

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

## MURDERERS ARE AMONG US, or

# OUR "GALLANT GUEST"

AMONG the many queer things the world has seen in the past fifteen years there are few that compare with the strange relations between régimes which claim to be mutually hostile and thus reject with great indignation the very idea of collaboration with their "arch-enemies". The surprise over the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 showed the extent the public accepted these statements at their face value. Since then, however, propaganda has made such progress that the invitation of a Communist head of a State by a Tory Government has caused little astonishment. In spite of the former's boast to lead the only C.P. faithful to the teachings of Marx and Lenin and the determination of Her Majesty's Government to destroy communism in Malaya and fight it in Korea.

The incongruity of such a situation was masked by a propaganda barrage designed to present the guest in the most attractive colour. Its success was due to the fact that the three main political parties and their press adopted a common policy on this point. Right-wing Socialists and Bevanites might quarrel over the extent of democracy within the Labour Party but found time to praise Tito's "socialist democracy" and laud "workers' control" there. Conservatives and Liberals to whom the nationalisation of the Bank of England was a sign that Bolshevism was reaching the shores of Britain, unhesitatingly expressed their approbation of the latest Communist experiments in Yugoslavia and spoke with admiration of "32 new divisions" lined up for the defence of the West. All agreed that their guest was a "charming" man and that by paying their respects to him they were also showing their friendly feelings towards what the Archbishop of York called "a sturdy, peasant community".

### Who is "Marshal" Tito

Like many other rulers of modern Europe, Tito began his career in the Social-Democrat movement. After 1918 he joined the C.P. and his dog-like loyalty to the Kremlin led the Comintern in 1928 to praise his work in an "Open Letter" to all the members of the Yugoslav C.P. Nine years later, the Comintern appointed him secretary-general of

its Yugoslav section and ordered him, according to his own words, to "form a new leadership within the country and to carry out a thorough party purge". He carried out this task to his superiors' satisfaction with whose help he liquidated among others, no less than five of his predecessors in the post of secretary-general.

No sooner was this task over than the Second World War began. Then again he followed the current party line set by Moscow. A call to insurrection followed after Hitler's attack on the U.S.S.R. The formation of partisan detachments and the large quantity of automatic weapons received from Mr. Churchill after the Italian capitulation, allowed him under the guise of the "anti-fascist struggle" to massacre thousands of innocent people. First in the villages and then in the towns.

The campaign of terror reached such proportions that after the end of the war Tito's newspapers announced the passing of death sentences on, among others, Jehovah Witnesses, school girls, peasant women and workers accused of theft. Apart from the system of beating-up, denunciations, forced labour for trivial offences, expulsions from secondary schools for "political" reasons, purges among students at Belgrade university, and all the paraphernalia of a police State.

In this task he and his followers displayed the moral outlook of Chicago gangsters and none of the "humanism" which Western politicians and journalists attribute to them. Thanks to their ruthlessness and the support received first from Moscow and then from the West, Tito achieved his main object: the preservation of power. On Stalinist lines for the simple reason that his

entire system of government is based on it.

That is why Tito is unable to give a message to the Western world. A moral condemnation of Stalinism sounds hollow when coming from the mouth of one of its offsprings, just as he cannot impress anybody when he speaks about the guarantees of freedom in Yugoslavia, he, to whom the destruction of that very freedom is both his own occupation and also the only condition for his remaining in power.

Nor will his "32 divisions" fight under him for their own enslavement. They and their families, and not his London hosts and admirers, are the best judges of what he stands for.

## Special Branch Screen Yugoslavs

THERE are in England to-day seven to eight thousand Yugoslav refugees, mostly from Serbia. Most of them were former prisoners of war in Germany in 1939-45, or fought in the guerilla bands which refused to come under Communist leadership and yet survived. They are mostly of peasant origin and are employed to-day in mining, textiles and agriculture. They live in hostels and camps.

These men and women were opposed to Tito both before and after his quarrel with Stalin.

During January and February they have been subjected to questioning by the Special Branch. The police sent invitations to attend for questioning, amongst others, to a woman who died four years ago; to a boy who is now just 16 and who left Yugoslavia when he was 3 years old; and to men and women over 60.

The questions, apart from those relating to age, occupation, etc.,

## Why Are They in Korea?

WHY are we in Korea? Nobody seems to know what the war is being fought about, and the long drawn-out arguments over the terms of armistice have induced everybody to stop worrying as to the reasons or even the participants.

It is said that "United Nations troops" are there. This is an extraordinary term. Russia is a prominent member of the United Nations; Soviet satellites abound in it. But are they on the South Korean side? How are we supposed to work up any enthusiasm for the cause of the United Nations when plainly staring us in the face is the fact that one of the Big Four with the power of veto is on the other side? So little does the British public know about the reason for the war that some people suggest the various members of the United Nations should pay a levy to

bring all troops up to the U.S.A. troops' level of pay—they hardly seem to understand what the United Nations means.

It is more of a war between the U.S.A. and China. But in that case what is everyone else doing there? Why these incessant stupid arguments about how many British and Commonwealth troops there are in relation to United States troops? If it is not a U.N.O. affair it is a U.S.A. affair.

But maybe we have gone to help the South Koreans? First of all, this is plain. The division between North and South Koreans is not the same as that between the North and South Americans. They are not two races but one, and the dividing line between them is one drawn purely arbitrarily across the map. On a similar basis one might divide North and South Londoners. Indeed there is more divergence of community life one side of the Thames from the other than there is between one side of the geographical parallel and the other.

However, who is helping the South Koreans? These poor wretched people (like those the other side of the parallel) are living in misery, poverty and the constant smell of death. The condition of the Korean people was described recently by Mr. Shimpei Kato, special correspondent of the Tokyo *Sangyo Keiza Shimbun*. We quote from the translation appearing in the Bombay *Bharat Jyoti* (25/1/53).

"The oppressive conditions of the war are relentless and affect everyone. In over two years of fighting, Korea has suffered 500,000 in killed and wounded and 4,000,000 persons burned or bombed out. With a total population of 25,000,000 these figures represent a ratio of one person in five who have suffered directly by the war.

"Tragedy is everywhere. A young boy who made his escape from North Korea relates the tale of how he lost his father in the mad rush when the United Nations forces made their retreat in January. A woman who has lost her husband bitterly expresses her hate of war.

"A man working in Seoul must spend half his month's pay for transportation to see his wife who has taken refuge in Pusan. Even in Pusan, small huts with roofs made of cardboard from the boxes discarded by the U.S. Army cover the hillside. Orphans huddle in front of the PX. The first bitter, cold blasts of winter are beginning to be felt by these people. It is no secret that fertilizer and other imported materials are being sold on the black market at prices several times above the official prices. Even if these affairs are exposed, it is only the lower bracket officials who take the blame.

