



‘NATIONAL BOLSHEVISM’ IN A NEW LIGHT

- its relation to fascism, racism, identity, individuality, community, political parties and the state

‘National Bolshevism’ is anti-fascist, anti-capitalist, anti-statist, anti-racist and ‘trans-identitarian’.

Fascism is worship of the national capitalist or imperial state. Yet the nation is not the state. The nation is its people. And people are individuals.

Being English or French, German or Russian, being white or black, male or female, Christian or Jewish, Islamic or Hindu, socialist or nationalist, conservative or revolutionary etc. may be a valid and even creatively dominant *part* of who an individual is – an important *part* of their identity – but it is neither their *whole identity* (their ‘whole self’) nor its *essence*.

Therefore to *identify solely* with being *anything* – whether German or Russian, white or black, male or female, Christian or Jewish, Islamic or Hindu, nationalist or socialist - is a *diminution* and *impoverishment* of our whole self or identity.

‘Individuality’ is what uniquely combines both the distinctiveness and ‘in-divisibility’ of the countless identities that make up our whole self.

To identify with a particular race, colour, ethnicity or nationality is, similarly, a diminution of our whole self – which embraces *many possible and actual identities*.

Limited and limiting identifications lead nationalists to the fascist ideal of total identification of the individual with a state.

Bourgeois, liberal or capitalist ideology however, identifies the individual *self* simply with his or her ego - treating identity itself as the ‘private property’ of this ego or ‘I’. Fascism simply substitutes this egoic ‘I’ with the state or leader as ‘super-ego’.

Fascist ideology identifies the self with its religion or ethnicity, the nation with the state, and the ego with the leader of the ‘nation state’.

The biggest mistake of nationalists and socialists has been the identification of the individual, the people and the nation with a particular identity represented by *the state*.

The greatest mistake of socialist and communist parties is the identification of individual, communal people’s or worker’s power with *state power*.

The aim of socialist and communist parties should *not* be to seek to attain *state power* through elections or seize it through revolutions.

It cannot be the aim of socialist or communist parties or organisations to ‘represent’ or act ‘on behalf’ of the people, let alone to take and exercise power ‘for’ them - for this runs directly counter to the aim of communism i.e. freeing people from all *power over* their free and autonomous *power to*.

“The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to the other working-class parties.”

The Communist Manifesto

National Bolsheviks are Communists – but opposed to both one-party and multi-party states.

They believe that communist political parties, like *all* political parties and all forms of social organisation should serve only to cultivate, disseminate and debate *ideas* i.e. new potentials for individual, group and communal action – and leaders capable of articulating those ideas.

Their aim as parties should not be to fight *for* but - in John Holloway’s terms - “against and beyond” state power – for the state which exercises “power over” people in a way which expropriates the autonomous power *of* the people and their autonomous “power to”.

The autonomous power *of* the people is their innate power *to* – a power to act according to their own desires and their own innate creative potencies, possibilities or potentials of action.

Resistance to capitalism means resistance to all form of *expropriation* and all exercise of *power over* people’s innate *power to* i.e. their creative and productive activity or “labour power” in Marxist terms.

The *overcoming* of capitalism on the other hand, is the exercise of complete freedom of the individual in the way they exercise and fulfil their innate potentials of creative and productive activity – their innate power *to*.

Capitalist enterprises and corporations exercise power over the people by *directing* the way that individuals use their innate potentials for action (their “labour power” or “power to”), expropriating its products, and also determining its *value* for society according solely to its exchange value or ‘market value’.

‘Wage-slavery’ is the not just the economic expropriation and exploitation of the individual’s labour power or power *to* but its enforced yet totally unfree exercise – its ‘employment’ in a way that bears little or no relation to each individual’s unique creative potentials or power *to* - and therefore leaves the individual *unemployed* – whether or not they ‘have a job’.

From this point of view it is absurd, for example, for socialist to demands ‘jobs’ and ‘full employment’ – for that is a demand for as much wage-slavery as possible, rather than its opposite – the freedom of individuals, groups and communities to exercise their individual and collective ‘power to’ in the way they choose – but without it being appropriated by an elite who exercise power *over* it.

Communism as Marx defined it is a society in which “The free development of *each* [i.e. the free cultivation and exercise of their innate creative potentials and *power to*] *is the condition* for the *free development of all*” and not the other way round.

The idea that communism can be achieved by either a one-party state or a multi-party *state* however, is fundamentally flawed.

