

WAR

For Anarchism

COMMENTARY

Vol. 3 No. 3

JANUARY, 1942

Twopence

Down With Politicians!

FOR WORKERS' ACTION!

THE third New Year of the war finds the workers even worse off than before. The increased cost of living has reduced real wages, while the system of individual reservation has struck a radical blow at their bargaining- and fighting-power. Meanwhile, in his Washington speech, Churchill has indicated the perspectives for the future. Initiative in the war may be taken by the Allies in 1943, while the workers will be consoled to hear that "in the grand proportions of history" the question of "deliverance" in 1942, 1943, or 1944 is comparatively unimportant.

At the same time our rulers are exhibiting some anxiety over the question of post-war reconstruction. Bevin is said to be turning his mind on to the problem of how to return to civil jobs the vast number of men and women whom his call-ups and comb-outs have thrust into the services. The "Daily Herald" suggests a "Schedule of Deserved Occupations," presumably intending by this curious witticism to revive the illusion of "jobs for returned heroes," which was so useful during, but not after, the last war.

All the press discussions both by the Right and the Left stress the need for revived and enlarged export trade. They none of them seem to grasp that such attempts to revive this senile ghost of the liberal epoch, demands an expansion of markets which it will not be within the ability of the alleged 16 Labour Reconstruction Committees to create.

"More Labour Representation"

The restrictions under which the worker of 1942 finds himself have largely been introduced by Bevin. And sections even of the Labour press are now beginning to realize that the Tories selected Labour Party men to do these unpalatable jobs because a Labour camouflage was necessary in order to get such reactionary measures over. Labour leaders like Bevin and Morrison have shown themselves only too willing to be more repressive than the Tories themselves. Yet, in spite of this, the remedy for the workers is still put forward in some quarters in the demand for more Labour Party representation in the Cabinet. If this demand is put into practice it will only prove once more to the workers that their "own" leaders, when in power, are just as useful in serving the boss as the Conservatives with whom they are so gratefully collaborating.

Democracy à la Churchill

The reformist socialist press also talks about "putting into practice the Atlantic Charter." The value of this treadbare document was indicated by Churchill's now famous speech of September 9th, when he limited "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," of Point 3, only to the peoples of Europe, and not to India. In his Christmas Tree oration at the White House, Churchill adjured us to "resolve that by our sacrifice and daring these same children shall not

be robbed of their inheritance or denied their right to live in a free and decent world" The generation of 1914, as has been pointed out before, were adjured to sacrifice so that their children (i.e. the cannon-fodder of to-day) should live in homes fit for heroes in a world made safe for democracy and free from war. It is the same old cry of "pie in the sky" and "free beer to-morrow"—if we do without to-day.

Meanwhile, the population of the islands of Saint-Pierre and the Miquelons voted 98 per cent. for De Gaulle. But when Muselier seized them for the Free French, the American foreign office—still in diplomatic relationship with Darlan and Pétain—condemned the action. There is even talk of appeasing Vichy by handing them back. That's Churchill-Roosevelt democracy applied to the 98 per cent!

The workers must not be humbugged by all this Reconstruction talk. So long as profit and wages exist, so long as the minority rule the majority by force, governments will do not what their Labour collaborators want; in the narrow circumstances they will find themselves in, they will do whatever is expedient at the moment for maintaining their power. Even if this means some British Noske turning machine guns on the British workers, the Labour men in the government, in spite of all their pompous schemes for Reconstruction, will back him up just as the German labour leaders did after the last war.

Revolutionary situations have arisen after most major wars of recent times. Labour uprisings occurred in England after the Napoleonic wars: the Paris Commune followed the Franco-Prussian war in 1871. In Russia the revolution of 1905 succeeded the Russo-Japanese war. The war of 1914 bred a crop of revolutions all over Europe. There seems no good reason for thinking that this war will "be different."

Workers' Reconstruction

But revolutionary situations born of war and economic chaos do not of themselves improve the lot of the workers. Frequently they provide an opportunity for extreme reaction. There is no reason to sit back and think that history will do the work for the workers unaided. The New Year resolutions of the workers must be to learn the lessons of the last war and this one: to put no trust

(Continued on page 4)

Anarchism

have you read?

- ANARCHY by E. Malatesta 3d.
 ANARCHISM by E. Goldman 2d.
 OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM
 by G. Barrett 4d.
 THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION
 by G. Barrett 2d.
 THE WAGE SYSTEM by P. Kropotkin 2d.
 ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM. THEORY AND
 PRACTICE by R. Rocker (160 pp.) 1s 6d.
 MUTUAL AID by P. Kropotkin 6d.
 REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT
 by P. Kropotkin 3d.
 ROADS TO FREEDOM
 by Bertrand Russell 5s.
 ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY
 by J. Wakeman 2d.
 TO HELL WITH CULTURE
 by Herbert Read 1s.
 WAR COMMENTARY—For Anarchism
 Files of Vol. 2. November 1940—October 1941
 including Supplements 3s. 6d. post free

On Russia

- THE RUSSIAN MYTH (2nd printing) 3d.
 BOLSHEVISM—PROMISES AND REALITY
 By P. G. Maximov 2d.
 AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE U.S.S.R.
 by A. Gide 2s. 6d.
 STALIN: A CRITICAL SURVEY OF
 BOLSHEVISM by Boris Sourvarine (690 p.) 15s.
 ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA
 by Eugene Lyons (650 pp.) Out of print
 A few second hand copies in good condition
 available at 2s.

(Please add 2d. in the 1s. to all orders for postage)

(If you are interested in our new publications and are not already on our mailing list send us your name and address on a postcard and we will keep you informed of new works as published.)

Orders for books advertised in
 WAR COMMENTARY should be sent to
 Freedom Press, 27 Belsize Rd., London N.W.6

Anarchism

Our rulers

WE have already had occasion to point out in the case of America, the now familiar spectacle of a nation's capitalists arming the enemy whom to-morrow they send the workers to fight against. The press cries of "Japan's treachery," "violations of treaty rights" etc., come home to roost if one recalls American connivance. *"Despite our revulsion at Japan's conduct and our numerous protests against Japan's violations of America's rights and treaties, we have been allowing Japan unlimited access to our markets and materials. We are the unofficial but indispensable partners in Japan's guilt."* (Dr. Walter H. Judd, in Readers' Digest, Feb. 1940). Similarly the New York Times on March 1st 1940 reported a deal between the British and Japanese governments, involving the sale of about 1,000,000 barrels of crude oil produced by British companies in Iran to Japan.

These are recent transactions. It might be thought from the British government's new-found sympathy with China, that they have always considered Japan as a "gangster." The record of the government's spokesmen is not a happy one in this respect. And the quotation from Churchill above shows that the blame cannot be fastened on to those useful scapegoats, the "Men of Munich"

When Japanese political leaders have, or are believed to have, betrayed their country, they either commit harā-kiri, or are assassinated by Japanese patriots. Britain, being a civilized country, reserves a different fate for her politicians. Thus Sir Samuel Hoare in spite of his actions in regard to Japan and that unfortunate affair with Laval, is now in receipt of a splendid allowance as ambassador to the "Christian Gentleman," Franco. Sir John Simon, far from having to make a hasty disappearance from world politics after his odious behaviour in 1931, is now Lord Chancellor, in receipt of £10,000 a year, and a guaranteed pension of £5,000 a year for life.

MANCHUKUO

In 1931 the National government came to power just after Japan had annexed Manchuria. Sir John Simon, then Foreign Secretary, successfully temporized at the League of Nations, for 15 months. He then made a speech at Geneva, which made Matsuoka, the Japanese delegate, remark that Sir John Simon had said in half an hour what he had

WHAT WE SAID IN 1937

The most truly important happening of the week has been the determined action of the Southampton dockers in refusing to land Japanese goods from the Canadian liner "Duchess of Richmond" last Saturday, not only for the intrinsic value, small though that be, but as an example of direct action and solidarity. The "News Chronicle" of Monday the 6th reports that the legality of the dockers' action may be called into question, since this may be described as a strike with a political motive. Fortunately, the rejected cargo is on its way back to Canada, and we hope that the dockers have learnt the lesson that nothing succeeds like success!