"During the elections in September, a Diet member is said to have made 100,000,000 Yen in illegal profits with which he bought a shiny American automobile. One day he rode his car into his home village and was beaten up by the angry villagers for his trouble. A young Korean said, 'It is good to have power that comes with position.'

"Next to the government officials and blackmarketeers, there are the soldiers who hold the most envied position. Promotions keep pace with the deaths of those killed in action. In two years a lieutenant can become a colonel. There are generals who are still in their thirties. In Korea, compulsory military training is from 20 to 23 years of age, conscription is from 24 to 28 and labour service up to 40 years of age. Labour service usually means digging trenches in the front lines and is said to be tougher than soldiering.

"The present Korean army numbers 340,000 and plans are afoot to increase the strength to 1,000,000. Therefore, most young men become soldiers. While

## Stalin's Historical Heritage

FOR many years a conscious attempt has been made to create a special myth around Stalin. History has been re-written in order to attribute every kind of historical prescience and heroism to him. To mark the occasion of his seventieth birthday three years ago, colossal busts of him were erected on thirty-eight of the highest peaks in the Soviet Union.

Such crudities may be smiled at in the West. Yet the newspapers of the West have also played their part in creating a Stalin myth, even when they are openly hostile to him. One of the Sunday papers, for example, captioned a photograph of Stalin on the bier with the words, "The great leveller is dead," and others have spoken of his services to the revolution. Now it may be that the term "leveller" may have intended to convey the sense of death the leveller, for it is certainly true that Stalin has more deaths on his hands than any other contemporary historical figure. But it also gives the impression that Socialism in Russia has something to do with equality. In fact, of course, the disparity between incomes of the highest and the lowest is greater in Russia even than in America.

### The Bolshevik Counter-Revolution

To estimate the rôle of Stalin and of Stalinism it is necessary to consider the revolutionary movement itself since 1917. It is still common to hear the Bolshevik *coup d'état* of October 1917 described as the Revolution. Actually,

the overthrow of the Tsar, the walk-out from the war, and the taking over of the land with the creation of workers' and peasants' councils, or "soviets", was the work of the people of Russia in February 1917. If the term social revolution means anything at all it means the seizing of initiative by the people as a whole and the overturning of existing property relations. With it goes a new attitude regarding the social relationship of men to each other. The revolution in Russia raised the slogan, "All power to the Soviets" and, in the summer of 1917 meant that all decisions should be taken by the local councils at the place of work. When Lenin took up this slogan and in the teeth of opposition from his own followers got it accepted by the Bolsheviks he did so in order to place his party at the head of the revolutionary workers and so seize the leadership. That done he proceeded to secure the reins of government, weakly and indecisively held by the Kerensky administration, for himself in the *coup d'état* of October.

Once in power he began to set up an apparatus of power which included a secret police modelled upon the Tsar's *Ochraná* but much more far-reaching and efficient, and to destroy the local power of the Soviets by centralising all administrative functions in the hands of his own party. By 1921 this process was so nearly completed that the strikes in Petrograd and the revolt of the sailors at Kronstadt were founded on this very issue and demanded the return of power to the Soviets. They were the last open

revolts against the Bolsheviks and were bloodily suppressed by Trotsky on Lenin's express orders.

The fact is that long before Stalin came to power the historical rôle of the Bolsheviks had been to establish the counter-revolution. They had wrested power from the revolutionary masses and re-established an autocracy more absolute than that of the Tsars.

### Revolutionary Movements Outside Russia

From the first, Lenin regarded revolutionary movements outside Russia solely from the standpoint of how they could help to consolidate the power of the Bolsheviks within Russia. Thus, when the Third International was founded, its 21 points secured the decisive leadership for the Russian government and exacted absolute obedience from the member organisations from abroad. Those who speak of the rivalry between Trotsky and Stalin after Lenin's death as though Trotsky stood for "world revolution" and Stalin for consolidating the position at home ("socialism in one country") forget that both accepted Lenin's position of seeking to make world revolutionary situations serve the interests of the Russian government rather than those of the revolution itself.

In the year of Lenin's strokes, 1923, Stalin delivered his famous dictum on the gathering German revolution, that in his opinion the workers in Germany had to be held back rather than pushed on. The revolutionary attempt of 1923 failed,

Continued on p. 4

### "A STAIN ON THE TIMES WE LIVE IN"

THE searchlight which in the last week has illuminated the sufferings of the homeless so close to home is beginning to dim, for the crisis seems to be ending. Before the light fades altogether let it flicker on the less merciful lot of other homeless ones who now number tens and hundreds of thousands.

They are farther away, and not so well noticed. Some are in Berlin and Western Germany. A thousand refugees from the compassionless Soviet tyranny are to be flown every day from Berlin to join the multitude who have preceded them. And when will they see their old homes again?

Four years ago or more, when the Arabs and Israelis were fighting, close to 900,000 Arabs fled from Palestine into camps that appeared like unlovely eruptions all over the Middle East. They are there still, nearly all of them, and in them Arabs live in wretchedness, crowded into hovels, ill-fed and bereft of hope.

—News Chronicle, 9/2/53.

Continued on p. 3

# SECRET TRIALS IN BRITISH PRISONS

THE following news item appeared in a recent issue of the *Manchester Guardian*:

"A man in Chelmsford Prison, involved in a recent disturbance there and sentenced by visiting magistrates to corporal punishment, will not undergo the punishment. A Home Office spokesman said last night:

"The Home Secretary has been unable to confirm the award in view of a technical defect in the proceedings. He has referred the case for investigation of an alternative charge—assaulting a prison officer—by a Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner of Prisons."

"The Home Office stated on Thursday that eleven prisoners at Chelmsford, charged before visiting magistrates with refusing to work, had been sentenced. 'Another prisoner,' the statement said, 'was charged with incitement to mutiny and the visiting board's recommendation is now being considered.'

"The charges arose out of an attempt by three men to take keys from a warder and a refusal by fifty men to work in the brush shop."

These cases again draw attention to the whole procedure of Secret Trials in British prisons. In cases where the Visiting Magistrates impose flogging as a punishment, such punishment must be ratified by the Home Office before it can take place. But ever year thousands of prisoners are given various forms of punishment by the Governor or by the Visiting Magistrates\* at hearings held behind the closed doors of the prisons, under conditions which would be considered inadmissible in the Criminal Courts. It might be argued that minor infringements of prison regulations which are punished by minor penalties are so

\*The Report of the Commissioners of Prisons for 1946 shows that in the year 1945 the offences in men's prisons numbered 11,167 and the number of prisoners punished, 6,526. There were 6,919 awards of dietary punishment, 7,087 of loss of remission, 4,859 of close confinement and 10 men were flogged.

