



# Alliance against Conformity

## Bund gegen Anpassung

[www.bund-gegen-anpassung.com](http://www.bund-gegen-anpassung.com)

---

**It's true: we are communists.**

**Why?**

Certainly not because we prefer common property **as such** to private property (ownership of means of production; Marx and Engels never had anything against any other kind of private property anyway as there is no reasonable point to it, despite all the malignant lies concerning this topic even at their time, see Marx/Engels Collected Works, Vol. VI p. 497ff.; just like Marx, Engels and Lenin we leave renunciation of worldly commodities and social masochism to Christians and the "Greens"). We simply think having common property is better than having **no property at all**. For not owning the foundation of one's existence means to become a victim of extortion. This is what we don't want to be or to remain. Whoever doesn't want that either should stop avoiding us. It could be rewarding, even if it is just for the purpose of keeping one's dignity: not to be the idiot permanently manipulated by teachers, newspapers or other media controlled by the ruling class.

We also wouldn't have any objection against a craftsmen's and farmers' idyll as it existed during certain periods of the Middle Ages or the pioneering days of Northern America. At that time, it was not exceptional and still possible to be the owner of one's means of production. But such structures have not been competitive any longer for quite some time already as they were based upon a very low technical standard. Today, however, with a reasonable and efficient distribution of labour, **three working hours a day would be enough** to enable **all people** to enjoy a much higher standard of living than the one Germans have today, i.e. approximately that of Western Germany during the Eighties, which really was quite good ("Schaufenster des Westens" ["Show-case of the West"]). However, in order to achieve this, several generations of one-child families world wide would be necessary to make the number of people match the resources available on our planet. That would be quite easy, if the one-child family policy would only be propagated and supported half as much as today's propaganda that makes smoking a target of ostracism or preaches endless shrinking of the standard of living and mobility for no reasonable purpose at all. For our parasites in power, who are controlling the media and have been streamlining and using them for their own purpose for a long time, hate

nothing more than decreasing competition among the unpropertied people, resulting in a decrease of the latter's susceptibility to extortion. But this is what would actually happen quite soon if the number of people were to decrease, and this is therefore what this human filth in power fears most. For then, along with a growing population of black grouse and rhinos, for instance, there would also be a rise in wages and the quality of life – and what major shareholder or government parasite could like **that**? For, with increasing instead of decreasing wages but decreasing instead of increasing working hours, many people, instead of being rushed and miserable, could get brighter and wonder whether production should not be organized collectively for the supply of the people and the wage system not be replaced by a share system quite similar to that of stockholders which has been established for about the last four hundred years.

“Communism” has a bad reputation though – not only due to the defamation mentioned above but also due to the poverty and pettiness prevailing in the destroyed “Eastern Bloc”, which claimed to pursue the establishment of communism and even claimed to pursue the goals of Marx and Lenin. This inherited poverty, which it did not share with its serious military opponents, existed indeed, but was it really the result of its economic system, as schools and media have been hammering into our heads? If this had been the case, its satellite states would have had to get richer after their submission to the USA and the establishment of the capitalist system in the remains of the USSR. In reality, however, most of their inhabitants have been driven into poverty, degraded to beggar status or ruthlessly exploited by being put under extreme pressure at work, and they are all being patronized, kept on strings and lied to far more than was ever the case during normal times in any country of the Eastern Bloc.

Well, by no means do we want to simply return to the former times in the Eastern Bloc; certainly they were more comfortable and less mendacious than the present but they were also marked by a narrow-minded and depressing atmosphere, after all. Neither Marx nor Engels nor Lenin would have liked them. The planned economy existing there could have been handled in a more rational and efficient way, it is true, but this certainly was not the main cause of the poverty and therefore military weakness of the Eastern Bloc as compared to the developing wealth of its enemies. The immediate reason is far more simple, but it was actually on both sides of the “Iron Curtain” that it has been, and still is, covered with an equally iron silence or swept under the carpet: it was the **inherited** state of technical underdevelopment, the poor economic power and therefore **military weakness** of the newly founded Soviet Union. If the capitalist-imperialist states existing at that time (mainly England, the USA and France) had not been weakened **themselves** by the First World War, they would have wiped out the newly founded Soviet Union as determinedly and brutally as they are doing and have done with Syria and Libya today. Nevertheless, England and the U.S. soon saw to it, through their satellite troops, that **millions** of Russians starved to death, because the “white” mercenaries, excellently

equipped and supplied by them, destroyed factories and, in the first place, railway lines. (In view of this mega-crime, the Russian nation has been remarkably little resentful!). Nevertheless, they would have annihilated the young Soviet Union if they had not been afraid of the masses of workers they would have needed as soldiers for that purpose, soldiers who did not want to wage another war and were justly suspected of perhaps turning around their guns one day during that war. Still, in 1920, the English Prime Minister Lord Curzon was determined to declare war on the Soviet Union when his “white” satellite troops – today they would be called “rebels” – did not make progress enough, but he abandoned this plan because the labour unions in his country called a general strike against it. Today, sadly, things would be different.