Spain and the World, 10.12.37.

WHAT CHURCHILL SAID IN 1933

"British interests required us to keep out of the quarrel which has broken out in the Far East and not wantonly throw away our old and valued friendship with Japan. It was the interest of the whole world that law and order should be established in the northern part of China The condition of China, plunged in a strange combination of anarchy and Communism was the cause of boundless and inexpressable misery to her industrious people. China was in the same state that India would fall into if the guiding hand of England was withdrawn."

(24.2.33)

and JAPAN

been trying to tell the Assembly for weeks! The whole transaction bore out Lenin's apt stigmatization of the League as a "thieves' kitchen"

Although Sir John Simon has borne most of the criticism he was by no means alone in his attitude. Mr. Amery, the present Secretary of State for India, on February 27th, 1933 said: *"I confess I see no reason whatever why, either in act, or in word, or in sympathy, we should go individually, or internationally against Japan in this matter. Japan has got a very powerful case based on fundamental realities . . . when you look at the fact that Japan needs markets and that it is imperative for her, in the world in which she lives, that there should be some sort of peace and order, then who is there among us to cast the first stone and to say that Japan ought not to have acted with the object of creating peace and order in Manchuria and defending herself against the continual aggression of vigorous Chinese nationalism? Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stand condemned if we condemn Japan"*

Japanese "peace and order" has meant, in fact, almost continuous war for ten years in China. But we can agree with Mr. Amery's last sentence entirely!

Just to make it quite clear where the Conservatives stood, we will quote Sir Nairn Stuart Sandeman speaking on the same day:

"I am frankly pro-Japanese, entirely pro-Japanese, because I believe that the Japanese will settle the question in Manchuria and settle it quickly, and the less time that is spent in settling the row in Manchuria, the sooner we shall get to doing trade in China. Frankly, I wish we were in close touch with Japan and were prepared to say that we are going into the Yangtse Valley."

The renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Naval Alliance was constantly advocated at the time by Conservative M.P.'s like Sir Roger Keyes, who is so vocal now about Japan's perfidy. No wonder that a writer in the "Japan Chronicle" of 4th Feb 1933 in seeking the naval alliance stated *"I am confident that Mr. Churchill and the British Naval officers will endorse my view. So will the "Daily Mail" and the "Daily Telegraph."*

Sir Samuel Hoare, now at Madrid, continued Sir John Simon's policy.

In the summer of 1937 it was Mr. Eden's job to parry awkward questions by equivocal replies justifying Japan's renewed aggression in China. Neville

Chamberlain was another vigorous defender of Japan (It is perhaps worth while to note that in their report of 28 April 1932 I.C.I. record that Sir John Simon holds 1,512 of their shares, while Neville Chamberlain had 11,747 shares [quoted in "Monde" 8th July 1933]. I.C.I. are said to have supplied poison gas to both Japan and China).

BEVIN DOES HIS BIT

But the Conservatives were not alone. Bevin also did his bit. When in February 1938 dockers in London and Middlesbrough refused to load scrap iron on to the Japanese ship "Hararra Maruh," Bevin, as secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union disowned them. This may be regarded as the official attitude of the Labour leaders towards effective intervention on the part of the workers.

CHINESE "DEMOCRATS"

The government's new found sympathy for China will no doubt win it some popularity, among those who have forgotten its many declarations on the lines of those quoted above. We have always declared our sympathy for and solidarity with the Chinese workers and peasants, fighting against multiple Imperialist exploitation and Japanese aggression. But we are not deluded into thinking that the Chinese Government is democratic. A recent writer states that "Indeed the Second Revolution of 1926-7 which established General Chiang and the Nanking Government in power might be compared to the Nazi revolution in Germany" (Pringle "China Struggles for Unity" 1939). Chiang-Kai Shek has killed his political opponents and rivals, and massacred sections of the Chinese workers on almost as grand a scale as Stalin in Russia. But the "aggressive Chinese nationalism" of Mr. Amery in 1933 has now become a democratic partner in the firm of ABCD powers. A junior partner we fancy.

STALIN AND ASIA

We have already seen Matsuoka hand in hand with Simon at Geneva in 1932, where he warned against the danger of "Sovietism" in China. It remains to recall him on a similar footing of friendship with Stalin

(continued from page 2)

in their supposed leaders whether Tory or Labour. But, instead, to rely on their own strength and build their own weapons by organizing themselves in economic organizations at the point of production, in fields and factories, mills and mines, on the basis of class struggle. The workers alone can effect the reconstruction of their world and their lives, by placing the means and resources of production under their own control and operating them for the benefit of all. "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." Only thus can Liberty and freedom from want be achieved by the hungry post-war masses. They must begin now.

in May 1941—8 months ago. After the conclusion of the Soviet-Japanese Non-Aggression pact, the journalists at the Moscow station were astonished when Stalin came down to see Matsuoka off. Embracing the Japanese warmly, the all-wise leader of the U.S.S.R. declared eternal friendship with the Japanese. "After all" he said "we are both Asiatics."

"The Soviet Far Eastern Armies are intact. This superbly trained and magnificently equipped body of armies, far from having been drained on since the German assault began in the west has actually been augmented" (Philip Jordan's cable to News Chronicle, 11th Dec. 1941) In spite of this however, and in spite of Litvinov's tactful speeches in America, the U.S.S.R. has already expressed the view that the most useful contribution they can make in the Pacific contest is to engage the Germans on the Eastern Front. General Tojo also stated on 16th December that "there is no change in the attitude of Japan towards the Soviet Union, which has repeatedly declared that she considers herself bound to the neutrality pact with Japan" (News Chronicle, 17. Dec. 1941.).

Russia has refused to open a second front against Japan and has made no declaration of war. That these have not been immediately forthcoming as soon as the war with Japan began, is an indication that the motives behind the war are not so simple as our propagandists would like us to believe. For if the issue were really one of "Democracy" versus "Fascism," such concerted action would be immediately undertaken. Even if the "Democratic" powers had not, on their own showing, armed Japan to the point where they are able to take on both America and Britain at once, the hesitations and equivocations of those vociferous protagonists of "Freedom" would be enough to discredit their propaganda.

TO HELL WITH POLITICS!

Of course the attitude displayed by Amery, Simon and Hoare towards Japan, was also displayed by the same group, representing the capitalist interest of the ruling class, in regard to Italy over the Abyssinian war, General Franco in Spain, and throughout the whole pre-war period, Hitler himself. For those who remember these indications, the falsity of the "righteous claims" of the whole crew of war-makers, from Churchill and Stalin, Hitler and Tojo, Roosevelt and the Labour leaders, is apparent. It is impossible for the conscious workers to associate themselves or their movements with such self-confessed reactionaries and hypocrites. The workers must steer clear off all such intrigues and leaders and the brutal wars their power-politics and self-seeking produce. For the working class there is only one struggle and that is the class struggle, against all exploiters whether at home or in other lands. That is the only struggle in which the ideals of Justice and Freedom are not besmirched and have any true meaning.

J.H.

.....
**WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED WITH
 YOUR COPY OF WAR COMMENTARY
 PASS IT ON TO A FRIEND**

Limitations of Community

HISTORY is littered with the memories of Utopian experiments, conceived in times of stress as practical alternative ways of life to those of the societies then existing. It is not therefore surprising that the present war crisis has created a revival of this taste for communal experiments, and that the movement most active in founding these communities should be the pacifist movement, whose members find themselves isolated in a war society and feel the need to create their own social units, cells within a military state in which conscientious objectors and their fellow travellers can develop a mode of life more to their taste than that around them.

