’s action by attempting to negotiate with it through activism. Fascism works in the same way however the original values sometimes differ, and fascism itself is a more extreme form of such process, it is an embrace of the state which was promised to them as privileged people. A worker may also continue this process to an extent to which they completely reject the state even in its ideological form, and yet instead advocate for essentially a people’s state. In this way, it is not the bourgeoisie that enforces and reproduce morality, the proletariat enforces it on each other through both the interpersonal, public, and political sphere, and reproduces it by enforcement. The justification of their daily oppression must be pushed to its own logical limits lest we realize that our oppression has no justification and therefore offers nothing to us. Only when communism has been realized or when capitalism is in its last days will the majority of the proletariat realize that all forms of morality so far have kept them in a state of submission.

To an extent, even the social justice movements were and still are perpetrators of bourgeois morality, the liberal value of equality is taken to its logical conclusion, but only a conclusion relatively safe for the reproduction(1) of capitalism; because economic equality was obviously out of the question, social equality had to do. Or more so, the other groups which despite being extremely oppressed by the state, demand those same values for themselves as well, that same morality pushed them to demand validation from their oppressors as equal under the same morality. And although social advancement has disrupted, only symbolically at this point, the reproduction of the capitalist system by primarily disrupting (a) the racial manner in which class is still structured. (b) The structure and functionality of the nuclear family as a tool of reproduction(literally reproduction of primarily workers) and (c) the function of individuals as only one of two expressions of biological reproduction; the continuation of labels based on originally the productive process and now often on liberal values also continues the pressure of mass proletariat reproduction despite it being currently unnecessary. The end of inversion will bring about with it the liberation of the family as well as individuals from the burden of reproduction as their primary function. Communism will see a family which is not bound by a reproductive relation, it may lack bounds altogether, consisting of friends, or exists as a communal unit, or isn’t a unit at all. The organization of individuals according to reproductive use, particularly for the purpose of a supply of labor, namely, gender, is a relation and expression which implies its own use through being thought of as not only binary but also as a category of social relation itself. Gender has become a symbolic expression of the reproductive function of the gender identified with, the current liberation of gender from reproduction is an illusionary one, as the implication of such is continued through the often ridiculously overblown gendered behavioral and expectations of expression pushed onto trans people. Even the act of deviating from one’s biological sex is seen as a mental illness, which is even perpetrated in the transgender community itself by some people, you cannot be trans or non-binary unless you are mentally ill, is the line of reasoning there. Due to the implications of such categories, it is necessary for the communist movement to abolish

gender as a category altogether. That can also be expected once production no longer becomes necessary.

Alienation

Apart from the cause and nature of morality, its effects mirror the entirety of the capitalist system; and the inversion of society manifests itself in its own ideology. We are told to be good for the sake of goodness, not in order to get something in return despite there being supposed rewards for it. It has become obvious that most values, traditional and liberal, are twisted or created for the sake of keeping the capitalist system running smoothly. Every taboo is taboo only because it disrupts it. Yet here we are, conforming not to get something in return but seemingly for the sake of conforming, despite that never being the real case. It is just as alienating to see values which do nothing but imprison and domesticate you thrown at you by every screen you open, through everyone you meet, every portrayal of society you encounter; than to sacrifice your time and autonomy to go to work for something you don't care about every day. The former is a symptom of the latter which simultaneously reinforces it. The separation one experiences from their daily activity, community, and means of survival correlates to a separation of the individual from the ideology which manifests itself as a byproduct of a similarly alienating system.

The worker experiences daily life as a series of environments in which he only passes through, any interaction that may occur is not autonomous, as it is all action which conforms to the specified task of whatever product he uses. The environments, home, work, and one of consumption, are alien to him as he has little to no ownership and therefore control over them; his "living" space is most likely owned by the bank or a landlord in which he must pay to live in, at work he is a wage slave under the direction of a boss and his time is controlled directly by such while the other two environments control his time indirectly, in places of consumption such as the grocery store, he is there for the specific purpose of buying things, again, in an environment not owned by him. Supporters of markets say they fear communism because their property will be taken and they will own nothing; yet they lack ownership of everything on which they rely on to live, they only really own useless items which they have acquired. Our communism is one in which every individual will own their sole environment, there is no longer a body apart from themselves which holds a monopoly over their time and survival. We reject the institution of work as a direct dictate over our time and energy, it necessitates all other institutions of capitalism, as the existence of a wage implies that there is money, which then implies that it is exchanged, and which the nature of work also implies that commodities are being produced. Spending the majority of your time in a place in which you own no part of for the sake of earning money in order to survive, and waste your time buying useless items every once in awhile which only further your alienation by making it obvious to you that you lack real connection to anything, is in no way more critical to the function of capitalism than consumption is. However, work is of a higher importance to us because much of the left continues to advocate for it. The very people who claim to care about the enslavement caused by capitalism continue to advocate for wage slavery with a human face. The very institution of work is one which cannot be owned by the worker, its function necessitates that it controls the worker. As the bourgeois has in actuality, very little control over their lives due to their constant need to increase production. This forces them to be slaves of capital as well, despite them being the dominant class. Is that what the socialists want? To bump up the proletariat in the productive food chain? Work is not only tyrannical in itself

as the occupier of one's time but also implies that production is still the boss. The proletariat will still go to work in order to produce more so that they can earn more and therefore survive, only this time you've cut out the middleman. Is this not already the system which dictates today? While work can manifest itself in many different ways which are not necessarily the average 9 to 5, work as we define it is specifically the process in which production reproduces itself, as things are being produced. The existence of the wage is one which relies on production in that it allows commodities to continue to be produced within the confines of capital. Work always implies production and therefore implies capitalism, as every aspect of it implies all others. No institution of capitalism is more important or pressing than the other alone, each implies and is a function or byproduct of another, and all capitalistic relations must be dealt away with if we are ever to abolish systematic alienation. Seeing as how this makes it so difficult to develop a sound method of action against or analysis of capitalism, we have to conclude that our critique seeks to deconstruct and abolish every aspect and form of capitalism because everyone necessitates another.