Communism means “the withering away of the state” (Marx). Yet the attainment of communism cannot be achieved through first establishing a people’s or worker’s ‘state’.

Indeed there is not, never has been and cannot be any such thing as a people's 'state' or worker's 'state'.

For the modern 'nation state' (as opposed to feudal monarchies) arose with and must disappear with capitalism.

The 'nation state' is capitalist *in principle* - for is ruled by the banks and corporations - who use the pretence of exercising state power 'on behalf' of the people (whether through 'representative democracy' or dictatorship) to exercise power *over* them.

The nation as 'state' needs to be replaced by the nation as a free association of sovereign individuals in the form of *non-feudal* and *self-governing* economic enterprises, educational institutions, communities and municipalities based on direct democracy – not dictatorship or 'representative' democracy.

Protection of national sovereignty therefore, is not protection of the nation as a state but of the nation as a *sovereign people* – as a direct and truly democratic community of autonomous and sovereign individuals and communities.

The state however, like capitalist corporation is undemocratic in principle – turning both free individual and collective *power to* into an object of its own *power over*.

Today it is the international banks that rule nation states, parliaments, political leaders - and even capitalist corporations - not just through wage-slavery but through neo-feudal debt-slavery.

Debt-slavery both destroys jobs and reinforces people's dependence on them – on wage-slavery.

Yet freely chosen, creative, productive, individually fulfilling and socially valuable activity or 'labour' is not the same as 'employment' in the form of wage-slavery. Instead it is activity that expresses the innate qualities and fulfils the values and potentials of the individual. It therefore constitutes a form of work or labour whose *value* cannot be measured in purely quantitative and monetary terms.

Wage-slavery creates a vast separation between active and productive work or *labour* on the one hand and from *pleasure* on the other - turning pleasure itself into nothing more than an industry whose commodities serve to make up for a basic lack of pleasure *in labour itself* – in the free exercise of *power to*.

Wage-slavery, reinforced by debt-slavery is essentially ownership, exploitation and control of the individual's *time*. Therefore *the single most important form of resistance to capitalism* is the exercise of all means possible to re-appropriate our own time - allowing us to use time to *freely* choose the way we exercise and fulfil our *individual* creative and productive potentials - our 'power to' or 'labour power'.

This means creating and expanding *time-spaces* in our lives – indeed even in our jobs - in which our activity or labour as individuals is in one way or another freely chosen, freely conducted, and above all engaged in *in our own time*.

Taking our time increases the *quality* of the time we give to an activity or task – thus adding to its *qualitative value* rather than reducing its value purely to the *quantity* of time put into it.

Through *taking our time* we can release and fulfil new and pleasurable ‘powers to’ rooted in our own innate and unique qualities and potentials as individuals.

Exercising these unique *powers to* - by acting in our own time and in our own unique way - allows us to not only to *pleasurably fulfil* our individual values and potentials but thereby also to make a unique contribution to *society as a whole*.

Capitalism measures and rewards the *clock time* of our labour and its purely *quantitative value*.

Communism replaces payment according to the *social status, market value* and *quantity* of an individual’s work with payment according to an individual’s *quality* of work and its *value* for *society as a whole*.

Resistance to capitalism then, means *above all* resisting all pressures to reduce *subjective time* to a constricted quantity of ‘objective’ clock time.

Subjective time is *awareness time* – the time we give to *being aware* of all that we do, thereby enabling ourselves to do it from a *qualitatively* deepened, enriched and expanded *awareness*.

Awareness transcends both action and identity. For by its very nature, the awareness of any activity or identity transcends that activity or identity, whilst at the same time also *embracing* countless alternate or possible activities and identities.

Identity itself is essentially the result of an act of identification i.e. is itself a form of activity.

Conversely, any given form of activity is at the same time the enactment of a specific identity.

Freedom is the gift that awareness grants to *choose* between different activities and identifications, whilst at the same time not regarding them as mutually exclusive – as either totally the same or totally different – but rather as *simferent*.

If any two things or people were totally same they would not be two things at all but one.

Similarly, if any two things or people were *totally* different there could be no relation whatsoever between them.

Essentially then, identity is neither sameness nor difference but ‘similarity-in-difference’ or ‘simference’.

Simference is a wholly new understanding of all forms of *identity* – linguistic, religious, political, cultural, behavioural and even biological.

No one ‘inherits’ exactly the same nose, mouth or eyes as a parent or grandparent for example. There may be a distinct similarity, but one that also is inseparable from an element of difference. The two noses are neither exactly the same nor completely different – instead they are *simferent*.