## Book Review

### A KOESTLER AUTOBIOGRAPHY

ARROW IN THE BLUE, by Arthur Koestler. (Hamish Hamilton & Collins, 18/-)

ARROW IN THE BLUE is the first volume of an autobiography by the novelist, Arthur Koestler; it takes us from his birth to 1931, when he began the publicly better known section of his career by becoming a member of the Communist Party. Thus, to a very great extent, it avoids the controversial and passionate atmosphere which is bound to envelop its successor, but this may be an advantage, for *Arrow in the Blue*, except for occasional passages, does allow one to form an image of Koestler as a person independent of the stereotyped professional anti-Communist which he has tended to become in recent years.

It is, on the whole, a pleasing book, vividly written and endowed with an irony and, at times, a wit that one would not have expected

numerous that they could not be tried in open court. But it is not sufficiently realised that Visiting Magistrates can impose very severe punishments, which can among other things prolong a man's imprisonment by many months.

We believe that the general public is still unaware of the powers given to Visiting Magistrates, and of the total lack of facilities afforded the prisoner to adequately defend himself at such Secret Trials. For this reason we are reprinting an article we wrote for the *Freedom Defence Committee* in 1946 on this subject, with which we think many FREEDOM readers are not familiar, the importance of which lies in the fact that it is a first-hand account of procedure in these Secret Trials.

★

AT the beginning of 1946 the Freedom Defence Committee took up the case of a young Dutch naval deserter serving a sentence of 3 years at Wormwood Scrubs prison who was unjustly, in the Committee's opinion, awarded 3 months' loss of remission and six months' loss of stage privileges by the Prison's Visiting Committee. The charge, on which he was found guilty, was of "attempting to incite other men in his working party to join in a disturbance." The Committee obtained no satisfactory answer from the Home Secretary with whom a long correspondence was exchanged; but the correspondence did reveal the most unsatisfactory state of affairs that exists inside prisons so far as punishment of those who break prison regulations is concerned. It is in this connection that we refer to this particular case, because, in fact, at the time that the correspondence with the Home Secretary had got under way, the Dutch boy had been transferred to a prison in Holland and was no longer under the Home Secretary's authority. We are in this article concerned with Secret Trials in prisons, a procedure under our exist-

ing prison system which is unknown to most people who have not experienced prison life.

The writer, in company with J.H. experienced prison punishment, and since it was connected with the case of the Dutch boy it is not out of place and not without general interest we think to briefly mention our case. The writer was working in one of the mail-bag shops in which were also working some 80 boys who were waiting to be transferred to Borstal institutions.\* One afternoon the Borstal boys decided to call a strike because they rightly maintained that their bread ration had been cut down for no official reason. At 2 o'clock the strike started, all the boys getting up from their stools and assembling in one corner of the workshop. There were three officers present, but they wisely did nothing to interfere in what could have become, in a matter of a few minutes, a very ugly situation. The men in the shop did not join in the strike, but just looked on. Eventually a fourth officer came into the shop and made a bee-line for the ring-leader of the Borstal boys and closed in with him. This was a signal for the boys to "let him have it". The other three officers still thought it wise to remain white-faced spectators of the whole affair. They had, however, sounded the alarm and within a few minutes officers, principal officers, chief officers and the boys' governor arrived on the scene. The ring-leader was hustled into one of the store rooms, and the remaining boys were marched back to their cells in groups of four accompanied by two officers. The men were then ordered out into the exercise yard so that they would not see the state to which the ring-leader had been reduced when they transferred him from the storeroom to the strong cell. When we had been exercising for some ten minutes the chief officer and a warder came out and marched off the Dutch naval prisoner back to his cell. The next morning he was brought before the Deputy Governor and charged with attempting to incite the men to join in the disturbance. As the Governor is not empowered to try a case of incitement to a disturbance, the prisoner had to wait nearly a fortnight for the Visiting Committee. The writer and J.H. became

of so passionate a fictional polemicist. There are occasions when a pretentious vein of pseudo-philosophy, reminiscent of his *Insight and Outlook*, enters in; there are times when the child Koestler is credited with a depth and complexity of thought which it seems evident are the products of a memory refined by sophistication. Yet at the same time the book presents a whole series of scenes and tableaux from the author's life which are wholly delightful.

There is a vivid little vignette of the Hungarian Commune of 1919 as Koestler saw it when a boy, a revolution where the idealism remained for its brief hundred days, where the Communist Party never had the time to consolidate itself into a dictatorship and the workers, with their "strange self-confidence and dignity", still retained their position as a revolutionary force.

Later, Koestler's parents moved out of Hungary into Austria, and he entered the University of Vienna and became a member of one of the student corps—a Zionist corps devoted to proving that Jews are just as good as Gentiles at cutting up each other's faces in duels. Koestler describes with genial irony these more ridiculous sides of the Zionists' activity in Vienna, but he also shows how it led him to become a devoted follower of the extreme nationalist, Jabotinsky. And here, when he comes to describe this hero, one feels that Koestler is still too far blinded by the rosy visions of youth to realise the essentially authoritarian character of Jabotinsky's rôle. Koestler, in fact, emerges as a chronic devotee, whose later conversion to Communism has the same religious character, and whom it is now not in the least surprising to see following with exactly the same devotion the hybrid and negative religion of Anti-Communism.

Zionism led Koestler in his early twenties to Palestine, and perhaps the best part of this book is to be found in the description he gives of the few years he spent in this country before it achieved its present militant Statehood. He lived in a small *Kvusta*, a community which practised the extreme of elementary

communism in its daily life, and where he found a spirit of lifetime devotion among its members which he could not hope to emulate. After a while he was found too attached to the world to be suitable for such an idealistic environment, and he returned to Haifa, enjoying the free hospitality of the farmers and the communities he passed on the way.

After Palestine, Koestler entered on his career as a foreign correspondent for the German Ullstein combine, and spent a considerable time in the Near East and in Paris; the chapters on the latter city are distinguished by a very telling exposure of the nauseating hypocrisy which attended the celebrated Marthe Richard morality campaign that ended in the closing of the Paris brothels.

It was in Paris that Koestler began to turn towards Communism, and he describes with evident honesty the process of rationalisation by which, having discovered that he was in rebellion against things as they were in the world, he found himself led by a specious logic to accept Communism as the creed of rebellion and to become involved in the closed system of Marxist thought. A grandiose, fascinating, absurd, and in some respects highly phoney voyage of the Graf Zeppelin across the Arctic seas, in which Koestler took part as a newspaper man, provides a fitting climax to the volume. Descending from this unwieldy dirigible, Koestler takes a new ascent on the monstrous balloon of Communism, and the book ends, as Koestler admits, rather like and old-time film serial. The next volume will tell us what happened to Pearl White Koestler in the land of the giants. If it is as well written as this, it will at least be worth reading.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

involved in that we realised the whole case was a frame-up, that our Dutch friend had no means of defending himself and therefore decided at all costs to smuggle out a report of what exactly happened (since the writer witnessed the whole incident) with a view to some kind of agitation being started outside to have the charges heard in open court. Our plans failed and the document fell into the hands of the prison officials. I will now attempt to outline the procedure so far as a secret trial is concerned.