While work is just as miserable as work is expected to be, so-called "play" isn't much better. The binary nature of the two spheres inevitably leads to work being unenjoyable and "play" becoming a chore as well. Enjoyment and pleasure is not the primary goal of a worker's life, that comes as their second job; consumption takes up one's time while simultaneously, as work often does, promoting itself as enjoyable, but you still cannot survive without doing it. The spectacular nature of commodities, particularly those intended for recreation, creates an idealized vision of every commodity and the idea of recreation itself; and once this time or these things are experienced they only disappoint. But things have been analyzed to death by other writers, what interests us more is the commodification of playtime. The time after work, as well as vacation time, are commodities which are byproducts of work time, while conveniently continuing to keep the proletariat reproducing the capitalist state. Of course, the disappointment felt after one bought something they realize they either don't need or don't enjoy using is also felt when one expects to have fun on their vacation, only to find a pressure to enjoy it with the same lack of control and structured confinement experienced at work. Work is miserable, and finally getting off of it is at first relieving until there grows the burden of suddenly having all this "free time" (despite usually having to pay in order to get the full free time experience, enjoyable things and activities almost always have a price). Vacations give you not just a few hours or a day or two but perhaps a week or two, even more, panic inducing! You have so much time to have the kind of fun you rarely have and are terrified of wasting it; should you travel somewhere? Travel, or under capitalism, tourism, cherry picks the most widely desirable notions of an area, such as perceptions of its local culture and landscape, note, perceptions of. Despite these perceptions rarely coinciding with the actual nature of the area, most vacation spots have been raped by the most brutal of capitalist regimes anyway (primarily the Caribbean, Central and South America, Asia, and Africa) and the realities of daily life are undesirable for consumers. All of these marvelous travel opportunities provide you with an experience of a place that only exists in the western mind to not satisfy the dreams of world travel you'll never have the time or money to achieve. Anxiety not only plagues the security of keeping a job but also invades our free time as it becomes precious, and cannot be put to waste. Such a pressure to enjoy our free time ends up only creating the imitation of play in places of recreation rather than the actual experience of pleasure; we're all forced to put on our phony smiles and drink our happy juice, a coping mechanism to avoid the massive disappointment we actually feel when we're supposed to be enjoying our time off.

And this all leaves us to question, does the very organization of work and play as two different spheres contribute to the daily alienation one feels from their lives and communities? The anxiety that comes with a lack of control, as well as a limited and specified time for everything in which one may hope to somehow assert some sliver of autonomy over, is evident of the massive amount of alienation capitalism creates. In this separation and alienation of time, we are all united under one miserable banner. Our project is to abolish the separation between work and free time, which means getting rid of both. Work and free time are two areas which enforce and are upheld by their binary nature; as one creates the motive for the other by taking over the majority of one's time, the other is ruled by the anxiety caused by the other and has become commodified due to the tendency of capitalism to expand. In this, they create their separation because one is defined as the absence of the other. Once we abolish this binary we are then able to create real play, while the imitation of play is caused by the anxiety of not having fun, real play can only be done when we get rid of the anxiety which corrupts it. Real play is experienced spontaneously, is not assigned a specific time by another institution, and is experienced as the enjoyment of time, not a time for enjoyment. Whether that play takes the form of creation or recreation, is meaningless, as the two will no longer be necessarily dichotomous. Our definition of play is that of an activity which is done without the involvement of anxiety-inducing, alienating systems or institutions; and is motivated by un-mediated self-interest. It is an activity which lacks all forms of alienation, from both the material conditions and the ideas which arise out of such. The nature of play depends mostly on what the person is doing specifically. The organization of play itself as a particular set of time is what implies that time also alienates us, our own lives alienate us because of the pressure we feel to live them, such philosophies of meaning and the good life are symptoms of a much deeper set anxiety. Even so-called existentialist philosophies continue to force the burden of meaning onto us, even those who claim that life has no inherent meaning imply that it's our job to create that meaning. Instead of freeing ourselves from the pressure to spend our time here wisely as nihilism does, it continues to create an ideology of enslavement. You are supposed to make your life meaningful, but to whom? Who dictates whether or not your life was worth it? Not even yourself, avoid valuing your life according to how meaningful you figure it is because those ideas will always rely on how meaningful you are to the greater society. Don't measure yourself, don't compromise your real desires for the sake of saving precious time, own your time because there's nothing wrong with you and there never will be. Under communism play is the form of every individual's domination of their own experience, there is no such thing as wasted time. Once the separation of time is abolished, there becomes a universal time which loses its societal character as we know it by returning the interpretation and therefore the reality of time to every individual's control. While capitalism characterizes itself as a unification of separation, communism is a unification of ownership.