‘Simference’ is not merely a banal recognition that things and people may be exactly the same in certain respects ‘and’ different in others. For again, both *absolute* sameness or identity and *absolute* difference are impossible *in any respect*.

Instead *simference* is the understanding that both things and people are different *in the very ways in which are similar* and in similar *in the very ways they are different*.

Simference is that understanding of identity that Wittgenstein called 'family resemblance' rather than absolute identity or sameness.

Both families and communities are founded on identity understood as *simference* and not as sameness.

Identification with others strives for identity with others in the form of sameness and negates identity as *simference*. In negating the essence of identity as *simference* it also negates the essence of *individuality* as *simference*.

Identity understood merely as sameness defines itself *by* difference. Thus to 'be' Protestant or Orthodox Christian for example, is essentially to *differ* from being a Catholic one.

Identity as mere *sameness* in other words, *cannot do without difference*. Its only recourse then, is to turn difference into some form of foreign or alien 'otherness' - an otherness to which it nevertheless remains *eternally bound* through either *hatred* or *indifference* - albeit at the expense of true identity and selfhood, which is *neither* sameness *nor* difference but *simference*.

No two Russians, Germans, Arabs or Jews are German, Russian, Arab or Jewish in the exactly same way - or in a *totally* different way. What *unites* them is their *simference*.

The same relation of *simference* applies to two or more family members, to two or more members of a racial, cultural, ethnic, religious community, to two or more people sharing what appears to be the 'same' ideology or worldview - or to two or more people *seemingly* sharing the 'same' identity *in any respect whatsoever*.

Why is this important? It is so because it allows us to distinguish National Bolshevism from any form of Hitlerist biological racism and any notions of race purity - whilst at the same time both maintaining and refining the whole concept of communal or common 'identity' through the notion of *simference*.

Genetics alone of course, has long shown that the notion of biological race purity is nonsense - for the fact is that a so-called 'pure' white 'Aryan' may share less genes in common with another 'pure white Aryan' than with a black African or Jew.

Nevertheless the wholly false identification of *psychical value commonality* with *biological race purity* persists.

So also however does the false identification of community or commonality (cultural, ethnic, religious or political) with mere sameness *or* difference - as opposed to *simference*.

The *state* and its institutions puts people in categorical boxes that imply mere sameness - asking them to tick their sex, principal language, religion, colour, ethnicity, nationality etc.

But what then is a 'nation' in contrast to a state? This is a basic question is we are to properly understand what the word 'National' in 'National Bolshevism' refers. The nation *as such* is its people, whose ethnic variety and diversity cannot be reduced to mere categorical boxes, mere similarities *or* differences.

What brings individuals together as ethnic communities - and in turn can brings those communities together as a 'nation' in the sense of a union of communities - are neither similarities nor differences but *simferences* in their respective root values, religion, language and cultures.

In Europe tribal, ethnic, linguistic and cultural differences of different tribes and peoples (Volker) were the basis of successful resistance to the rule, firstly, of the imperial Roman state and later the Roman papacy. So much for the word 'National' in 'National Bolshevism'.

But what about the word 'Bolshevism'? The slogan of the Bolsheviks was 'All Power to the Soviets' i.e. not to bourgeois parliaments but to autonomous, self-governing councils - and to industrial and agricultural communes. Any notion of a one-party Soviet *state* ruling over its own Soviets is therefore *not* Bolshevik.

'National Bolshevism' then, strives not just for a *non-party* state as opposed to a one-party or multi-party state but for a *stateless* society i.e. *communism* in the Marxist but also wider sense - understood as the free association of individuals in self-governing communities and communities of communities - owned and ruled over by no one and ruled instead by their own different values, and power to realise them.

Both the words 'National' and 'Bolshevism' look backward historically. On the one hand this can be seen as unfortunate and as making the term 'National Bolshevism' seem 'out-dated' in modern, post-modern and liberal terms.

Yet what is conserved in this term is something revolutionary - the possibility of unified multi-ethnic nations that are not *divided* by ethnicity (the aim of both multi-culturalism *and* its enemies) but united by *different* spiritual and cultural values - all of which stand against the global empire that now rules all *nations* as political *states*.

This is the *Empire of Money* i.e. "the devaluation of all values" by the pure abstraction of monetary 'value' - and with it, the crass commodification, degradation and destruction of the true spiritual wealth of different peoples and their historical national cultures.

Peter Wilberg, 2011