## PROCEDURE AT SECRET TRIALS

As we were assembling in the prison yard, J.H. and I were called out and taken to our cells, each of us accompanied by two officers. Our cells were then "turned over", each article of bedding being thoroughly searched and then dumped in a pile on the floor. We were then stripped (in the name of "decency" the prison regulations allow for one article of clothing being retained!) and our garments thoroughly searched. We were locked up until the following morning when we were marched off to appear before the Governor. We were charged, and this was the first intimation of the nature of our "crime", with attempting to communicate unauthorised communications on unauthorised paper. Had the Governor not taken such a poor view of our crime we would have been punished then and there, that is to say without any facilities to find out what our rights in the matter of procedure, etc., were. The prisoner's word does not count against that of the warder! The Governor told us that he wanted an impartial judgment of our case and remanded us for a week until the visiting magistrates came to the prison.\* We were then marched back to our cells and locked up for the day. Indeed, for the next six days we spent 23 hours a day in our cells and the hour's exercise was taken in a yard away from the other prisoners. And even during the exercise we were not allowed to communicate

\*It should be noted that the punishment that can be imposed by the Governor is limited, the Visiting Magistrates having much wider powers. Consequently, we assumed that the Governor's impartiality was not to be taken too seriously!

## Film Review

### ONE SUMMER OF HAPPINESS

READERS may remember, just before the war, the scandalous success of a film called "Extase" wherein Hedy Lamarr flitted through leafy woods in soft focus for ninety seconds. The Lamarr scamper would have had no artistic or cinema value but for the simple but impure fact that Miss L. was naked. However, no harm was done to public morals as the woods were very leafy, the focus was very soft, and the ninety seconds were timed with a stop-watch.

I was reminded of this film in coming across in a Sunday paper (that tribute of vice to the Sabbath virtues) an advance publicity item about "One Summer of Happiness," the new Swedish film at the Curzon Cinema, London.

The hero and heroine (Ulla Jacobsson and Folke Sundquist) appear naked in a bathing sequence in this film. "But," says the Sunday paper, "Miss Jacobsson and Mr. Sundquist have been friends since childhood and, furthermore, they are engaged to be married." So, despite the photo of the bathing sequence in the paper (more sharp in definition than the film-company still) the Great British Public can be assured that its moral sense is not to be outraged. Folke is going to make an Honest Woman out of Ulla.

D. H. Lawrence said in his pamphlet "Pornography and Obscenity," "I am sure no other civilisation, not even the Roman has showed such a vast proportion of ignominious and degraded nudity and ugly, squalid, dirty sex. Because no other civilisation has driven sex into the underworld, and nudity to the W.C."

The attitude of the Sunday papers on this and all sex items, the attitude of cinema proprietors from the one who advertised "the sexiest programme in London" to the one who proudly quotes a film critic's claim to "have blushed a rosy red"; all contribute to the degradation of sex, and inhibit against a healthy attitude towards this subject.

"One Summer of Happiness" is a beautiful film, whatever the censor's dirty hands, the cutter's shears or the critic's foam-flecked drollings may do to it.

It is a simple story of a boy and a girl who fall in love and enjoy "One Summer of Happiness". The world gives them no more. In fact, the world gives them nothing except what they take,

with one another. Thus one sees that in prison the punishment begins to operate even before one has been found guilty, a fact which confirms the prisoner in his belief that whoever is right, he is always wrong.

## ONE MINUTE HEARING

We eventually appeared before the Visiting Magistrate. He had spent a quarter of an hour with the Governor before we were admitted. Presumably, during that time the Governor was expounding his theories on impartiality! One was marched in, with a warder in front and a principal officer behind who barks, 'Halt. Right turn' and one is face to face with justice and impartiality! The hearing lasted one minute. "Did you write this document?" "Yes, I did." Right turn, quick march, shouts the principal officer and one is back in the corridor, whilst the magistrate and the Governor discuss the situation in the light of the evidence and the case presented by the prisoner at the hearing just described! A quarter of an hour later we were back in the room just to hear the punishment we were to receive for our "crime". 21 consecutive days on a diet of bread, porridge and potatoes, 4 weeks' solitary confinement, of which all but one hour a day is spent in the cell, 8 weeks exclusion from association privileges, and 2 months loss of remission (which meant in fact adding 3 months to our sentence).\* The next day I saw the Governor and demanded a petition form, not in the hope of obtaining redress but in order to put on record the whole incident in the workshop and the reason for our attempt to smuggle out the information concerning the treatment of Borstal boys in Wormwood Scrubs. When, later, we were taken to the Governor, he appeared very conciliatory, and informed

\*A prison officer who round about that time was caught selling sheets from the prison hospital in a local public house was sentenced to one month's imprisonment, and the Governor spoke up for him in court! Of course, the Governor didn't know that this man was also running a tobacco racket in the prison, from which he was making about three times as much as he earned as a warder!

Continued on p. 3

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

### New Books . . .

H. J. Massingham and Edward Hyams *Prophecy of Famine* 12/6  
Herbert Read *The True Voice of Feeling* 25/-  
(Studies in English Romantic Poetry).

### Reprints . . .

Tolstoy *Resurrection* 7/6  
(World's Classics Double Volume).  
William Godwin *Caleb Williams* (U.S.) 30/-

### Something to remember him by . . .

Boris Souvarine *Stalin: a critical survey of Bolshevism* £1  
Leon Trotsky *Stalin* remaindered to 17/6  
(was 25/-)

M. L. Berneri *Workers in Stalin's Russia* 1/-

### Out of Print Penguins . . .

1/6 each  
Shaw: *Pygmalion*; Goethe: *Faust* (Part I);  
James: *Turn of the Screw*; Brontë:  
*The Professor*; Voltaire: *Candide*.

Postage extra.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,

LONDON, W.C.1

## STALIN'S HEIRS & THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

THE death of Stalin has let loose a flood of speculation in almost every daily and weekly newspaper on the question of how will it affect Russia and hence how will it affect the world at large? Much of this speculation has been merely sensational, but it does bear testimony to the importance of the event itself to the course of history. In passing one may remark that for Marxists individuals as such are not supposed to have much importance, history being swayed by the development of the productive forces. The death of Stalin, however, like the death of Lenin, may well show that individuals do in fact have a very profound effect on the history of their times.