Leftism

To most so-called communists, revolution is the right thing to do, and their communism exists as nothing more than an ideological status in the political scene. Communism is their identity, not their desire, not their acknowledgement, not their conclusion. Of course, this has led to all sorts of spin-offs, the leftists fight about which program is moral and effective as if they had the power to actually put such a program into action. Communism is not something that is to be "put into action", it is a process to be acknowledged. When we say we are communists, we initially

imply that we acknowledge it's progression, reality, and antithesis; whether we desire such an antithesis doesn't matter since there really is nothing we can do about it anyway, I say we might as well.

But of course, not all leftists see it like we do, the social anarchists, for instance, tend to see communism as an ideal system, one to be put in place and not an antithesis which will happen regardless of whether or not you "take action". Social anarchists love to fight over whether or not collectivism, syndicalism, or communism is a better system; they seek to institute these systems more often than not for the so-called good of the working class. As if communism or some dead system like syndicalism was something to be managed by a pseudo-state. They replace the state with councils, syndicates, even communes; not as a way to guide us towards communism, which lacks such deliberate organization by definition, but to run a pseudo communism, one which claims to be stateless and classless but instead has differently named institutions which do the same thing a state would. Even the Marxist-Leninists claim to only want a state for the sake of transition. The stateless and classless nature of communism implies that all organization is done on a personal level, not a political one. Without class, and especially without hierarchy, the political institution loses its function and power; as everything political stems from a negotiation between classes. Even if such institutions are decentralized, it is still a state, because it forces a particular class relation and objective worldview onto everyone else. Many of these so-called anarchists fail to acknowledge the way institutions such as work and even production reproduce capitalism. They make the same mistake that many Marxist Leninists make, a fetishization of work is the result of a program which concentrates on the identification of the working class under capitalism, not its negation and therefore negation of its function under communism. It is concerned with the preservation of the proletariat, it assumes that the bourgeois are the ones in control when in reality production and the valorization of labor is. The immediate nature of revolution is also a concern of ours when examining anarchist theory, there is no acknowledgement of the material conditions which drive capitalism to progress eventually into socialism and communism. These conditions being that of the decline in value, no such analysis exists in anarchism and therefore, such theories fail to analyze their position in history; because of this, they have nearly always failed to provide an effective method of action. They are simply not aware of their surroundings, which is why their program will never be substantially decisive. The same can be said for Marxist-Leninists, such ideologies came about in areas which were primarily pre-industrial, therefore, the transitions demonstrated are meant to progress production to a stage in which the highest stage of communism can be established. A decent idea, but a wildly outdated one; because we don't live in a preindustrial society, instead, much of the world has entered a post-industrial one. We are not already there, however, we are definitely past the point in which state capitalism becomes necessary, post-scarcity is nearly a reality, capitalism is accelerating towards collapse at an alarming rate. There is no transition, and while we have no ability to establish communism on a significant scale now, the spectacle, with all it's representations of power, are disintegrating just as centers of power are (something that will be discussed further into the book), the death of politics will leave us with no other alternative but to reject all previously known institutions including the state on a utilitarian rather than idealistic basis.

The old feuding ideologies of social anarchism and Marxist-Leninism, while we tend to agree with the anarchists on their acknowledgement of all hierarchy as detrimental to communism, and the Marxist-Leninists on their acknowledgement of material conditions within their program; both ideologies fail any hope of being implemented today because they were designed to

operate under outdated conditions, and therefore could not function without a political apparatus, which is inherently hierarchical as its function is to mediate between those with power and those without, implying a hierarchy. Such a hierarchy was undoubtedly needed at the time in order to accelerate the material conditions, and while the Marxist-Leninist states failed in achieving communism, they succeeded in getting closer to it. And the anarchists of the 30's at least demonstrated that a society similar to communism could exist. Whether or not these ideologies create a functioning society("work") is none of our concern, as contemporary conditions render them incompatible; they are unlikely to make the global impact they once did.