These communities which are not fortuitous collections of individuals living together for convenience have, in general, certain common characteristics. They deny the validity of external organisations, such as the state. They deny the virtue of private property and attempt to establish a communal and equal share in goods and products and an obligation to work in the common interest. They have a certain missionary purpose, but this is in most cases vitiated by a conviction that they have only to set an example for the remainder of society to become impregnated with a desire for communal living, followed by a breakdown of the state into a patchwork of groups very much like their own. Their reaction from contemporary society tends, in its concrete aspects, to take an atavistic nature, demonstrated in a desire to return to primitive methods and jettison the technical advantages of an industrial civilisation. Lastly, their attitude tends to become escapist, in that they do in practice turn away from contemporary problems into their own circle and thus acquire distorted views of social realities and needs.

With some of these communities and their ideals we find ourselves in a degree of sympathy, for one of the aims of anarchism is the devolution of the state into a federation of groups and individuals living under the rule of 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' and owning and working communally all the means of production and distribution. In the achievement of this aim lies the only possibility of a satisfactory human society. *But it can only be attained by a fundamental change in the whole of society, by a breakdown of capitalist economy and a complete substitution of an anarchist-communist economy. Such a change can only be precipitated by actual participation in contemporary politics, by entering the bloodstream of society rather than becoming encysted in the idealist isolation of a small group within the state which can be removed by the surgeon's knife of violence whenever it becomes a nuisance.*

Thus, while we feel a qualified sympathy for those communities who are honestly seeking some social

solution, we realise the danger of the fallacies which arise among leading sections of the community movement, which tend to give a curious mystic significance to the very word COMMUNITY and which develop exaggerated ideas of the achievements that are possible through communities and of their power to survive a hostile society.

Dr George Macleod, for instance, says "You may not know it, but you are in the mainstream of the one movement that has any hope in it, either for you or for the world," and in the November *Adelphi* John Middleton Murry declares, 'I believe that community is the only antidote to totalitarianism.'

Murry's article is particularly significant as an example of the kind of dangerous sophistry that can arise from theorising about communities. It is also

By

George Woodcock

interesting in that Murry gives an idea of the form of society he believes can be attained by means of communities.

'The community movement' he says, 'aims directly at economic and political decentralisation, by endeavouring to create the nucleus of local and autonomous units

'At the political level it seeks spontaneous and voluntary consent to the leadership of the proven 'best' and a glad and grateful recognition of the gifts of the natural leader who is endowed with imagination and sensitivity enough to keep him in constant touch with 'the sense of the meeting.'

'At the economic level it directly overcomes the evil of unemployment by basing itself upon subsistence production A certain price has to be paid for this in the general acceptance of a wholesome frugality. The standard of living in community must be quantitatively lower, but should be qualitatively higher than that of the acquisitive society.

'At the religious level, community transforms the individualistic and anti-social pseudo-religion of the acquisitive society by the discovery of the reciprocal reality of God and man in 'the severe contentions of friendship' and in the subordination of the ego to the needs of the community as a living whole.'

In other words, the community society, as envisaged by Murry, will be based on the leadership principle and the principle of the individual's subservience to the group. And these are the principles of totalitarianism, adapted to a non-mechanistic and pseudo-religious society.

For the rest, we are promised a retreat from machine production which, as Murry admits, will mean toil and scarcity in a world where leisure and

plenty are possible. Our reward lies in the mystic 'discovery of the reciprocal reality of God and man'!

However, this singularly drastic 'antidote to totalitarianism' is based on such economic and social fallacies that there is very little chance of its success.

For instance, the community theorists ignore the fact that England is essentially an urban and industrial society. It is possible that an economic slump might send many urban workers back to the land, but the powers of agriculture to absorb additional workers have a limit and, even if we assume a population shrinkage of considerable proportions during the decades before us, the majority of the people are likely for many generations to remain grouped in large aggregations, such as the city and the factory. Industrial and urban organisation are problems to which community theorists and the community conferences that have taken place at Langham have given no profound consideration and for which they have provided no practicable suggestions.

Furthermore, in spite of their desire to dissociate themselves from 'the acquisitive society' the communities cannot avoid being economically linked with the capitalist state. Their desire for the economic break is shown by their insistent demand for self subsistence, but, even although they may be willing to accept a lower standard of living, it is impossible for them, in a country like England, to produce everything they need on one isolated patch of earth. They need seeds, implements, cloth, medicines, postage stamps, etc. And to obtain these they must have some medium of exchange with outside society. They must get money in some way or another, either as subscriptions from persons living in capitalist society, or from selling their produce, which means that in practice they enter into competition with the surrounding producers and use their advantage of cheap labour as a factor in this competition. Whichever of these methods they adopt, they cannot avoid being involved in the capitalist economic system.

In spite of this unavoidable economic dependence on outside sources of money, they are, for the most part, under capitalised and unable to buy the plant that would enable them to make their work light and efficient. From this fact that they cannot afford tractors, etc., springs the escapist reaction towards handicrafts and obsolete methods of cultivation and industry.

Socially, their ideas are inadequate, because they do not realise, or do not care to admit, the essential and unavoidable nature of the struggle that exists within society and make no provision or organisation for those forms of non-violent action against the state and capitalism which are compatible with their pacifist position and which are inevitable before a free and just society can evolve.

Their attempt to form a new society within the framework of the state stands little chance of success because their economic dependence makes them vulnerable to such a degree that a mere boycott would starve them into extinction. They exist on sufferance within a state that, as it becomes more totalitarian, will be less likely to tolerate them. Already their

(continued on page 8)

BRITISH

These incidents occurred at Nellore, a town one hundred miles north of Madras, in South India.

(Note during the Dasara festival in September, Hindus take processions through the streets. Before they can do so they have, however to obtain the permission of the police. Since no section of the population objected, this was a mere formality. This year for some inexplicable reason, the police revoked their permission on the day before the festival. The people considered it a repressive measure designed to curtail their liberties and unsuccessfully protested against it)

September 22nd: A large meeting was held. It was decided that every Hindu should wear a black arm band on the 23rd, the day of the festival, as a mark of protest.

September 23rd: From early morning large numbers of police, armed with lathis and rifles, patrolled the streets. About twenty children carrying black flags, walked along the main street in silent procession. The police snatched the flags and arrested them. Attracted by this incident a number of people gathered in the main street, and were charged by the police with their lathis. At 11 a.m. the superintendent of police took charge, and three times ordered lathi charges. People who stumbled and fell down were mercilessly beaten.

Inflamed by these incidents 30 men started in a procession, gathering people on the way. After a lathi charge they were arrested.

At 1 p.m. another procession of children followed. They too were charged with lathis. Many were seriously injured, and one eight-year old boy, whose skull was broken, was taken to the hospital by the police themselves. Late in the evening he died of his wounds.

From 4 p.m. till 8 p.m. there were continual lathi charges. In one street some of the injured who took shelter in a doctor's house (Dr. M. S. Rao) were dragged outside and beaten up (by constable 192)

At 6 p.m., the small group of aged men who spend their evenings reading their sacred books in the Pilgrims' Rest House were charged by the police with lathis. Some were chased into the backyard and beaten

TERROUR in INDIA

Massacres like that at Amritsar in 1919 have received so much publicity that they appear as isolated events in British rule. They thus actually divert attention from the continual repression and violence called British "rule" in India, which is the inevitable outcome of the rule of a tiny minority over a vast but poverty stricken and unarmed majority....The release of Nehru and other prominent congressmen has similarly diverted attention from the huge mass of anonymous workers who overcrowd the British gaols in India. The following incident is translated from a peasant paper, "Zamin Ryot" of September 9th, 1941. It is not startling like Amritsar. It represents more the everyday occurrence in Imperial India.

up; others, too old to move, lifted up their hands asking for mercy, were also beaten up. One whose whole left side was systematically broken, was carried to the hospital.