The present occasion is the first on which a dictator has died by natural process while still in standing power. The other outstanding dictators of our time, Mussolini and Hitler, were overthrown by outside forces, and the problems to their régimes as to who would succeed them never arose because their régimes were overthrown with them.

The case of Stalin is different. There must have been many attempts within Russia to foresee what would happen at his death. But such attempts must also have come up against the factor which makes the present situation so tense—the fact that Stalin's own personal rule was always maintained by him by a continuous process of setting off one faction of his followers against another one. Malenkov, Beria and Molotov (to name only the most obviously powerful of the men of the Kremlin) may each seek pre-eminence because of personal ambition; but they also are at loggerheads because Stalin maintained his own rule—indeed, his rise to power depended on it—through just this process of weakening all possible rivals by setting them off against each other. His was the extreme case of the policy of divide and rule.

Another way of looking at the problem is to consider the machinery of power wielded by these men. Malenkov, especially, and Molotov to a lesser extent represent the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Beria represents the Police in a state in which that body wields more power and influence than the world has ever before known. A police, moreover, with its own economic power based upon the slave labour population of the labour camps and prison camps. In addition to these, there is the Army, with Bulganin or Zhukov in command.

These men, powerful because of the institutions they head, may well fall into a struggle each one intent on not being the loser who in Russia loses all, including life itself. It is this self-interested rivalry that Stalin has bequeathed to his successors to sort out.

All the non-communist papers are aware of this aspect so fraught with the possibility of weakening in the leadership. But there is an aspect which also makes them seek to present a united front. This other factor is the necessity to keep in subjection the population of the Soviet Union and its satellite empire. Beria may be hateful to Malenkov as a rival, but he may also be valuable or even essential to him as the chief of a police organisation which keeps the Russian masses from sweeping away the whole Communist hierarchy without thought for their internal

rivalries. And so it is with Bulganin and the Army.

The upper reaches of the Soviet hierarchy must always be beset with mutual suspicion, fear and distrust, and without Stalin to balance them these rivalries may well break bounds simply through the need of individuals to safeguard themselves by whatever means they find to hand.

Recently, the general tension of fear must have been greatly accentuated by the party purge which Stalin set in motion at the nineteenth party congress last autumn. From this point of view, Stalin could hardly have chosen a more unsuitable moment to die.

But what of the Russian people themselves. Unrest has shown itself not infrequently and not in the remote past only. After the war there were the Ukrainian revolts. These are the populations of thousands of deportees removed from their own homes and villages. There are the Jews, and there are the millions in Beria's labour camps. Uprisings may accentuate the differences in the leadership, or they may make the leaders stand together to cope with the crisis. It would seem unwise to disregard the possibility of unrest. There is no point in maintaining a police force if the population are solidly for the government. Where the apparatus of coercion and repression is as vast as in the Soviet Union, there cannot be much doubt that there is potential or actual hostility to the government. The curs of the Kremlin may be snapping at each other's throats but they cannot be unmindful of the human tide of potential revolt on their doorstep.

Their technique, their ability and their training fit them to face this problem successfully. But the death of Stalin has weakened the dictatorial structure of the Soviet Union and so may give the Russian workers and peasants the chance to throw off the yoke of the Communist Party. We are only interested in the Palace Revolutions for the influence they may have on this fateful possibility. Whatever the immediate upshot, the next few years will be of decisive importance for the Russian people.

## FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**  
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.  
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**  
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**  
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.  
Food Production and Population 6d.  
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSON :**  
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**  
Anarchy. 6d.  
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**  
Marxism, Freedom and the State. paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :**  
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.  
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.  
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**  
Delinquency 6d.  
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**  
ABC of Anarchism. 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.  
The Wage System. 3d.  
Revolutionary Government. 3d.  
Organised Vengeance and Justice. 2d.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**  
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

## WHY ARE THEY IN KOREA? Continued from p. 1

the pay is small, they are respected and they receive extra rations of rice. Their livelihood is extra rations.

"But there is a dark side to the picture. The problem of wounded soldiers is one of the biggest of social problems. They receive no compensation and their only privilege is free admission to theatres and free street car rides. Wounded war veterans become vendors and sell their wares in restaurants. On the train going from Pusan to Seoul, we passed a train on the opposite tracks full of wounded Korean soldiers. In boxcars were wounded soldiers with their arms in slings looking forlornly out. No one can tell their future fate.

"Inflation is oppressing the livelihood of the people. The average monthly living expense of a Korean family is about 500,000 Yen (15,000 Japanese Yen). A cup of coffee is 1,500 Yen, a package of American cigarettes 3,000 Yen a Chinese meal for one person 30,000 Yen. It is only natural with the scarcity of goods and the flood of paper money being printed.

"The pay of a lieutenant is only 30,000 Yen a month and he is just barely able to make both ends meet. With the increase in the armed strength, government spending will increase, and people's livelihood will be increasingly oppressed by spiral inflation and heavy taxes.

"No one pays much attention any

more to the peace talks at Pan Mun Jon.

"The Korean man-in-the-street feels that there will be no peace in Korea as long as the United States and the Soviets are opposed to each other and that even if there is an armistice, their livelihood will not become easier. However, they are extremely sensitive to any news that the communist army is about to launch a big offensive.

"Koreans would like to escape from the oppressive conditions in their homeland and some attempt to smuggle into Japan. However, the cost per person is over 1,000,000 Yen and there is a good chance that they will be cheated. After riding all night long on some little fishing boat, they will be told that they have arrived at some point on the coast of Japan, and the unsuspecting Korean all dressed up in Japanese kimono would get off only to be caught by South Korean police. They discover that they have landed again on the Korean coast only a few miles away from Pusan.

"Fear of another communist offensive is very great. In a psychiatric hospital there is a patient who shouts, 'Banzai' for Syngman Rhee and then for Kim Il Sung. This may be the true sentiment of the Korean people."

We are not helping the South Koreans. All the future holds for them is escape. And they are not

permitted to land in Japan. It is quite out of the question that the great empty spaces of Australia would welcome them—they are the wrong colour of skin. Nobody wants them. They can rot in Korea. We are fighting for them—what a laugh. Soldiers at least, if not killed, get demobilised. For the Koreans there is no demobilisation. There is not going to be much Korea for them any longer either. But the misery must drag on. You see, once many years ago, there was an aggression. Russia was out of the Assembly at the time so U.N.O. decided to stop it. Now it's rather difficult to back out.

It will be our fate, too, that is mirrored in Korea, and if we do not decide to do anything about it, we too may be living in devastated cities as the wounded walk by, planning only how to escape from the country but prevented at every turn, while death looms up with every minor quarrel at the debating table. Because once, many years ago, there was an aggression and it's rather difficult to back out.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## SECRET TRIALS Continued from p. 2

us that he had read our petitions which, of course, he would send on to the Home Office (he did not contest the facts contained in these documents). Were we aware, however, that we had the right to appeal to the Visiting Committee?