Of course, no critique of social anarchism(and Marxism-Leninism at times) is quite as colorful as that of the post left tendencies; and although we find many of their critiques of the left, particularly that of political organization, their rejection of Marx and shallow interpretation of Stirner are weaknesses of theirs. While post left theory doesn't necessarily contradict with egoism, it misses a valuable point; the nature of egoism is one which primarily focuses on the individual psychology of oppressed peoples and how they hinder their own liberation, egoism is not just some call for individual insurrection. The post left's Stirner is only concerned with the act of liberation, and the criticism of organizations which limit this liberation, not the reason that liberation is desired in the first place. The problem is that Stirner did not actually elaborate on how the individual could be liberated, while the majority of his work focuses on how power structures manipulate people, this is why the former interpretation is a weak one. The post left claims to be a tendency born out of the desires of fed up anarchists, and I think in the beginning it was, we advocate such a subjective approach to theory ourselves, yet like all forms of anarchist thought it too descended into an oversaturated set of abstract values, which makes up the whole of the post left. The post left demonstrates an idealization of individual desire by assuming that a particular set of values and avant-garde ideas represent such individuals; in this way, it creates an ideology of itself by using a handful of ideas to represent the desires of individuals who identify as post left. It is a label just as constraining and ignorant as any other, but at least their anti-intellectualism will render their ideas useless in the long run. Like the ideologies mentioned previously, the post left is unaware of the material conditions, but unlike the others, the rejection of theory and fetishization of action leaves them with the same attitude as many working class people, angry and uneducated. They prefer one to radicalize and somehow come up with an effective plan of action through experiencing the real world, not by reading some book! Ironically, the post left has never had a movement in real life despite existing since the 60's and 70's, I'm sure they're getting a wealth of information. The desire to learn, explore the ideas of others, and attempt to understand the world is just as much if not more so important as the desire to throw bricks at cops; yet I see no intellectual curiosity and pleasure being encouraged by the post left, in fact, the opposite is seen, what lovers of individuality and freedom these people must be. Of course, as one continues to read they eventually realize how ineffective a radical analyzation of society is without an acknowledgement of the contradictions of capitalism; and no one has been radicalized without exposure to radical messages, angered without such messages yes, but not radicalized. Many youths despise capitalism, yet few are in the position to pose a threat to it because most lack knowledge of radical ideas and methods. They may steal or break the law in some other way, but lack the understanding that they are accelerating the contradictions of capitalism(if they are proletarians), oh, we'll get there eventually, but don't you want it to happen quicker? How vulnerable will these people be once communization has occurred? We suppose it will be their own fault. The post left seems to be doomed to useless action or none at all because to act without

being grounded in your motives and position in time is pointless. Despite our criticisms, we can see eye to eye with post-leftists on certain subjects, such as the rejection of party systems, politics, morality, and hierarchy in a certain context. They are closer to us tendency wise than the other two schools of thought, which is why we enjoy taking every opportunity to criticize them.

So-called left market anarchists, while their theory isn't radical in the slightest, I would even argue less radical than the social anarchists and Marxist-Leninists. Many post-leftists claim to be left market anarchists themselves despite the post left claiming to be more radical than anybody, needless to say, I don't think any real post-leftists want them either. Perhaps all the people urging us not to criticize them do it out of sympathy because they know as well as we do that left market anarchism poses no threat to the capitalist system whatsoever. Like the social anarchists, they want to keep some parts of capitalism and remove others, in this case, they would remove everything except for the state because markets have always worked so well without state regulation and intervention! Every leftist knows that capitalism can absolutely function without a state! Would the ideal world of left market anarchism instead have a people's council to decide such things, a people's guard, or whatever other names they substitute for "state". But no, they don't want to keep everything else, they want cooperatives instead of privately owned property. They actually manage to be more ignorant of the process of valorization of labor being the factor which oppresses the workers regardless of whether they are the boss or not. The workers are still sacrificing their time and quality of life to constantly produce, to constantly reduce their labor to an alienating system of measuring it; production itself is oppressive. If they continue to delude themselves into thinking that their theory is in anyway egoistic or individualistic then we certainly have no hope for them.

Of course, seeing as their ideas are currently rendered non-threatening by the state of capital, we invite people to explore different theories and read, before they inevitably get to us.

Part 2

Philosophy of Philosophy

Some claim that our ideas are in fact not philosophy, but are instead anti-philosophy; nothing could be further from the truth, in fact, we are on our way to becoming the very blossoming of philosophy. Philosophy is best utilized as the critical flow of thought against all sacred pursuits, against religion and against ideology. Philosophy which does not think for the reader, but provides a critique which provokes the reader to think for themselves, to apply their subjectivity to the ideas put forth. When one reads a piece of philosophy that resonates with them they discover the advantage that philosophy has over other modes of thought, while religion expects one to sacrifice their desires and experiences to "living right", real philosophy does no such thing, instead, it affirms your experiences and relation to the world. Philosophy is a mirror which shows us our realities and desires, ones which we knew all along but could never realize. When a piece of philosophy resonates with you emotionally, you know you've found your truth. The acknowledgement of personal aspects and motivations causes us to go through a regeneration every time we find ourselves through philosophy. Philosophy has evolved up to this point, having its roots in the natural alienation of humans from an environment out to get them, tendencies which evolved into philosophy as religion, then to philosophy as ideology, and finally philosophy as reflection and deconstruction. We want to regenerate our perceptions so that we may become wiser actors

during the revolution. Why do most religions and ideologies share the same messages, partially because ideology and many philosophies arose out of religion, to understand the latter we must understand the relationship between the former and the lower classes. Religion, Western and Eastern ones (a special investigation would need to be taken in order to understand New World religions prior to invasion) share a similar message of obedience while hinting at revolutionary positions, it is in this way that we know our analysis of social constructs is correct, while the lower classes did trick themselves into repression, their condition as oppressed and desire to abolish their oppression is evident. The tendency of most religions, ideologies is to communicate a universal doctrine of submission, one which grows more and more lenient as the oppressed come to terms with their own condition as the productive method progresses.