This way, the young Soviet Union survived, but had lost too much blood and could never really catch up with its enemies. Its **relatively** high military expenses, **disproportionate** compared to that of the countries that were threatening it and which disposed of a rich heritage, remained too big a burden. If Germany, which, besides England, had been the leading industrial country of the world, had followed the Soviet example, the Soviet Union could have been saved. But the SPD (German Social Democratic Party) betrayed the German revolution, suffocating it in blood, and, with the help of the proto-fascist “volunteer corps” (“Freikorps”) built up for this purpose, directly paved the way for Hitler (and by their disgusting attendance at Parliament in February 1933 – as if Hitler had not had the communist blocking minority of MPs arrested just shortly before – they later gave his “seizure of power” a camouflage paint of “legality” without which the “Bohemian lance-corporal”, as Hindenburg nick-named Hitler, would have met with much more difficulty from the side of that same Hindenburg and, consequently, the Pope).

No one learns all these facts (or ever has done so) at school nor reads about them in TIME magazine - or did you ever? But, strangely enough, they were not even taught at any school in the GDR, and this is startling at first. Obviously the Eastern Bloc had a kind of “death instinct” which the “Western Bloc” and the Church were always lacking. The reason for that was that the Soviet Union, which was bled out and had no chance to catch up with its enemies, gave up its liberal and world-wide goals under Stalin **without admitting it**. All the other lies and the boundless mass murders under Stalin’s regime which may be seen as a kind of “physical” repression *sensu* Freud (i.e. of anything calling to mind Marx’s and Lenin’s objectives), resulted from this original lie. All the states of the Eastern Bloc, as they developed as a consequence of Hitler’s defeat, originated from the state under Stalin’s rule and are thus infected with this contagious lie; therefore, nothing was to be expected from them.

This also explains why the mechanism described above was never mentioned at any school: in the Eastern countries, there was the legacy of Stalinism, i.e. the loss of their liberal and collective goals, which blocked truth and resulted in ideological phrases like “Socialism will win” in order to prevent

any realistic view of the past and its consequences from coming about. Hence the military inferiority to a rich and thoroughly aggressive enemy that enforced it to make **disproportionately high** efforts to arm for its part, thus causing a decline of the standard of living, could no longer be admitted. Having been kept in the dark, the people far and wide made the principle of planned production (instead of that of production directed by trust owners) – and consequently “Communism” as such – responsible for this low standard. The image of “Communism” became connected with poverty or at least with narrowness and petty-mindedness. Yet, given military victory and the survival of Marx’ objectives, the exact opposite can be the case – Communism is tailor-made for **rich** societies (“high standard of the productive forces”); it would have been useless to detrimental in the Middle Ages. (The “Western Bloc” had no reason at all to have its own pupils told its own disgraceful deeds and to risk having them develop “silly” ideas anyway.) This explains why so many and so absurd prejudices exist about the concept of Marx and Engels (and its analytical deduction).

Since, after the first shock caused by the annexation of the GDR was over, many people are meanwhile becoming curious again about this concept, it is now being systematically covered with trash by “our” media and especially by the (utterly unauthentic) “LEFT” (a synthetic German party made up of state-fostered nobodies simulating SPD dissidents and GDR state party’s survivors, all pretending to be leftist as well as traditionalist in the sense of “working class odour”). As fits the purpose, Marx is said to have been a kind of defender of the Euro, an apostle of poverty, or a “green” crotchety weirdo – what a perversion! As an international example of this distorting and substantial castrating of Marx you may take Terry Eagleton’s much-praised and superficial book about him, which, after lots of truths and truisms, ends up in sheer nonsense, such as defining proletarians as “penniless **women**” (plus chronically diseased persons and so on; compare to that bullshit Marx’s detailed discussion of the concept of the “productive worker” that is very closely attached to Adam Smith’s and is equally serious and rational). In fact, Marxism’s base was the **rise** of the working class, made possible by successfully striking and having sympathisers in the army, which needs **masses** of soldiers; otherwise, there would have been no echo of Marx’ and Engels’ writings, and we would not know of their existence. That is why their hope of the working class seizing power was not unrealistic at all; unfortunately, it failed outside weak and impoverished Russia, and since then, we have only observed the weakening and decline of the working class because of technical development that deprives strikes of any major chance, thus demoralizing the whole working class in the proper sense of the word. On the other hand, the great majority of non-heirs are suffering from the consequences of private ownership of all essentials of living by very few persons just as in pre-technical Merovingian times, too; unifying those deprived of self-determination by lack of substantial property might create a true political power that could furnish the Marxian concept and goal with a new social base.