How can a prisoner know what his legal rights are if he is not allowed to have legal advice or have access to the Standing Rules governing the prison? The Standing Rules are a secret document which are locked away in the Governor's office. They cannot even be consulted at the British Museum!

I have dealt with the routine of Secret Trials in prison as I experienced it. The injustice of it all must appear obvious. Its consequences can be studied if we return to the original case discussed which the Defence Committee took up with the Home Secretary. When we were released we gave the Defence Committee a detailed report of our Dutch friend's case. We did not colour the facts. The Home Secretary's information regarding the procedure, the calling of witnesses, etc., differed considerably from the facts put forward by the Defence Committee. And the point is that we know that the Home Secretary has been misinformed. But there is no redress. The hearing was held in secret. For the defence there was only one poor miserable prisoner with no status. For the prosecution there is the Visiting Committee, the Governor, the Medical Officer and the officers. For the Home Secretary, what they say, goes. If on the other hand, the case had been heard in open court, there would be no disputing the evidence, and the prosecution (the prison authorities) could not take the liberty, as they did in the case in question, of limiting the number of witnesses. They cannot deny this fact since my Dutch friend had actually included my name among the witnesses he wished to call and I was not called. Yet the Home Secretary in his letter to the Defence Committee states he is informed that the prisoner

"... was asked by the Chairman which prisoners he wished to call as witnesses in his defence and named two, who gave evidence. The weight to be given to this and other evidence was a matter for the Visiting Committee who had all the persons concerned before them and were in a position to judge of the credibility and accuracy of their evidence."

The "evidence" was really quite a joke. The only person who heard the incitement to join the disturbance was a civilian instructor who was always hostile to the Dutch boy. Not one wit-

ness from among the prisoners was called to give evidence that he had heard any call to action. And as the Defence Committee pointed out to the Home Secretary:

"The incident referred to occurred shortly before 2 p.m. By about 2.20 p.m. the Borstal boys had been subdued and were escorted to their cells. The men in the shop, including L. [the Dutch youth] were marched out into the hospital exercise yard. Only after they had been on exercise for some ten minutes did the Chief Officer and a Warder called L., then they accompanied him back to his cell where he was locked up until the following morning. We suggest this is the most fantastic procedure to be adopted by the authorities with a man who it is alleged has been inciting to mutiny! The disturbances in the shop lasted for some twenty minutes. At the beginning there were at least three officers present besides the civilian instructor, and later, officers, from Chief Officers down as well as the Borstal boys' Governor were present yet no one noticed that L. was inciting the

men to join in the disturbance. Or are we to believe that the prison staff would stand by and watch a man inciting others to join a disturbance? We think your report from the prison authorities will have shown that the first Borstal boy tackled by the staff was the one who took a leading rôle in rallying the boys. He was immediately removed from the shop... If L. was inciting the men, surely the same procedure would have been adopted in his case rather than the one described above." But the Home Secretary had nothing to add to his previous letter!

THIS article was written before the Criminal Justice Bill of 1948. But since the Bill makes no provision for open hearings and an adequate defence in cases in which serious infringements of prison discipline are alleged, we can safely assume that the conditions we described in our original article still obtain. Indeed, the wording of the Manchester Guardian report shows clearly that the original trial of the prisoner whose punishment was not confirmed by the Home Office, was held in secret.

LIBERTARIAN.

## DEBATE

### ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM?

THE periodical skirmish between Socialists and Anarchists in London was held this year at Denison House on March 1st, and showed once again the fundamental differences between the two ideas.

The debate, on "Socialism or Anarchism?", was opened by A. Turner for the Socialist Party of Great Britain with the usual attack on capitalism, with which, of course, the Anarchists always agree. He then went on to outline what his party mean by Socialism, namely the classless, moneyless, non-governmental society. Once again, with such broad and general ideas the Anarchists agree, but it is when we get on to the question of "How?" that we find the flaws in the Socialist arguments.

The main contention of the S.P.G.B. is that the centre of control in the modern State is Parliament, that the entire population must be educated to understand Socialism, that nobody is incapable of understanding Socialism and that when everybody understands Socialism they will embrace Socialism en masse by voting the S.P.G.B. into Parliament where their first and only task is to pass a law disbanding Government, the State, capitalism and itself.

Philip Sansom, for the London Anarchist Group, opened with a comprehensive exposition of Anarchism, made necessary, as he said, because the S.P.G.B., like all political parties, always misrepresented the Anarchist case. This was in fact shown by the Socialist as the debate continued, by his struggling hard to associate the Anarchists with violence and coercion and nothing else. Turner made several clever debating points, by quoting out of context, but was unable to assail the Anarchist position as outlined by Sansom.

When the Anarchist turned his attention to Socialism, however, the difference

in the approach of the two speakers was apparent. Sansom was dealing with the fundamental bases of the Socialist case. He agreed that everybody was capable of understanding Socialism—and, of course, Anarchism—but that was not the same as accepting it. He understood it ("Too sure to be a Socialist") and was quite sure the capitalists understood it too—but would they allow it to come into being without a struggle?

Sansom questioned the validity of the ballot,\* and quoted from S.P.G.B. literature and speakers to show that if they were returned to Parliament maybe they would not be quite as libertarian as they make out now—that we should have to trust them with power, and that Anarchists are not prepared to do.

However, as he pointed out, there was little danger of the Socialists ever attaining political power through the ballot. He outlined all the countries where democracy had been destroyed and where Socialists were therefore helpless, and he asked if the British ruling class would be any different from the Russian, German, Spanish, Chinese and all the others if their power were threatened through their own institutions. He claimed they would tear up the Constitution and abolish democracy if they looked like being used against them.

By contrast, the Anarchist advocated the means of direct action by the workers—means which could not be taken away from them because they did not depend on the grace of the ruling class, but on the essential economic power of the working-class.

The weakness of the Parliamentary Socialist case is never so apparent as when opposed by the case for Anarchism.

R.M.

\*("Engels says, 'Universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class.' The Anarchist says, 'Universal suffrage is the gauge of the security of the ruling class.'")

Have you renewed  
your subscription  
to FREEDOM.

FEW of the bourgeois journalists of the capitalist press, when they weigh in with their attacks upon the "restrictive practices" of the workers, ever seem to stop to ask themselves just how or why those practices developed. Or, if they do, they take for granted the supposition that they may have been justified in the old days, but are not now.

True, what are called restrictive practices were of more urgent point to workers during the days when unemployment was a more widespread problem than it is to-day, but, as many workers are discovering to their cost, unemployment is not such a remote possibility as the glib-tongued holders of safe jobs would have us believe.