Alienation in Relation to Bourgeois Ideology

There are two types of alienation that interest us, one of the alienation between the individual and their immediate environment due to the commodification and objectification of everything; the other the alienation between the individual and the wider aims of society, or more accurately, the supposed aims of society. Both forms of alienation manifest themselves on a deeply psychological level, as is the nature of alienation, causing the proletariat's perception of themselves (in reference to individual notions of self-worth), to be both oppressed and repressed. It is oppressed in the sense that the commodification of all social relations dominates self-worth, by enforcing one's ability to produce and gain an abstract social standing (which almost only comes about through submission and usefulness to capital both materially and ideologically) over his own deep-seated desires and perceptions. Material alienation, as it continues to objectify, commodify, fetishize, and standardize relations; spawns an ideological landscape which mimics it. Ideologies, religions, and pseudo philosophies tend to share common characteristics, whether it be a false opposition between political ideas such as those seen in liberalism, the prevailing political stance of today, or a fetishization of old slogans and symbols as a means to invoke some pseudo emotional response, a response only felt because everyone else that thinks like you are feeling it (this seems to be used by many political fronts). While both sides are not only capitalist but also lack much difference in the way they manage it, most being neoliberals; they create a false dichotomy between socially liberal and socially conservative views. While most socially conservative views align with the views commonly held during the golden years of capitalism; socially liberal views tend to justify themselves by the ideology of liberalism, notions such as everyone has certain unalienable rights and all men are created equal, despite the problems that come along with such ideas under capitalism. Both serve to simply uphold different versions of the same status quo within the greater political sphere, so while they do have some difference, they do not inherently oppose each other nor do either propose a real alternative to the current state of things. Such false dichotomies arise out of a reaction to the standardization of ideology, as they all end up serving the same societal method, despite not all methods being systematically capitalist, the oppression associated and inherent to capitalism continues to persist because these ideologies continued a capitalist societal form. Such ideologies, leftist ones included, arose out of conditions which were not compatible with communism so it would make sense that they continued a capitalist societal method. Such a method or form brings us to the second kind of alienation mentioned, that of the individual and the aims or rather, the method of society. The relations which created all previous and current systems including capitalism have always been created according to the benefit of

the ruling class within that system, such a system could only offer wealth and power of course, not direct living. Such a method focuses on both benefiting the ruling class but also reproducing its own conditions as well as the conditions of all classes. It only benefits the ruling class out of the reproduction of that class and that class relation, which is done by continuing to reproduce itself, as class relation is inherent to these conditions. Due to the reproduction of class associated with this form, as class implies hierarchy, a society which arranges social relations and persons according to productive use is always formed. Material tendencies manifest themselves both sociologically and individually, they disrupt and control each other, however, in practice they tend to lose their dichotomy. This form finds a home in ideology as well, as the common characteristic which all ideologies share is a program which aims to rearrange social relations and roles, instead of getting rid of the roles and demanding that we arrange ourselves according to our desires, whether they be beneficial or harmful to us is none of our concern, as being arranged and driven towards constantly reproducing our arrangement is harmful to us anyway. In this, we mediate ourselves through a morality and ideology of arrangement, of external use, and of production; as the form of reproduction creates an ideological landscape which only serves to uphold it. The alienation that this form creates scatters across many areas of life, it is an alienation of the individual from this method of arrangement and constant production because it doesn't benefit them, it agonizes them, it represses their emotions and ideas, it hinders their creativity, it causes them to constantly police themselves by discouraging pursuits of unproductive pleasure, or anything unproductive in general. The guilt one feels after partying all night is a perfect example of this, creating anxiety throughout daily life over maintaining a "healthy" balance between productivity and non-productivity. An anxiety which eventually can only be controlled through some form of escapism.

It is this psychological impact which particularly interests us, how do individuals react to the alienation and anxiety imposed upon them throughout their lives? While the individual is, on the one hand, anxious because she has to deal with performing well at work so as to not get fired, she is certainly not breathing a sigh of relief when she clocks out. When she goes to work she is answering the question, "how will I survive", and when she gets off she realizes the amount of time she's both wasted in living but spent well in surviving. The problem of balancing one's time between work and free time, when to recover from work and when to rest up for it, is a constant negotiation in which you are constantly on the losing end, because you are sacrificing your time for time which is not your own, time which is spent selling yourself to survive only so that once your shift is over you are faced with the same negotiation at the same odds. This is what the proletariat is deeply anxious about, the avoidance of a reality that stares them in the face every day, that they are wasting their lives. At a certain point their lives not only are wasted but become increasingly difficult to find, much of the entertainment capitalism has to offer is disappointing, they're often too tired from work to notice. While one can certainly utilize their time, live, during their time off of work, that life is corrupted by the anxiety experienced as another day of time wasted draws near. If you ever had a meltdown when coming to a realization that you've wasted your life, it's because you have. Christianity attempts to offer us a solution, there must be another life, because if there is another life, one in which all time is your time, and life literally lasts for eternity (the elimination of such anxiety entirely), then there is a method to the madness of this world. Of course, Christianity predates capitalism, but it does not predate labor and the separation between work and free time, it especially does not predate slavery. Christianity is, in fact, all about sacrifice, a gross fetishization of it, the very premise of Christ sacrificing

