

Chapter Four: The Rule Of Law

Socialism And The Rule Of Law

One of the most absurd beliefs ever to be expounded by the socialists, or indeed by anyone, is that socialism will lead, somehow and inevitably, to the regeneration of man. When the *workers' paradise* finally arrives, there will be no need for policemen, prisons or any related institutions; not only will government, as far as it exists, be purely administrative, dealing with the orderly running of society, but nobody will break the law or even want to break the law. This is not so much a political concept as a religious one. (1) Leaving aside the inconvenient fact that there has never been the slightest evidence that anything like this will ever come about, it is extraordinarily naïve, and is comparable to the pie-in-the-sky nonsense that most religions sell their adherents in return for leading virtuous lives on Earth. (And paying their tithes).

There is though a far more sinister side to socialism, and one which always comes before the promised Paradise on Earth. Lenin defined Marxism as "the doctrine of class warfare plus the dictatorship of the proletariat". (2) And he defined the dictatorship of the proletariat as "*the rule - unrestricted by law and based on force - of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the labouring and exploited masses.*" (3)

It is not easy to define precisely what is meant by the rule of law, but one prerequisite is that the law must be fairly abstract, that it must apply, or would apply, equally, to everybody in the same circumstances. There can be special laws governing blind persons and women, for example, but these are not abrogations of the rule of law. (4) For example, in Britain, and in many other countries, the law recognises that sometimes a woman who has recently given birth will, because of a hormone imbalance or some such physiologically based mental problem, harm or even kill her baby. Thus the law provides for the offence of infanticide if it can be proved that this was indeed the case. (5) Children and feeble-minded persons may be subject to different laws, primar-

ily to protect them from exploitation, and so on. These are very proper exceptions, as far as they can be called exceptions.

The chief safeguard for all of us is, in the words of F.A. Hayek, that "the rules must apply to those who lay them down and those who apply them - that is, to the government as well as the governed - and that nobody has the power to grant exceptions." (6)

The socialist idea, that the government is unrestricted by law, means exactly that, laws do not apply to the government, only to the regulation of the people under the control of the communists/socialists. It was George Washington who said that government, like fire, is a dangerous servant and a fearful master. (7) Like all the Founding Fathers, Washington recognised that the first act of government must be to limit its own power; this is the purpose of a constitution, to limit the power of the government. A leading anti-Communist, Dr Fred Schwarz, recognises this also. Schwarz says of Lenin's dictum, that the government is unrestricted by law that "[t]his is a very sinister and serious feature of the Communist system...because the history of civilisation is the restraint of government by law. Government unrestrained by law is naked tyranny." (8)

In Britain, in recent years we have been unfortunate enough to witness a number of monstrous injustices: the Birmingham Six, Guildford Four and similar cases, spring to mind. These cases and many others, have resulted in people challenging their convictions through the courts. People who have been wrongly convicted, sentenced and served time in prison can be awarded monetary compensation, although most people would turn down any amount of money rather than spend the best years of their lives in prison. Sometimes too the police overstep the mark, and again, there have been a number - a large number - of successful actions against the police in recent years for false arrest, and other improprieties. Usually in such cases the police fight all the way then settle at the court door insisting that they have admitted no liability. Rarely are offending police officers even disciplined in any meaningful sense of the word, much less subjected to criminal prosecution. (9)

In reality, even in a so-called democratic country like Britain, the police and other authorities can often do more or less what they damn well like, and in the event of a complaint or investigation, the entire bureaucratic machinery closes ranks in what many people often interpret as a megalithic conspiracy. (10) [The current writer has personal experience of this]. Police officers who investigate other police officers are the least respected by their colleagues.

Imperfect as our system is, there are at least some checks and balances. Under communism/socialism, none of the even limited redresses the citizen has under our system are possible. When you are arrested under socialism, the authorities can and will do as they damn well please. There is no suing the police for wrongful arrest, no suing the authorities for wrongful conviction. Indeed, there is no wrongful arrest, no wrongful conviction; once they have decided you are guilty, you are not only guilty but finished.

Britain does not have a written constitution, but in Britain and other countries, the government *must* obey the law, and can be challenged in the courts if it doesn't. We will give here two historic examples of this, one from Britain, the other from the United States. First though, let us take a brief look at *Magna Carta*.