Since the present administration took office, the figures for unemployment throughout the country has increased by over 50 per cent. Throughout the post-war years [except the abnormal "demobilisation" year of 1946] the unemployed figure was fairly steady at the 300,000 mark. It is now between 450,000-500,000. This is still a small fraction of the pre-war figures, but it should never be forgotten that any "surplus" labour, even a small number, is a threat to the security of every employed worker.

If a boss knows that there are more workers available at the local Labour Exchange, he can get more high-handed with his own workers than if there were none. Similarly, his workers know that they have got to protect themselves from being declared redundant—as it is politely called to-day. So they take steps to see that they do not work themselves out of a job; they take restrictive measures which may not only secure their own jobs but may in fact enable an opening to be made for one of their unemployed fellows.

Unfortunately, this sometimes means a conflict of interests between workers, and the craft division of workers usually manages to aggravate the situation rather than improve it. I have in mind the recent case of the demand by the painters' union that four unskilled labourers employed cleaning paintwork in a London hospital should be replaced by union men. The labourers had been doing the job for seven years to the perfect satisfaction of their employers. Over that seven years they had obviously learned pretty well all there is to learn about cleaning paint, but because they had never served their proper apprenticeship, or, more likely, because they had never taken out a painter's ticket, they had to be pushed out to make room for someone who had. This certainly seems hard, but the real hard fact is that at this time of year large numbers of house-painters are out of work and it is part of their union's function to get them fixed up with jobs if at all possible. Probably the painters put into the jobs will quit in the spring or summer when there will once again be plenty of outdoor decorating to be done—and the

## Restrictive Practices

sorry business will be repeated next winter.

It is easy but superficial then simply to attack the union, for the real villain of the piece is the system of casual employment from which house decorators in general suffer. Add to this the fact that the labourers were doing a craftsman's job at labourers' wages and one sees even more strongly the case for the National Society of Painters, who were in a position to bring pressure on the hospital because, of course, of the vast amount of painting and re-painting going on all the time there.

The four men were themselves union men—but members of the National Union of General & Municipal Workers, one of the vast monstrosities of unconnected tradesmen who, far from gaining strength from their association, in fact are weakened by dilution. This union has been asked to take up the paint-cleaners' case and so there will be a squabble between the two unions as to whose members should be unemployed!

Ten painters were dismissed from this hospital (the Westminster) last autumn as redundant—it is hardly likely therefore that the painters' union will stand by and see what they consider to be legitimate painters' work carried out by somebody else at 5/4d. an hour less than what they consider to be the proper rate for the job. So the trouble is discovered to be rooted in the economic division of workers by the wages system.

Another recent instance provided the Press with a fine opportunity to attack restrictive practices, when 1,600 "semi-skilled" trolley-bus maintenance men threatened to go on strike because London Transport had given the job, previously done by them, of changing the licences on all London trolley-buses to "skilled" coachmakers.

The task of changing the licences is not a very large one. It entails removing the holders, taking out the small circular paper licence and replacing it with a new one for the current year. Up to this January, anybody at the depots has nipped up and changed them, but the coachbuilders, who have for years had the monopoly of this highly skilled job at the petrol-bus and coach garages have now extended their claim to do it on the trolley-buses too.

The operative function seems to be the use of a screwdriver. Maintenance men are not supposed use screwdrivers—these are coach-builders' tools—and the maintenance men say that in fact they do not use screwdrivers. Since the job entails unscrewing a couple of screws, obviously they must use nail-files, or pennies, or something in lieu of screwdrivers, but on this they are keeping mum.

Damn silly, isn't it? And yet both sections of workers are defending what they consider to be their interests, and

those who dismiss these actions as foolish and restrictive are clearly those who have never lost a job because what they were doing has been taken over by somebody else. From the broader, more objective, view of those outside the industry these squabbles are pointless and wasteful. But from the point of view of those concerned with the purely narrow and selfish motive of defending their jobs against all moves which may

help to make them redundant, these restrictive practices have sense.

What is the alternative? Well, sad to say, under anything like the present competitive wages system, there is no alternative. Just as sections of the capitalist class protect themselves from "unfair" competition by trade agreements, tariffs and the like, which invariably result in higher prices for the buyer, so too must the workers protect themselves against their competitors—other workers. And in each of the cases I have mentioned (only two out of

thousands) the public will eventually pay for the increased costs.

There is no alternative to all the stupidities of capitalism without the abolition of capitalism itself, and there will be no end to the squabbles between craft unions until we have seen the end of craft unions and workers organising themselves by industry for the purpose of running that industry, when they will cease to say "This is my job and that is yours," but will be able to say "This is our industry." P.S.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### "DOWN WITH EDUCATION!"

AS J.S.B. addressed his remarks to those who agree with me, and as I certainly agree with myself, I feel that I owe him a reply.

He is disappointed that "an anarchist can speak of a 'free' choice being made by someone without an understanding of the alternatives". Do we—any of us—ever have a complete understanding of the alternatives? Does anyone, no matter how much knowledge he may have, ever understand all the reasons for his having made a particular choice?

It seems to me that J.S.B. has raised in a particular form the old problem of free will and determinism. I believe it was Berkeley who said that all the evidence tended to support determinism and all our experience to refute it. The sciences that treat of man—biology, medicine, psychology, etc.—are all determinist in conception. No real advance in knowledge was made until the discovery of the scientific method, with its insistence on the exclusion of the observer's own predilections and the restriction to only those factors that hold for all observers. The concept of free will comes from our own introspective experience, and what may seem to us a choice freely made may appear to another as behaviour resulting from some physical or psychological compulsion. If an observer had unlimited resources he might find that all our acts formed a pattern governed by the interrelation of events, a pattern similar to that exhibited by physics. Indeed, I believe that the programme of the Gestalt school of psychology is an attempt to show that this is the case. Determinism, however, is not fatalism, and even though our brains may be nothing more than biological forms of the digital computer (as recent research into the working of the central nervous system suggests may be the case), whose functioning determines the choice we make, we do nevertheless experience introspectively the making of a choice. This making of a choice we call using our will, and though the will is an abstraction like the mind, the concept is a useful one. This dichotomy is prob-

ably inevitable from the nature of things, and we can only accept it.