By 6.30 the higher officials of the police took lathis themselves and joined in the charging of the people. Private houses along the main street were forced open and the people dragged into the street.

September 24th: Lathi charges continued more intensely. The Inspector of police questioned the arrested children, using obscene and abusive words, and alternating each question with a slap in the face. About forty people were seriously injured in lathi charges.

September 25th: Thirty-one people were arrested, six of them being women. In the evening two donkeys draped with black flags were let out. The police chased them, arrested them and took them to the police station. The Union for Civil Liberties sent telegrams to the Governor and the Inspector General of Police in Madras. The District Judge (Mr. George Sanson) censured the police for unlawfully arresting the citizens. Later an ordinance under Sect. 144 of the Indian Criminal Procedure Code was proclaimed, prohibiting processions, meetings and the assembly of four or more persons.

September 26th: In the town jail the recently arrested citizens went on hunger strike as a protest against the bad food. Severe lathi charges were made. Two old men were beaten up even after falling into the gutters, and were taken to the hospital with concussion. Also a six-year old boy, whose ribs were broken from repeated kicking by a policeman. Boys who were being chased out of the town turned on the police

at the railway line and threw stones at them, injuring two policemen.

In the evening the police fired in one street. Since there was no crowd at all it is impossible to say why they did so. Three shots were fired. One man was seriously injured in the face. An old man of eighty, who was, as usual, saying his prayers in the verandah, was killed. A 14-year old girl who was standing in the doorway was also killed. Police refused permission to Boy Scouts who wanted to organize First Aid to wounded in the streets.

September 27th: Funeral of the girl (Narasamma). Permission given for a crowd not exceeding two hundred people to attend the funeral. By the time they reached the crematorium, ten thousand people had joined the procession.

The latest news received from the town is that the government is thinking of appointing a committee to enquire into these atrocities.

LONDON PUBLIC MEETINGS

Tuesday 6th 7 p.m.

West London Group have organized a meeting at the Broadway Congregational Hall, Brook Green Road.

Speaker: F. LOHR

Wednesday 14th 7 p.m.

Meeting organized by the Kingston Group Kingston Hotel

Speaker: TOM BROWN
Chairman: J. W. Barker

Wednesday 14th 7 p.m.

West London Group Public Meeting
Coop Hall, 18, Western Avenue
Speaker: MAT KAVANAGH

Discontent Among Market Gardeners

THE agricultural policy of the government and the manner of its administration by state bodies is causing considerable discontent among market gardeners and nurserymen, who feel that no regard is given to their interests in spite of the considerable contribution they make to food supplies by the intensive cultivation of large crops on small areas of land.

Many Agricultural Committees, even some in the market gardening Home Counties, have no Horticultural sub-Committees or Horticultural advisers. In consequence many cases have arisen of orders both uneconomic and unfair being issued to market gardeners. Men with small acreages have been instructed to drill with cereals, in spite of the fact that they have no proper equipment. One man with seven acres, from which he had raised three or four crops a year, was told to fill his land with potatoes, a procedure which would have ruined him. Some committees have forbidden the growing of lettuce on the ground that it is a 'luxury crop,' and growers with greenhouses built for cucumbers have been told to grow tomatoes in them, although the houses are quite unsuited for this crop.

There are also complaints against marketing organisations. One grower who had 25 cwt of onions, informed the appropriate authority and waited for them to collect his crop. By the time collection was made only 9½ cwt of onions were fit for use, yet the grower could not sell the remaining 15½ cwt to prevent them going rotten on his hands.

This discontent with unjust and uneconomic government measures has at last reached a head, and, as a result of three conferences, the last on the 4th December, a National Growers' Association has been formed for protecting the interests of those men with small holdings who find they have been treated unfairly by the authorities and represented indifferently by the National Farmers' Union.

There remains the danger that this new organization may become dominated by the large seedsmen and nurserymen (who are often wholesalers as well who will control it for their own interests. It will therefore be necessary for the small market gardeners to maintain a constant vigilance if the Association is not to become the instrument of the capitalists in their industry.

WAR COMMENTARY AND SUPPLEMENT (post free)

6 months, 2/6; 1 year, 5/-.

Special terms for quantities.

All subscriptions and inquiries should be sent to:

FREEDOM PRESS,

27, Belsize Road London N.W.6.

me and my radio

*Each evening when the pips give out
The muezzin call to prayer,
I lay aside my paper and
Sit forward in my chair*

*For radio's my all-in-all,
I worship at its shrine:
It tells me what to think about
At six p.m. and nine.*

*It tells me how to get my food
And where I must apply;
It tells me whom I have to hate,
And whom to love, and why*

*It really is a treat to know
Who are your friends and foes,
For allies change from day to day,
Much more than you'd suppose*

*So when the priestly go-betweens
Read out the evening news,
I sit agape in silence and
Assimilate their views*

*But when the nation's leader he
Himself explains the war,
Ah then! I put my candles up
And kneel down on the floor.*

GABRIEL SEAL

(continued from page 6)

continuance is threatened by the new vested interests in the land which are arising during this war and which are likely, at the very least, to halt the acquisition of land by 'communistic' competitors.

However, although communities are unlikely to form the beginning of a new society, they might fulfil a certain function, particularly in agriculture, to explore the possibilities of functional group organisation. I do not, however, agree with Comrade Gibson's contention that communities 'demonstrate in practice the ideas which we propagate in theory.' What they do demonstrate is that in certain circumstances people can live together in amity. But this has already been well proved by such institutions as the family, the college, the monastery. And those with any experience of communities will know that many of them, like many families, do not live in amity. Not a few become, as Max Plowman said, 'abortive and sporadic attempts by inexperienced persons to live a kind of life which becomes simply disreputable—a life of bickering and dispute, of envy and hatred, of slackers and self-indulgence, of mean and greedy individualism masquerading in the rags of social service.'

Who Shall Exploit Us ?

by Tom Brown

THE unsatisfactory conduct of the war has resulted in a demand for the greater control of economy by the state: a demand made by various shades of politics from the "New Statesman," through the Labour Party "rebel" M.P.s to the Conservative Party ranks. All seek in the demand for nationalisation and state control a magical solution of the acute difficulties of the state. While the demand is voiced largely by politicians, a few workers have been deceived by the cry. Some time ago the workers at the Royal Ordnance Factory at Dalmeir protested against the transfer of the factory to private ownership. Most amazing statements were made in the handbill issued by them; "Citizens—your property is being stolen—Defend your property against the invaders."

The circle being complete it is well to ask the nationalisers just exactly how will the extension of state control of economy prove more effective in prosecuting a war which the state has so far hopelessly bungled. Anyone who has been unfortunate enough to transact business with a government department will not question the inefficiency, irresponsibility, timewasting procrastination of the tax-eaters. So far no case has been put forward; no attempt to prove the superior efficiency has been made. So far it is to be accomplished by magic.

It is not generally realized that the state now controls most of the economy of the country and almost all of the labour. Besides the millions of the R. A. F., Army, R. N., and Civil Defence, the state owns the Post Office, Royal Dockyards and engineering factories and controls the mining industry, petrol, the railways and road transport, engineering and shipbuilding, food, paper, wood and most essential commodities. Even before the war there was a general extension of semi-state enterprises like the B.B.C. and London Passenger Transport Board (which the Labour Party called socialism). One might fill this paper with further examples of nationalisation and state control. So, if we really wish to see how it works we have the opportunity.