himself in order for believers to have a chance at a second life is the perfect summarization of the tendency we are about to go deeper into. Interestingly enough, the existence of hell is the logical conclusion of the life work negotiation, if you do not sacrifice one life, you have to sacrifice it in the other. How convenient that the proles have no choice but to sacrifice their lives in this one; God wants them to do so, or rather because they have no choice in the matter, a God in which they could only hope is benevolent wants them to. I suppose if one were to apply such an idea to the nature of class hierarchy and production that would be true. Note that this is not just inherent to Western ideas but Eastern ones as well, Buddhism, for instance, follows the same logic, only sins are replaced by vague ideas of desire. Such an idea has only survived because the material conditions have accelerated life-work anxiety, and although Christianity as an organized religion has been phasing out for quite some time, it lives on in the narratives it influenced, particularly morality and political ideology. All immoral actions and ideas are at heart, in their purest form, are rejections of work based sacrifice, and are primarily deemed immoral for that reason. Theft, forms of violence, any form of sexual activity that isn't heterosexual, sexual deviancy, etc., are all, while they may not necessarily be healthy for everyone involved, are unproductive in the greater capitalist sense and cannot be profitable to the capitalist state (because the proletariat would cause an outrage). These activities, when not done for the sake of profit, are not forms of sacrifice in this context. To not forgive someone for any indulgence in life, as besides morality, God also encourages sacrifice as a virtue in itself, is to refuse them a chance to justify their quietly miserable condition by rendering them stuck with only this life; it demoralizes the collective by showing them their fragility. Besides which, to forgive in the Christian sense is to validate that a sin is, in fact, a sin by implying that it needs to be forgiven. The fact that they realize that everyone "sins" shows us how it was indeed the proles, not the ruling class, which primarily created and enforced as they do even today Christian ideas; everybody has time off of work and will indulge in them because that is what they negotiate their time for. Work is the ball and chain of life, taxing it in pain in order for it to continue to even have a chance of acting. I can't live if I don't survive first. Even political ideologies, ones which even claim to be atheist and progressive, leftist even, talk of liberation as if it were morally right, well it's only morally right because to be liberated implies that you were not before, you had to sacrifice before deserving the resolution of your anxiety. We don't know what real freedom is, freedom without ever needing a sacrifice to be experienced, will it even really exist as we think of it? Probably not. Our ideas rely heavily on binaries, perhaps the idea of losing touch with one state which then makes alien the other is what drives us to justify our misery. We forget how adaptable we are. Most probably the main force which drives the proletariat especially but the bourgeois as well, is their powerlessness in the face of capital and it's process, powerlessness to stop it anyway, the sacrifice of their lives for a distant other one reflects how distant directly lived experience really is in capitalism, because a God wants them to quite literally survive in order to get to live; gives their sacrifice meaning because it is going to reward them with non-sacrifice in the end. Justification quickly becomes an aspiration, and the more the alienated condition of the proletariat worsens, the more it has to be made an ideal, romanticized, and fetishized in order to encourage them to aspire to old values. It is a reaction to capitalism's decay, as the reward for labor diminishes and misery increases, one aspires to become a representation of the very thing that is oppressing them in an attempt to gain the standing of God but will always fail, as they will never become more autonomous than their comrades. Christianity is most likely existentialist in reality. But make no mistake, the material basis for "God" is real, and we will kill him.

Communization will make all time our time, my time will be my time and your time will be yours; through this full living is the default. As the time constraints imposed upon us by labor and capital are abolished, it can only be inferred that moral restraints may wither away to a significant degree. This process will take some time, as morality has been heavily ingrained into us, however, all other capitalist relations have been as well. That being said, it may be useful to prepare yourself for the coming revolution, and the process of communization, by transgressing bourgeois morality now, our comrades can create a truly revolutionary environment within our circles. Of course bourgeois morality will not be done away with unless the material conditions which produce such a morality, especially that of time under capitalism (although other capitalist conditions most likely also produce a moral reaction, further investigation is needed), because of this we can only do so much, however morality is not a material condition it is a psychological one, and therefore is more subject to our manipulation. Even creating an environment which is more communal may help you wiggle your way out of moral constraints. The proletariat will only be able to completely divorce bourgeois morality once communization occurs, the alienation which produces morality will be abolished, which will usher in an era of chaotic creativity, many are likely to become self-destructive in their fear of such radical change, which is why communists exist now. The usefulness of communists today can be realized in our transgressive and knowledgeable talents, skills which must be honed in order to be used effectively. Our goal right now is to prepare ourselves for communization, to be aware of the material conditions, to understand to the best of our abilities what may become of them, to acknowledge the way capitalism shapes the way we think and to disrupt that influence the best we can, to radicalize more people, and to practice relations which will provide as a net for the proletariat to rely on during and immediately after revolution. Whether you call it a party or not, as communists of similar tendencies begin to band together, we can serve as primarily a way of integrating disillusioned people into communist relations. Such action is likely to be more necessary in the very latest stages of capitalism, prior to the revolution and during, however even that is something that is expected to occur fairly easily without our help, as the material conditions will necessitate communal living as a means of survival. Many “radicals” contest that rejecting the morality we know now is counter-revolutionary, as they claim that the proletariat will moralize against capitalism as a means of class consciousness; yet the only arguments against capitalism moralist leftists can come up with only relate to how this society goes wrong and how they could create a society that would instead go right. Again, the idea that communism is simply another way to organize people, and the only problem with capitalism is that it organizes people in the wrong way seems to plague these leftists to the point where we legitimately wonder if perhaps it has something to do with bourgeois morality. Morality is largely dictated around how society is to be arranged, it does not consider the fact that society is headed to a point in which it can no longer be arranged because morality has never existed in an environment in which people were not alienated and powerless. Basing one’s criticisms of bourgeois morality proves to cease to be a criticism at all, as their only answer to capitalism is another arrangement, a carrying on of alienation. Some might even say that we are being moralistic in saying that society is no longer to be arranged, we don’t see it that way at all, we only see communism as the conclusion to capitalism, we don’t care whether or not you consider it to be morally right or wrong. We don’t even consider capitalism to be morally wrong, it is the progression of feudalism. So don’t be afraid to break the law, don’t be afraid to be brutal or disgusting, embrace degeneracy, embody everything bourgeois moral-

ity hates. Don't get caught up with pseudo-radicals, they are ignorant of the ways capitalism influences them.