Of course, the best thing would be to get to know the originals by Marx and Engels; since, however, they were written long ago and are quite sophisticated and extensive, this is a hard task, and our own contributions to create adequate versions of its application to our time have so far been confined to our (German) language. (But cf. B. Schilli: [Who is the »Ruling Class«?](http://www.ahriman.com/en/ruling_class.htm) [[click http://www.ahriman.com/en/ruling\\_class.htm](http://www.ahriman.com/en/ruling_class.htm)].)

But now you at least have an authentic document on what and who we really are; mankind missed its millenarian chance when the spreading of the Russian Revolution was sabotaged by the SPD in the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and capitalism has been transformed into monopolism, market economy into something like prison economy. (A symptom of this process is the vanishing of money in favour of plastic money, i.e. the suppression of relatively free acquiring of goods and its replacement by totally supervised acquiring of them in a way similar to getting food and other necessities in a prison from its administration.) Seemingly, an industrialized Pharaonism or Byzantinism is approaching globally.

This means: by confining the working class's revolution to Russia and, consequently, its economic strangulation by isolation and the arms race, even Hitler's defeat could not revitalize the authentic communist policy and impetus, first, because it had degenerated, if not collapsed, long before in the impoverished USSR itself, further, because even when chasing Hitler's army from Eastern Europe, the USSR could not gain more than the second-class economies of comparatively small and weak, rather underdeveloped countries – **and** was unpopular there because of its own perversion and loss of its original concept. Meanwhile, the USA has been crushing the national sovereignty of every and any country, controlling their governments, media, and property; this state of affairs will remind later historians more of the Roman Empire than of the classical capitalist states which did compete with each other and had separate ruling classes who made the national laws, not some invisible mega-rich US citizens substituting them as almighty rulers and appropriating the former national capitalists' property (cf. e.g. the smashing of the Swiss banks and bank secrecy). National sovereignty is the prerequisite of any political revolution or even substantial reform; had tsarist Russia not been a sovereign state, the Russian Revolution would have been quite improbable, or at least even more difficult than it already was.

That is why the international forces of enlightenment and freedom (the most elaborated end of which was Marxism, meanwhile potentially aided by Freud's insights, the means of modern psychology already broadly used by its enemies, and even the insights of neo-Darwinist biology that reveal to us, for instance, the secrets of meme selection in class societies the analysis of which was preceded by Marx' and Engels' theory of ideology) have to start their struggle again, on an international level, in a manner reminding us of the first nominalists (when feudalism and religion seemed almighty, but the first guilds were forming in the re-emerging European cities) or the French

Enlightenment movement that finally succeeded in crushing monarchism and clericalism. We all, regardless of race or nation, are in a similar situation now; dialogue is needed against the US media's global thought control (an analogon to medieval religion and religious indoctrination), and this dialogue has not only to reach as many countries as possible, but especially the USA: despite being "Master Citizens" in analogy to Hitler's less successful Master Race, the majority of US citizens are actually also living under poor conditions, deprived of personal freedom (*vide* e.g. the alcohol and "sexual offence" laws in that country of the big "international" companies) and, consequently, dignity. The majority of US citizens, too, not only the population of all other, US-dominated countries, could live under far better conditions of life by establishing Communism in Marx' sense – by measure of standard of living, working time and personal dignity (scientific education included) – given population shrinking by birth control, because no social structuring can beat maths. This, roughly, is our programme.

Anyway, whoever does not appreciate this ongoing global development of helotization, poverty, mental and civil decay that inevitably follows the breakdown of the communist movement caused by the isolation of Lenin's success, is invited to a dialogue. This is better than suffering silently.