State Capitalism is not Socialism

WE are most concerned with the workers' point of view, for unfortunately, many workers believe that nationalisation is socialism. While it is usually described as state socialism (as in Russia) a more accurate description is state capitalism. In a capitalist society the means of production are controlled by a minority class while the majority, the workers, find themselves without control of the means of life. As they can only live by gaining access to these means of production, they are forced to hire themselves to the owners, to sell their labour power for wages. In a system of "state socialism" or nationalisation the means of production are not controlled by the workers but by a minority class; the workers still selling their labour power find them-

selves working not for this or that capitalist, but for the ruling class as a whole. There still exists gross inequality of income, as under private capitalism and the worker remains a wage slave. Only a simpleton could suppose the state to be society or the people, the state is the executive committee of the ruling class. Nor is the state a super-human, divine institution which stands above society, absolutely just in the balance of classes. The state is a human product worked by human beings and as such reveals all the failings of those human beings. State socialists seek to disguise the class character of the state by clothing it in magico-theological vestments.

Trying a New Boss

STILL, many workers hope to get more from state than private employment, higher wages, security, and the end of exploitation. But wages in government employment are not necessarily higher, and often less, than private employment. An old Labour Party argument was that the state would pay higher wages and the private employers would be forced to follow suit. Yet in the engineering industry wage increases are negotiated first in private firms (through the Engineering Employers' Federation), then the government follows. Piece-work earnings are vastly higher in private firms as contrasted with state engineering establishments.

The wages of thousand of Post Office workers are almost unbelievably low. At the Stalinist controlled "Peoples Convention" of a year ago F. H. Hedges, the delegate of the London District Committee of the Post Office Engineers' Union said "I myself after 16 years in the Post Office Engineering, have not yet reached the maximum rate, and that the minimum for skilled workmen is 40s.6d. in the provinces and 43s. 6d. in London." (The Convention a little later, called for the state "to take over the banks, transport, armaments and other large industries.")

Security of employment is just as elusive in state service. Thousands of civil servants (e.g. Labour Exchange clerks) may serve the state for years without being other than "temporaries" and even establishment does not make certain of life employment. During the great economy scare of the early twenties tens of thousands of government employees were dismissed, and full establishments, as in the case of Pembroke Dockyard, were closed.

Nationalisation cannot end exploitation for the same inequalities of income persist; those below get too little, those above take too much and in any case a profit is made. The Post Office annually discloses an immense profit which can only be made by the exploitation of the postal employees. It matters little to the exploited that the fruits of exploitation go to the capitalist class instead of a single capitalist.

Buying out the Capitalists

HOW is the state to obtain ownership of industry? By buying out the owners? Obviously so much money does not exist; the only course open is to give the owners bonds in return for their

THE KRONSTADT

THE correspondence between Trotsky and Wendelin Thomas (one of the leaders of the revolt in the German navy in 1918, and a member of the American Committee of Enquiry into the Moscow Trials) regarding the historical significance of the events in Kronstadt in 1921, has given rise to widespread international discussion. That in itself indicates the importance of the problem. On the other hand, it is no accident that special interest should be shown in the Kronstadt revolt to-day: that there is an analogy, a direct link even, between what happened at Kronstadt 17 years ago, and the recent trials at Moscow, is only too apparent. To-day we witness the murder of the leaders of the Russian

capital and pay them a regular, guaranteed dividend. This is the case favoured by the Labour Party and the Communist Party. At the People's Convention of Jan. 12th, 1941 an amendment favouring "Nationalisation of banks, land, transport and large industries *without compensation*" was defeated by the Standing Orders Committee, composed of C.P.'ers and Stalinist stooges. Now if the capitalists are to be "bought out" by being given a guaranteed dividend how much better off are the workers? They must be exploited to provide the profits. Indeed many capitalists favour nationalisation as the solution of a declining industry—as the railways. It is well to recall that Mr. Churchill while a candidate for Dundee, had the nationalisation of railways in his election programme.

It may be said that the state may expropriate the capitalist class. As no political party advocates expropriation little need be said of this, except to ask how the capitalists represented by the state are going to confiscate their own property as private owners?

So far from abolishing the capitalist class, nationalisation gives them new vigour. So long as a class society exists, it matters not the form it takes, the old ruling class transfers itself to the new regime. If privilege and authority continue they have little to lose. Just as the old feudal lords of Japan became the rulers and owners of the new Japanese capitalist imperialism, so the old capitalist class may become the administrators of "state socialism" or state capitalism. At the present time there is a strong tendency towards private capitalists like Beaverbrook and Woolton, becoming cabinet ministers and civil servants.

All that troubles and threatens the workers under private capitalism continues under state capitalism—low wages, insecurity and exploitation.

The issue is not, as the politicians would have it, who shall exploit us, the state or the private capitalist but, shall we not end exploitation itself? To do so the workers must needs take possession of the means of production by revolutionary, industrial organisation and operate them co-operatively in the interests of all, abolishing the wages system. The task of syndicalism is the general lock out of the master class. Only when the workers possess the means of production can they be free. Not by changing masters but by abolishing masters. That is the aim of we syndicalists—the mines to the miners—the factories to the engineers—all economy to the syndicates!

This article was written in 1938, at the time of a new outbreak of purge trials at Moscow. In view of the publicity now being accorded to the "democratic" Soviet Union in the contemporary Press, we consider that Kronstadt is topical to-day. In 1921, danger from foreign intervention had passed, and the Russian workers were everywhere expressing indignation and unrest at the dictatorship of the Bolshevik party over the workers' soviets. The sailors at Kronstadt passed the resolution reproduced in Ciliga's text unanimously except for three votes (Kuzmin, Vassiliev, and Kalinin). In spite

revolution; in 1921 it was the masses who formed the basis of the revolution who were massacred. Would it be possible today to disgrace and suppress the leaders of October without the slightest protest from the people, if these leaders had not already by armed force silenced the Kronstadt sailors and the workers all over Russia?

Trotsky's reply to Wendelin Thomas shows that unfortunately Trotsky—who is, together with Stalin, the only one of the leaders of the October revolution concerned in the suppression of Kronstadt who remains alive—still refuses to look at the past objectively. Furthermore, in his article, "Too much noise about Kronstadt," he increases the gulf which he created at that time between the working masses and himself; he does not hesitate, after having ordered their bombardment in 1921 to describe these men to-day as "completely demoralised elements, men who wore elegant wide trousers and did their hair like pimps."

No! it is not with accusations of this kind, which reek of bureaucratic arrogance, that a useful contribution can be made to the lessons of the great Russian revolution.

In order to assess the influence that Kronstadt has had on the outcome of the revolution, it is necessary to avoid all personal issues, and direct attention to three fundamental questions: (1) In what general circumstances the Kronstadt revolt arose? (2) What were the aims of the movement? (3) By what means did the insurgents attempt to achieve these aims.

The masses and the bureaucracy in 1920-1

EVERYONE now agrees that during the winter of 1920 to 1921 the Russian Revolution was passing through an extremely critical phase. The offensive against Poland had ended in defeat at Warsaw, the social revolution had not broken out in the West, the Russian Revolution had become isolated, famine and disorganization had seized the entire country. The peril of bourgeois restoration knocked at the doors of the revolution. At this moment of

REVOLT

By Anton Ciliga
(author of *The Russian Enigma*)

of its peaceful character, and before the "rebels" had even thought of taking any defensive military measures (such as the occupation of Oranienbaum on the mainland) Trotsky sent the Red army to "shoot them like partridges." 18,000 were killed or shot afterwards, although not a single one of the Communist commissars arrested in Kronstadt had been harmed. Subsequently all kinds of calumny were used by Lenin to discredit the Kronstadt sailors. Their resolution however speaks for them, and we are glad to publish Ciliga's article in English translation.

crisis the different classes and parties which existed within the revolutionary camp each presented their solution for its resolution.

The Soviet Government and the higher circles in the Communist Party applied their own solution of *increasing the power of the bureaucracy*. The attribution of powers to the "Executive Committees" which had hitherto been vested in the soviets, the replacement of the dictatorship of the class by the dictatorship of the party, the shift of authority even within the party from its members to its cadres, the replacement of the double power of the bureaucracy and the workers in the factory by the sole power of the former,—to do all this was to "save the Revolution!" It was at this moment that Bukharin put forward his plea for a "proletarian Bonapartism." "By placing restrictions on itself" the proletariat would, according to him, facilitate the struggle against the bourgeois counter-revolution. Here was manifested already the enormous quasi-messianic self-importance of the Communist Bureaucracy.