The conditions of societies have created ideas and values which have manifested themselves in slogans, in narratives, and have impacted us on an emotional level; despite most of these "modern" or "Western" ideals often contradicting themselves with events. As capital further progresses, the ideals which are used to justify the material conditions become obviously emptier and emptier, not because capitalism destroys all value and meaning but because there was no meaning to the values in the first place, the golden age of capitalism is over, the more it progresses the more its bonds disintegrate, the more that default becomes known. To put it simply, we disagree with many communists in the notion that there is a deeper meaning to be found in communism, a meaning that capitalism has suppressed. Whether or not capitalism disregards the value of humanity is none of our concern because we do not believe there was any, to begin with. Like all ideas, meaning and value arise as the human reaction to material conditions, as such reactions have tended to be justifications or pseudo rebellions against alienated, hierarchical systems. Therefore, we conclude that the notion of existentialist meaning and purpose will either be exclusive to the subjective realm or won't exist at all under communism. On one hand, meaning today implies that one ought to value X, which it can then be inferred that X is morally correct. For example, a common theme of bourgeois ideology is the notion that doing the right thing is meaningful, while bad things are senseless, something may no longer be immoral if it has good reason to be carried out, it is then therefore meaningful because there is meaning, reason, or purpose for doing X. What if there is a reason to do an immoral act however that reason is also immoral? Then there should be some meaning to it, right? Surprisingly, wrong, we have yet to see such an occurrence, an immoral act without a moral reason for doing so is simply immoral, despite moral reason being a fairly relative term, or such an act is meaningful if in some way it conveys a message on what is moral. While you could experiment with meaning, and give immoral acts without moral reasoning meaning instead, you would still be defining your actions by moralistic reasoning. Not only does this demonstrate the limitations of subjective meaning under capitalism, but also anti-moralism under capitalism; the problem with anti-moralism is that it validates morality by implying it's influence. However, this doesn't mean we don't embrace anti-moralism, anti-moralism may imply that morality's influence exists but unlike its counterpart, it delegitimizes that influence by rejecting that it coincides with our goals. Anti-moralism, when expressed correctly, soon evolves into amoralism, which is the normalization of activities, desires, or movements which are thought of as immoral, while this still implies that morality has influence, it now lacks power within said circle because it is no longer thought of as naturally opposed to it, instead the amoral circle is a completely separate thing where morality's influence is reduced to a casual negative. The point of our movement, of course, is to transcend bourgeois morality, morality as we have always known it, that in turn means eventually transcending anti and amoralism; something that can only be done under communism, when the material conditions no longer include a reality which necessitates them. The same thing can be said for existential meaning, as it is deeply linked to morality, it will also be transcended under communism. Whether or not a radically different kind of morality and also existential meaning arises out of the conditions of communism is not something we oppose nor deeply theorize. As for meaning, existential meaning, the drive to measure up can only be done at this point according to turning oneself into a tool for the sole purpose of usefulness to capitalism. Although the search for meaning may be defined differently for everyone, the ideas in

which meaning is compared are false objectives. We can expect an eventual secularization after communism has been around for a while, due to the almost complete lack of alienation in which ideas such as existential meaning and religion arose. Because of this, we tend to be partial to nihilist positions.

Some Words on Civilization¹

Capitalism is, of course, present in nearly every facet of our lives, especially in the first world where it has progressed further; but no more is this obvious than in the organization of civilization. While civilization is necessary to an extent, we don't see the natural elements going away anytime soon, even the most primitive manifestations of it have been in reaction to and to an extent reproduce alienation. Primitive peoples created shelters which although necessary for survival, reinforced the alienation they felt from their helplessness in relation to the natural world. Likewise, the structures which were built in the age of social alienation reinforced the alienation felt as a result of productive inversion, the separate nature of these buildings and specialization that is their function reinforces the separation between production and consumption, work and free time, political and personal. A person works in the office or factory and then leaves to go to a separate building, her home, to spend her time off work, to eat and sleep. Buildings are specialized for specific functions, and standardized in order to reproduce spaces for such activities on a massive scale; the organization of civilization today is a reflection of the way capitalism functions. Although such separation does not create alienation in itself, the necessity for this physical specialization (as activities are separated they each need separate spaces to do such activities), reinforces the alienation felt by specialization by the very representation of every space as physically separate. Civilization is not capitalism, however, today, it is both a manifestation and representation of capitalism, the function of spaces for generating capital and the representation of the mode of production in those spaces due to their functional necessity. This spacial alienation is especially prevalent in urban areas because there is not only more centralization around production, there is a higher degree of specialized standardization of spaces in a smaller area. For this reason, we believe that communization will arise from the cities first. Under communism, exponential production is not necessary for survival and there isn't a degree of alienation which must be replicated spatially in order for that productive capacity to be met; because it already has been met. We are curious as to how we will shelter ourselves from the elements when we no longer have to build civilization around production, most likely, however, we want to. Until communism, civilization will always be a representation, communism will abolish civilization as we know it. Subjectivity will be acted upon spaces, the notion that there is a separation between housing and other buildings will diminish, as the separation between work and free time will under communism. As the notion of work, an activity systemically done as a sacrifice will be abolished so will spaces which are strictly not housing. Buildings will exist as shelters however the buildings will not be specialized, they will be used for however a person sees fit, one doesn't even need to sleep in a shelter if they choose to. Permanent residence will eventually become less widespread, as the existence of permanent residence is primarily a relationship of consumption. Without having to pay for a place, what's stopping people from staying in multiple different buildings and areas within their lifetime? Imagine a few buildings