When J.S.B. asks whether anyone without knowledge in a scientific society can be free I cannot help feeling that he is on the brink of a fallacy similar to that perpetrated by those illiberal persons who deny the equality of man on the grounds that men are not possessed of equal strength, intelligence, sensibility, aptitudes, and so on. Those of us who assert the equality of man are not suggesting that a moron is the intellectual equal of a Newton or an Einstein. What we do say is that no one should be given man-made privileges in addition to the natural advantages that he is endowed with. Nor are we so foolish as to suggest that in an anarchist society men will be free from the restrictions that nature imposes on them. The achieving of anarchy will not mean

the end of disease, tempests, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, nor will it free us from the biological and psychological compulsions that govern our behaviour. We shall still suffer pain and sorrow, and we shall still have to face the consequences of our folly. But we shall be free from the interference of well-meaning persons who want to save us from our folly by limiting our freedom of action. This, it seems to me, is the crux of the matter. Whom would J.S.B. appoint to decide when a person had acquired enough knowledge to be able to make a choice for himself? Would he deny anyone the right to make a decision until satisfied of his capacity to do so? I do think that a person "without knowledge in a scientific society" could be free to live his own life in his own way if that society allowed him to do so. And if it was an anarchist society it would allow him to do so.

London, Feb. 28.

EDWIN PEEKE.

## Anarchism and Blue Prints

IN answer to B. Gelstein (FREEDOM, March 7), there are only two points I wish to make, since I consider that my attitude toward "programmes" was expressed clearly enough in my previous letter. The two points are:

(1) I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the contemporary French and Spanish anarchist movements to know whether all of their adherents consider "some form of coercive institution" to be compatible with anarchism. If there are some who do, it would be interesting to hear the reasons why they still consider themselves anarchists, since to my understanding the basic purpose of anarchism is the elimination of coercion from human relationships.

(2) It was no doubt cheering to the members of the Russian C.P. that they could enjoy "inner-party democracy" until 1929, I hardly think, however, that this provided much consolation to the thousands of mensheviks, social revolutionaries, left social revolutionaries, syndicalists, anarchists and even such opposition communists as Miasnikov, who were killed, imprisoned or driven into exile before that momentous date. The distinction between a one-party state under the dictatorship of Lenin and a totalitarian police-state under the dictatorship of Stalin may appear to be

"enormous" to academic minds, but to their victims it is one without a deference. Anyone who cares to investigate the general identity between the régimes of Lenin and Stalin should consult that excellent work of the late G. P. Maximov: *The Guillotine at Work*. London, Mar. 8. S. E. PARKER.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

### INDOOR MEETINGS

#### NOTICE

London Comrades are requested to note that the London Anarchist Group's Tuesday evening meetings will be held in future at:

GARIBALDI RESTAURANT,  
10 LAYSTALL STREET, E.C.1  
(3 mins. Holborn Hall)

MARCH 17—F. A. Ridley on  
WORLD POLITICS-1953 PATTERN

MARCH 24—DEBATE  
Philip Sansom & Rita Milton  
THE RELATIVE THREATS OF  
COMMUNISM & CATHOLICISM

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON  
DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.

MARCH 25—Mary Canipa  
"THE REVOLUTION"

### LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at  
101 Upper Parliament Street,  
Liverpool, 8.  
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

### GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS  
at  
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Carlin  
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw.

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:  
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed &/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS  
27 Red Lion Street  
London, W.C.1 England  
Tel.: Chancery 8364

## STALIN'S HISTORICAL HERITAGE

Continued from p. 1

and the contribution of the German Communists and their Russian chiefs had been to create confusion, uncertainty and indecision.

It was to be the same story in China of 1927. The rôle of the Communists, advised by Russian agents and members of the Comintern, was to ensure that events in China did not threaten the security of Stalin's dictatorship, which was in the next year, 1928, to embark on that war against the peasants, known as the collectivization of agriculture, which Stalin himself has admitted gave him more cause for alarm than at any time during the war of 1939-45.

The results of this gigantic and successful attempt to break the Russian peasants' effective hostility to the Bolshevik régime was the destruction of livestock to less than half of their previous numbers. It resulted in the deportation of millions of peasants to the labour camps of Siberia, and led to the disastrous famines of 1932 and 1943 (during which food was still exported from Russia) in which the dead numbered millions and were said to exceed those of the famine of 1921.

### Spain 1936-39

All this was the directly inspired policy of Stalin. In 1936 occurred the most important revolutionary situation since 1917, that created by the Spanish workers and peasants on July 19th and 20th. Stalin poured Russian advisers and foreign Communists like André Marty into Spain and by making the Spanish Communist Party the channel whereby Russian arms were made available secured the effective controlling position over the anti-Franco forces. Using revolutionary phrases, they pro-

ceeded to break down all the instruments of the revolution, the revolutionary militias, the peasants' communes, the factories controlled by the workers. Opposition political groups like the anarchists and the POUM (a Marxist party similar to the ILP, and having something in common with Trotskyism) were ruthlessly weakened by assassination and imprisonment.

Stalin's rôle in Spain is illustrated by the fact that most of the leaders of the Spanish Communist Party were taken to Russia in 1939 and most of them disappeared. A few, like the Communist General El Campesino and Hernandez survived and have exposed the rôle of the Russians in Spain.

### Elimination of Revolutionary Fighters

Under Stalin, the Communist Parties have solidly and consistently sought to gain control over every revolutionary tendency. They have rigidly pursued Lenin's "tactic of the United Front"—to try and work with other organizations so as to control them or, failing that, to destroy them. It is the method they used to secure power in the countries of Eastern Europe after the war. It was their method with the resistance movements during the war. In the course of securing their control the Communists consistently eliminated by assassination or other means non-communist revolutionary leaders. It is certain that they have eliminated and destroyed more revolutionary men and women in revolutionary movements outside Russia than ever the bourgeois police forces were able to do.

Trotsky called Stalin the gravedigger of the revolution meaning the Russian revolution. Actually Lenin and Trotsky

destroyed the Russian Revolution. It was left for Stalin to lend all the power of the Russian State to the aim of destroying the revolution and revolutionaries outside Russia. In this, as in so many other things, Stalin has continued the policy and historical rôle of the Tsars.

### Moral Disintegration

These are the historical facts. But the rôle of Stalin—and in this he is the true successor of Lenin—has also extended into the field of revolutionary morale. Before Lenin secured power in Russia a certain revolutionary morality existed. Revolutionists of various parties stood together in the face of police persecution (certain Marxists formed exceptions to this—see Tcherkesov's *Pages of Socialist History*), and the moral and ethical standing of the revolutionary movements stood high. It has been the achievement of the Leninists to destroy all that. They have utterly exterminated the idea of solidarity on the left—the "tactic of the united front" effectively does that—and they have openly used lies and falsification "if the needs of the revolution demand it, comrade". "Communism" has become synonymous with every kind of sophistry, casuistry, and analytical distortion of the truth. The damage done to the cause of the revolution and of progress generally is untold.

All this is Stalin's historical monument. And just as he sought to carry on Lenin's policy so will those who seek to secure the vacant throne of Russian dictatorship use the same methods of his persecution, assassination and deceit. It is to be hoped that Stalin in digging the grave of the revolution, has dug also that of his successors.

ANARCHIST.