The Ninth and Tenth Congresses of the Communist Party, as well as the intervening year passed beneath the auspices of this new policy. Lenin rigidly carried it through, Trotsky sang its praises. The Bureaucracy prevented the bourgeois restoration... by eliminating the proletarian character of the revolution.

The formation of the Workers' Opposition within the party, which was supported not only by the proletarian fraction in the party itself but also by the great mass of unorganized workers, the general strike of the Petrograd workers a short time before the Kronstadt revolt, and finally the insurrection itself, all expressed the aspirations of the masses who felt, more or less clearly, that a "third party" was about to destroy their conquests. The movement of poor peasants led by Makhno in the Ukraine was the outcome of similar resistance in similar circumstances. If the struggles of 1920-1921 are examined in the light of the historical material now available, one is struck by the way that these scattered masses, starved and enfeebled by economic

disorganization, nevertheless had the strength to formulate for themselves with such precision their social and political position, and at the same time to defend themselves against the bureaucracy and against the bourgeoisie.

The Kronstadt Programme

WE shall not content ourselves, like Trotsky, with simple declarations, so we submit to readers the resolution which served as a programme for the Kronstadt movement. We reproduce it in full, because of its immense historical importance. It was adopted on February 28th by the sailors of the battleship "Petropavlovsk," and was subsequently accepted by all the sailors, soldiers and workers of Kronstadt.

"After having heard the representatives delegated by the general meeting of ships' crews to report on the situation in Petrograd this assembly takes the following decisions:

1. Seeing that the present soviets do not express the wishes of the workers and peasants, to organize immediately re-elections to the soviets with secret vote, and with care to organize free electoral propaganda for all workers and peasants.
2. To grant liberty of speech and of press to the workers and peasants, to the anarchists and the left socialist parties.
3. To secure freedom of assembly for labour unions and peasant organizations.
4. To call a non-partisan Conference of the workers, Red Army soldiers and sailors of Petrograd, Kronstadt, and of Petrograd province, no later than March 10th 1921.
5. To liberate all political prisoners of Socialist parties as well as all workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors imprisoned in connection with the labour and peasant movements.
- 6... To elect a Commission to review the cases of those held in prisons and concentration camps.
7. To abolish all "politodeli"* because no party should be given special privileges in the propagation of its ideas or receive financial support from the government for such purposes. Instead there should be established educational and cultural commissions, locally elected and financed by the government.
8. To abolish immediately all "zagryaditelniye otryadi"†
9. To equalize the rations of all who work with the exception of those employed in trades detrimental to health.
10. To abolish the communist fighting detachments in all branches of the army, as well as the communist guards kept on duty in mills and factories. Should such guards or military detachments be found necessary they are to be appointed

* Political sections of the Communist party existing in the majority of State institutions.

† Police detachments officially created to struggle against speculation, but which actually used to confiscate everything that the starving population, the workers included, brought from the country for their own personal consumption.

in the army from the ranks, and in the factories according to the judgment of the workers.

11. To give the peasants full freedom of action in regard to their land and also the right to keep cattle on condition that the peasants manage with their own means; that is, without employing hired labour.

12. To request all branches of the Army, as well as our comrades the military kursant[¶] to concur in our resolutions.

13. To demand that the press give the fullest publicity to our resolutions.

14. To appoint a travelling commission of control.

15. To permit free artisan production which does not employ hired labour.

These are primitive formulations insufficient no doubt, but all of them impregnated with the spirit of October; and no calumny in the world can cast a doubt on the intimate connection existing between this resolution and the sentiments which guided the expropriations of 1917.

The depth of principle which animates this resolution is shown by the fact that it is still to a great extent applicable. One can, in fact, oppose it as well to the Stalin regime of 1938 as to that of Lenin in 1921. More even than that: the accusations of Trotsky himself against Stalin's regime are only reproductions, timid ones, it is true, of the Kronstadt claims. Besides, what other programme which is at all socialist could be set up against the bureaucratic oligarchy except that of Kronstadt and the Workers' Opposition?

The appearance of this resolution demonstrates the close connections which existed between the movements of Petrograd and Kronstadt. Trotsky's attempt to set the workers of Petrograd against those of Kronstadt in order to confirm the legend of the counter-revolutionary nature of the Kronstadt movement, comes back on Trotsky himself: in 1921, Trotsky pleaded the necessity under which Lenin was situated in justification of the suppression of democracy in the Soviets and in the party, and accused the masses inside and outside the party of *sympathizing with Kronstadt*. He admitted therefore that at that time the Petrograd workers and the opposition although they had not resisted by force of arms, none the less extended their sympathy to Kronstadt.

Trotsky's subsequent assertion that "the insurrection was inspired by the desire to obtain a privileged ration" is still more wild. Thus, it is one of these privileged people, of the Kremlin, the rations for whom were very much better than those of others, who dares to hurl a similar reproach, and that at the very men who in paragraph 9 of their resolution, explicitly demanded equalization of rations! This detail shows the desperate extent of Trotsky's bureaucratic blindness.

Trotsky's articles do not depart in the slightest degree from the legend created long ago by the Central Committee of the Party. Trotsky certainly deserves credit from the international working class for having refused since 1923 to continue to participate in the bureaucratic degeneration and in the new "purges" which were destined to deprive the Revolution of all its left-wing elements. He deserves still more to be defended against Stalin's calumny and assassins. But all this does not give Trotsky the right to insult the working masses of 1921. On the contrary! More than anyone else, Trotsky should furnish a new appreciation of the initiative

taken at Kronstadt. An initiative of great historic value, an initiative taken by rank-and-file militants in the struggle against the first bloodstained "purge" undertaken by the bureaucracy.

The attitude of the Russian workers during the tragic winter of 1920-1921 shows a profound social instinct; and a noble heroism inspired the working classes of Russia not only at the height of the Revolution but also at the crisis which placed it in mortal danger.

Neither the Kronstadt fighters, nor the Petrograd workers, nor the ranks of the Communists could summon, it is true, in that winter the same revolutionary energy as in 1917 to 1919, but what there was of socialism and revolutionary feeling in the Russia of 1921 was possessed by the rank-and-file. In their opposition to this, Lenin and Trotsky, in line with Stalin, with Zinoviev, Kaganovitch, and others responded to the wishes and served the interests of the bureaucratic cadres. The workers struggled for the socialism which the bureaucracy were already in process of liquidating. That is the fundamental point of the whole problem.

Kronstadt and the N.E.P.

PEOPLE often believe that Kronstadt forced the introduction of the N.E.P.*—a profound error.

The Kronstadt resolution pronounced in favour of the defence of the workers, not only against the bureaucratic capitalism of the State, but also against the restoration of private capitalism. This restoration was demanded—in opposition to Kronstadt—by the social democrats, who combined it with a regime of political democracy. And it was Lenin and Trotsky who to a great extent realized it (but without political democracy) in the form of the N.E.P. The Kronstadt resolution declared for the opposite since it declared itself against the employment of wage labour in agriculture and small industry. This resolution, and the movement underlying it, sought for a revolutionary alliance of the proletarian and peasant workers with the poorest sections of the country labourers, in order that the revolution might develop towards socialism. The N.E.P., on the other hand, was a union of bureaucrats with the upper layers of the village against the proletariat; it was the alliance of State capitalism and private capitalism against socialism. The N.E.P., is as much opposed to the Kronstadt demands as, for example, the revolutionary socialist programme of the vanguard of the European workers for the abolition of the Versailles system, is opposed to the abrogation of the Treaty of Versailles achieved by Hitler.