¹ This section can be interpreted according to the difference between technology and tools made in anti-civ theory, in this case all mentions of technology could be reinterpreted to mean tools however this can be discarded.

which lack specific purpose, being occupied by several people who change every day or week. The only limit is your preferred scenery or people to talk to. Agriculture will work similarly, as well as technology, while agriculture will exist, it will lack a specialization, perhaps gardens will be used for both food, aesthetics, and spaces where people can socialize. Agriculture will be integrated into other structures. Technology is the same, while machines will exist, we are likely to get to a point in which there will no longer be the specialization of machines, a machine can be used for many many things, similar to computers, machines can be integrated into spaces as well. Under communism, the need for large amounts of space to be taken up by buildings, agriculture, and machinery will diminish. We are opposed to civilization as objective representation.

On What to Do

While the spectacle seeks to represent life as a means for us to pretend to live through it, that representation is by no means fake, rather it is a reflection of our own spectacular lives by the very conditions which spectacularize them. We do not live directly in the first place, primarily anyway, direct life can be experienced to an extent under capitalism. The roles, the times, the constructs, but more importantly the very inversion of society and of all our lives are reflected back to us through the spectacle. Our lives are already spectacular, and art really does imitate life. Disappointment follows us everywhere, we pass through life rather than live it, our lives are passive by nature; roles within productive society are pushed onto us during childhood only for us to then be coerced into taking them on in adulthood. Such roles are not dictated by us, but rather for a pointless survival, we are chained by our own instinct; and as emotional trouble arises within the proletariat that instinct is often overcome. The worker realizes her own hopelessness, the absurd, miserable, and unjustifiable reality of her condition as being a member of the proletariat; out of her new consciousness arises both the desire to self-destruct in some way and the desire to destroy the everything else, because why not? It doesn't matter, so therefore I can live as much as I want. While the former is logical as we do oppress ourselves, self-hatred is not needed, you will never measure up to the role you are supposed to fit into, the morality you must hold, or the civility expected of you; but those don't matter either, they are not objective. The former can be remedied through the understanding of the latter, the external conditions which create the internal ones. The latter is the desire which will lead to revolution, it is the desire for direct life, for egoism, and for communism. Class consciousness, only the realization of the proletariat condition, will be brought about through the material conditions, as capital dominates more and more of our space and time, it's failure to satisfy our urge to directly live will cause us to reject it altogether. Yet the latter desire is what we want to explore and cultivate; until the revolution, our lives will be spectacular, through communism we will learn how to live again. Baby steps can be taken now and are crucial to providing networks and support during times of need during this process. The story of capitalism can be told from primarily two sides, the progression of capitalism from the perspective of the economy, or the progression of the proletariat by reference to their reaction to capitalism. While we want to keep our options open, we want to start this journey by analyzing the latter and cultivating the nihilistic desire for life.

We are not here to predict the communist revolution, nor do we think an accurate prediction can be made, while we certainly are not naive enough to declare that the revolution is now, do not mistake our cynicism for lack of action; revolution may or may not be just around the corner, but collapse is happening right now and has been for the past few decades. We find that

those who fetishize action are delusional enough to think that revolution is a switch that can be turned on at any time, we also find people who refuse to act for ideological reasons delusional(as a concept, a boogie man of the left, the myth of the armchair communist. A position that isn't actually held by anyone even left communists, a basic understanding of left communist theory would make this obvious.) for thinking that they can somehow predict when a revolution can happen or not. We see our own radicalization and drive to explore the extent to which we can free ourselves now, as well as the spread of our ideas a natural part of the progression of capitalism. We are not talking about reform, as reform has only shown to tame us, it is just as tyrannical if not more so than we had dealt with before. We are most likely entering the fascist stage of capital's decline, which means that now more than ever we must preserve radical information, build networks of support and insurrection, and begin to spread our message now. While we may be able to muster up quite a crowd now, it is unlikely that we would be able to reach enough people for a full-blown revolution. In the meantime, we will make our ideas known, cultivate proletariat nihilism, and shoot first. We understand the proletariat as a class but also as a group of miserable human beings, individuals who for the most part don't know why they're miserable, the fact that they come looking for information shows us that the movement is growing. When the proletariat rejects capitalism they embrace communism when they embrace communism they negate themselves as a class; we could eventually do this starting now. With this in mind, our circle has no further purpose than to encompass all facets of the revolution to the point where the distinction between us and the movement dissipates.

The Anarchist Library (Mirror)
Anti-Copyright



D.Z. Rowan
The Ultra Left International
A Manifesto
7/28/18

Retrieved on 8/9/18 from <https://ultraleftinternational.wordpress.com/>

usa.anarchistlibraries.net