Let us consider, finally, one last accusation which is commonly circulated: that action such as that at Kronstadt could have *indirectly* let loose the forces of the counter-revolution. It is *possible* indeed that even by placing itself on a footing of workers' democracy the revolution might have been overthrown; but what is *certain* is that it has perished, and that it has perished on account of the policy of its leaders. The repression of Kronstadt, the suppression of the democracy of workers and soviets by the Russian Communist party, the elimination of the proletariat from the management of industry, and the introduction of the N.E.P., already signified the death of the Revolution.

It was precisely the end of the civil war which

¶ Cadet officers.

* New Economic Policy.

produced the splitting of the post-revolutionary society into two fundamental groupings: the working masses and the bureaucracy. As far as its socialist and internationalist aspirations were concerned, the Russian Revolution was stifled: in its nationalist, bureaucratic, and state capitalist tendencies, it developed and consolidated itself.

It was from this point onwards, and on this basis, each year more and more clearly, that the Bolshevik repudiation of morality, so frequently evoked, took on a development which had to lead to the Moscow Trials. The implacable logic of things has manifested itself. While the revolutionaries, remaining such only in words, accomplished in fact the tasks of the reaction and counter-revolution, they were compelled, inevitably, to have recourse to lies, to calumny and falsification. This system of generalized lying is the result, not the cause, of the separation of the Bolshevik party from socialism and from the proletariat.

In order to corroborate this statement, I shall quote the testimony regarding Kronstadt of men I have met in Soviet Russia.

"The men of Kronstadt? They were perfectly right; they intervened in order to defend the Petrograd workers: it was a tragic misunderstanding on the part of Lenin and Trotsky, that instead of agreeing with them, they gave them battle," said Dch. to me in 1932. He was a non-party worker in Petrograd in 1921, whom I knew in the political isolator at Verkhne-Uralsk as a Trotskyist.

"It is a myth that, from the social point of view, Kronstadt of 1921 had a wholly different population from that of 1917," another man from Petrograd, Dv., said to me in prison. In 1921 he was a member of the Communist youth, and was imprisoned in 1932 as a "decist" (a member of Sapronov's group of "Democratic Centralists")

I also had the opportunity of knowing one of the most effective participants in the Kronstadt rebellion. He was an old marine engineer, a communist since 1917, who had, during the civil war, taken an active part, directing at one time a Tcheka in a province somewhere on the Volga, and found himself in 1921 at Kronstadt as a political commissar on the warship "Marat" (ex "Petropavlovsk"). When I saw him, in 1930, in the Leningrad prison, he had just passed eight years in the Solovietski islands.

The methods of struggle

THE Kronstadt workers pursued revolutionary aims in struggling against the reactionary tendencies of the bureaucracy, and they used clean and honest methods. In contrast, the bureaucracy slandered their movement odiously, pretending that it was led by General Kozlovski. Actually, the men of Kronstadt honestly desired, as comrades, to discuss the questions at issue with the representatives of the government. Their action, had at first, a defensive character—that is the reason why they did not occupy Oranienbaum in time, situated on the coast opposite Kronstadt.

Right from the start, the Petrograd bureaucrats made use of the system of hostages by arresting the families of the sailors, Red Army soldiers and workers of Kronstadt who were living at Petrograd, because several commissars at Kronstadt—not one of whom was shot—had been arrested. The news of the seizing of the hostages was brought to the knowledge of Kronstadt by means of leaflets dropped from aeroplanes. In their reply by radio, Kronstadt de-

clared on March 7th "that they did not wish to imitate Petrograd as they considered that such an act, even when carried out in an access of desperation and hate, is most shameful and most cowardly from every point of view. History has not yet known a similar procedure" (Ivestia of the Kronstadt Revolutionary Committee 7th March 1921).

The new governing clique understood much better than the Kronstadt "rebels" the significance of the social struggle which was beginning, the depth of the class-antagonism which separated it from the workers. It is in this that lies the tragedy of revolutions in the period of their decline.

But while military conflict was forced upon Kronstadt, they still found the strength to formulate the programme for the "third revolution," which remains since then the programme of the Russian socialism of the future†

Balance Sheet

THERE are reasons for thinking that granted the relation between the forces of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of socialism and capitalism, which existed in Russia and Europe at the beginning of 1921, the struggle for the socialist development of the Russian Revolution was doomed to defeat. In those conditions the socialist programme of the masses could not conquer: it had to depend on the triumph of the counter-revolution whether openly declared or camouflaged under an aspect of degeneracy (as has been produced in fact).

But such a conception of the progress of the Russian Revolution does not diminish in the slightest in the realms of principle, the historic importance of the programme and the efforts of the working masses. On the contrary, this programme constitutes the *point of departure* from which a new cycle in the revolutionary socialist development will begin. In fact, each new revolution begins not on the basis from which the preceding one started, but from the point at which the revolution before it had undergone a mortal set-back.

The experience of the degeneration of the Russian Revolution places anew before the conscience of international socialism an extremely important sociological problem. In the Russian revolution, as in two other great earlier revolutions, those of England and of France, why is it that it is from the inside that the counter-revolution has triumphed, at the moment when the revolutionary forces were exhausted, and by means of the revolutionary party itself ("purged," it is true of its left-wing elements)?

Marxism believes that the socialist revolution, once begun, would either be assured of a gradual and continued development towards integral socialism, or would be defeated through the agency of bourgeois restoration.

Altogether, the Russian Revolution poses in an entirely new way the problem of the mechanism of the socialist revolution. This question must become paramount in international discussion. In such discussion the problem of Kronstadt can and must have a position worthy of it.

† A comprehensive work on Kronstadt, containing the essential documents on these historic days, has been compiled by Ida Mett. Her publication should supply, in my opinion, a timely contribution to the international discussion which is now developing. (Since published in America by the International Review—Ed.)

Through the Press

CRAFT OR GRAFT?

Under the heading "craft," the polite Manchester Guardian of 26. 11. 41 reports the suggestions of Mr. C. F. Glenny, the eminent tailor and shirtmaker, made in his capacity of chairman of the Retail Master Craftsmen's Association and Export Group. "Although many of them sent their representatives twice a year to call on 25,000 rich American families they could not exist on export alone. Foreigners would not pay their overheads. But the rationing was killing their home trade." Mr. Glenny suggested that coupons should be reserved for "utility" garments, while the "craft" productions of the West End "which have given the prestige value to British exports," should be coupon-free, and have a proportion of raw material allocated to them. "The British working man never really worried his head about other people's business. Only 3½% of the population, anyway, bought the expensive clothes that would, by this scheme, be free of the coupon, and Lord Woolton, for parallel example, did not ruin the Carlton Grill for the benefit of the works canteen." Here is our old friend Equality-of-sacrifice again. We are not so polite as the Manchester Guardian. To us it seems more like graft!

LICK-SPITTLING TO STALIN

Writing in the Sunday Express of the 9th of November Joseph E. Davies, former U.S. ambassador to Moscow, declares that there are no fifth columnists in Russia because they have been all shot after the Moscow Trials. He goes on to say:

"I recently went through my diary and with the permission of the State Department re-read some of my reports as American Ambassador to Moscow in 1937 and 1938."

"Suddenly I saw the picture as I undoubtedly should have seen it at the time in Russia."

"Much of the world construed the famous treason trials and purges from 1935 to 1938 to be outrageous examples of barbarism, ingratitude and hysteria, but it now appears that they indicated the amazing far sightedness of Stalin and his close associates."

If Mr. Davies had re-read his diary and reports from Aug 1939-June 1941 while the Stalin-Hitler pact was in force he would have formed no doubt a rather different retrospective picture of Stalin's prescience!

HOW BRITISH FASCISTS ARE TREATED

When we read in the newspapers of how Sir Oswald and Lady Mosley are treated we sometimes think that democracy is worth fighting for after all! The fascist leader certainly receives all the consideration due to his rank. The Sunday Express tells us that he and his wife are 'going to share two fairly large adjoining cells, furnished as a bed-sitting room. . . . To ensure greater privacy the approach to them has been partitioned off. Bedding, carpets and several other articles of furniture have been brought from Sir Oswald's home. . . . Servants are provided as well 'they can arrange to pay other prisoners for cleaning out their cells.

From the Star Man's Diary comes this thrilling news 'I learn that the apartment to be occupied by the Mosleys at Holloway is now in the final stages of furnishing, and Sir Oswald is expected to arrive within a few days.

British soldiers are expected to fight and die in order to crush not Germany but fascism and meanwhile our fascists are provided with furnished cells and pleasant meals. C.O.'s and anarchists now in prison get hard labour with the prospect of being condemned again when they come out. And what will happen in the case of a German victory. Hitler will see to it that Mosley gets a cushy job but Pacifists and Anarchists will be put in prison again. A few days ago the newspapers reported that Jews, Communists and Anarchists were to be shot in France. Prison and lead are our lot under democratic and fascist regime alike, the fascists get furnished cells and high appointments.

PAUL RECLUS

Paul Reclus, the son of Elie Reclus and nephew of the great geographer and anarchist, Elisee Reclus, has died recently in Paris. Throughout his long life he participated actively in the anarchist movement.

He was a collaborator on Revolte, and replaced Jean Grave as editor when the latter was imprisoned. Later his friendship with Vaillant cost him 20 years hard labour; he was falsely accused of having helped Vaillant to organize his attempt to blow up the Chamber of Deputies. Paul Reclus escaped to England and on his return to France he worked on many anarchist newspapers and assisted Elisee Reclus in his immense work of preparing his "L'Homme et la Terre." In 1914, he approved the Manifesto of the Sixteen which gave qualified support to the Allies, but at the end of his life he recognized the futility of the hopes he had founded on the Entente. He was 83 at his death.

Democracy and Freedom in New Zealand.

In New Zealand the "liberty loving" social democratic Labour Party is in power. We have recently heard from the wife of a subscriber there who is a pacifist. She writes that "he is serving one year's imprisonment for so-called subversive writings and the holding of a street meeting." He sends us the following message "I'm glad to get your paper, and think the publication is a valiant effort." We extend our greetings to this comrade, and thank him for his message. He at least, has no reasons for harbouring any illusions about the "Democracy" we are still sometimes stated—by unwary politicians—to be fighting for.

ANARCHISM

A living philosophy

by

FREDRICK LOHR

at

CONWAY HALL

Red Lion Square

January 11th Sunday 2.30

January 25th Sunday 2.30

War Commentary 1941

Are you a new reader?

If so, why not obtain a complete file of **WAR COMMENTARY** for 1941?

The following are the titles of some of the articles which appeared in **WAR COMMENTARY** during the year:

Trade Unionism or Syndicalism by Tom Brown (series of 3 articles)

Divide & Rule by F. A. Ridley (2 articles)

Eric Gill—Anarchist by

Herbert Read

Politics & Religion in India by A. G. Stock

Empire Expansion in Wartime

Towards Anarchy by Fredrick Lohr

The Imperialist Conflict in Chile

Michael Bakunin

—A short Biography

U S S R—Anarchist position

(Editorial)

The State and the Workers by J.H.

The Battle of the Vitamins by

Tom Brown

etc., etc.

The equivalent of a 300 page book. These files of **WAR COMMENTARY** are obtainable from

FREEDOM PRESS

27 BELSIZE ROAD LONDON
N W 6

POST **3/-** FREE

Yorkshire

Friends of Freedom Press

A Public Meeting

will take place at

H U D D E R S F I E L D

January 18th

Will all sympathisers write to us for further particulars

THE I.W.W.

The Industrial Workers of the World, popularly known as Wobblies were organised in the United States of America during 1904. Since that time its members have carried the message of Workers' Freedom throughout the world. Organized on the basis of CLASS STRUGGLE, the I.W.W. has fought the Boss always on the industrial field. Ignoring the attempts of some revolutionaries to organize parties which co-operate with the Employers or the reformist craft unions to fight for working conditions of members of a craft union only, it has always declared that the only path to freedom for the workers is the one by which the workers at the point of production shall take over the means of production and distribution and themselves establish a Society wherein all shall give in service according to their ability and receive according to their needs.

While the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. receive great publicity in the capitalist Press both here and in the States, the work of the I.W.W. is unmentioned and so almost unknown in this country. The preamble of the I.W.W. which we reprint here, will be sufficient to indicate to our readers that it represents better than the reformist unions the true interests of the workers—whether they are organized, like the A.F. of L., according to craft, or like the C.I.O. on a so-called industrial basis. As a consequence the I.W.W. has been persecuted with all the ferocity of which the American ruling class has shown itself so eminently capable.

THE PREAMBLE of the

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

We find that the centring of management of the industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wage system."

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the every-day struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.

“Democracy is Preferable”

—Democracy is preferable to Fascism. The former in spite of all its shortcomings, permits one to live, think and within certain limits to speak and have at least a feeling of self-respect as a man. Fascism instead stifles life, crushes and abolishes all thought, and reduces human beings to a state of servitude. Democracy allows a glimmer of hope for the future; fascism is the tomb of all faith in man's destiny.

—Agreed, democracy is preferable to Fascism.

Relative liberty is preferable to absolute slavery.

Influenza is preferable to pneumonia.

Better one eye than none at all.

Better a sudden accident to the slow agony of hydrophobia.

Between two evils, the lesser is always preferable to the greater.

But why limit the choice to two evils? Would it not be better to avoid them both? In any case doesn't constant experience and reasoning teach us to try and attend to and cure the lesser evil in order to forestall and avoid the greater evil?

That democracy is an evil has been admitted by those who founded it on the ruins of the old regime defeated by the workers' revolution. They thought it would be a necessary evil, but an evil nevertheless.

The experience gained during the two succeeding centuries showed that bourgeois democracy was not a necessary evil; that it is an avoidable evil; that it must be energetically eradicated in order that all humanity may enjoy the benefits of liberty and hap-

STILL TIME!

AS this issue of War Commentary went to press a week earlier than usual we propose to hold over our final list of contributors to the Reconstruction Fund until next month so as to allow readers who are sending us Xmas contributions to have their contributions included in this list. We can say however that at the time of writing we have not reached the £300 aimed for by about £25, so those of our readers and comrades who think WAR COMMENTARY worth while, let us have your contributions large and small during the next few days.

piness, failing which murderous infections will exude from its purulent sores.

Fascism has come into existence just because men have not wanted to cure themselves and recover from the evils of bourgeois democracy: monopoly, exploitation, oppression and misery.

The lesser evil has produced the greater evil. Men and women today, if they wish to be sure of enjoying liberty and justice and the happiness of well being must choose not between a greater or lesser evil—because the latter contains the germ of the former—but between good and evil, between justice and iniquity, freedom and oppression, civilisation and barbarism, between life and death. They must choose between war, which keeps people oppressed and exploited by monopoly of individual or state privileges, and Social Revolution which emancipates the producer from all exploitation, and the citizen from every form of oppression.

(We have translated the foregoing from a recent issue of the Italian Anarchist paper “*L'Adunata dei Refrattari*” (The Call of the Refractories) published in New York. It is an eloquent answer to those whose hatred of Fascism, which we share, prevents them, however, from applying the same moral values to British and American Imperialism, and the Stalinist regime simply because these powers are to their way of thinking working for the defeat of Nazism. In this way they forget to ask themselves why Fascism ever came about and who were the active supporters of the regime)

Series of lectures organized by the North West London Group of the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM PRESS

Fridays

2nd January William Gape

The Tramps Organize

9th January M. L. Berneri

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution

16th January Mat Kavanagh

The Easter Rebellion of Dublin 1916

23rd January Harry Jones

Peter Kropotkin

His life and work

30th January Tom Brown

Leninism and Stalinism

Lectures start at 7 p.m. Discussion

Admission free. All welcomed.