The Rule Of Law: From "Magna Carta" To Salmon P. Chase

The *Magna Carta* (ie *Great Charter*) was drafted at Runnymede and signed by King John on June 15, 1215; it was an attempt by the barons to restrain the power of the king, who up until then could do pretty much as he liked. Although it was not the first such attempt, it has gone down in history as a landmark. The *Magna Carta* had 63 clauses; it was reissued with alterations in 1216 and 1217; the *Habeas Corpus Act* of 1679 is said to originate with clause 39. (11) For the benefit of the total neophyte, a writ of *habeas corpus* allows a man's lawyers, family or friends to challenge the lawfulness of his detention. It can be used, and often is used, when the police have arrested somebody for a serious offence, usually murder or terrorism. People who are arrested and detained *incommunicado* for several days have a strange propensity to make *voluntary* confessions, which are then retracted in court.

In spite of the provisions of *habeas corpus*, a person detained in police custody has very little chance of being released until the police have had their way with him. (12) Magistrates tend to rubber stamp such applications; the current writer knows of no case in which a writ of *habeas corpus* was successful

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

in freeing someone from police custody. That being said, a judge can declare the detention of a prisoner in police custody or prison to be unlawful and can order his release. *Habeas corpus* may also be used by someone detained under the *Mental Health Act*, to win his freedom. Under socialism, all this goes out of the window.

The following snippets are of interest. The *Magistrates' Court Act, 1952*, requires that a person arrested without warrant should be brought before a magistrate "as soon as practicable" [and this] means, in the absence of any special statutory provision, that he is to be brought before a magistrates' court within 48 hours of the arrest..."

In a specimen period of three months, 212 persons (.43%) arrested by the Metropolitan Police, were detained for more than 72 hours before being brought before a magistrates' court. "The percentage may be tiny, but we are concerned with people not percentages." (13) As stated, under socialism, all this goes out of the window. Clearly, even under our (so-called) liberal system of justice there are many abuses by the powers-that-be. A government unrestrained by even these flimsy controls will soon become a naked tyranny.

Returning to the *Magna Carta* proper; three of the clauses read as follows:

38) "No bailiff shall in future put anyone to trial upon his own bare word, without reliable witnesses produced for this purpose."

39) "No free man shall be arrested or imprisoned or disseised [dispossessed] or outlawed or exiled or in any way victimised, neither will we attack him or send anyone to attack him, except by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."



40) "To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay right or justice."

These are fine principles which the passage of time should not be allowed to erode. (14) Times may change, technology does, but Man's nature remains the same, whatever the socialists would have us believe. Clause 40 is a vitally important one; although a rich man can afford expensive lawyers (15) and the privileges wealth brings, it is a point hardly worth arguing that, in the criminal courts at least, the capitalist state has dispensed a far superior brand of justice to the common man than Soviet Russia and Communist China. It is though

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

not only the individual citizen who may be taken to court under our bourgeois system of justice; the government can be taken to court if it breaks the law.

In April 1763, the MP and journalist John Wilkes (1725-97), the prime mover behind a scurrilous magazine called *The North Briton*, insulted the King's mother and accused the Monarch himself of lying. Although *The North Briton* was published anonymously, the identity of the people behind it was no great secret, and a general warrant was drawn up to arrest "the authors, printers, and publishers of a seditious and treasonable paper entitled *The North Briton*, No. 45". (16) The word "treasonable" was added to deny Wilkes the right to plead Parliamentary privilege. In three days 49 people were arrested, including many totally innocent persons. (17) [It is worth mentioning here that according to a standard biography of Wilkes, there appears to have been a large element of role playing in this affair. Wilkes was sent to the Tower of London, in some style, (18) and although prior to his arrest he was running around like a blue-arsed fly, he never seems to have been in any danger of having his ears lopped off, as did William Prynne. (19) Nevertheless, none of this should distract the reader from the seriousness of the principle at issue].

In the end, it was ruled not only that the general warrant was illegal, but that a writ of *habeas corpus* had been infringed and Parliament violated. (20) Following this, Wilkes won an action for trespass against the Under-Secretary of State and £1,000 damages for carrying out the instructions of the general warrant. (21)

A more prosaic example of the government being found in breach of the law is the Second Greenback case of 1870 in which the American judge Salmon P. Chase ruled that greenbacks were unconstitutional. (22) As he had been in the Treasury at the time, and was therefore responsible for the 1862 *Legal Tender Act*, he convicted himself! (23)

There have been other, contemporary, instances of the government being prosecuted successfully because of the separation of the Executive arm of government from the Legislative and the Judiciary. Again, this is by no means perfect, and judges are all the time subjected to political and other pressures. But under socialism the Executive is also both the Legislative and the Judiciary. (24) This principle is what socialists refer to as Democratic Centralism. A better phrase is naked tyranny. Later, Hitler copied this structure in Nazi Germany with the Leadership Principle.

Chapter Five: Religion, Arts And Media

Socialism And Religious Freedom

It is well known that Karl Marx referred to religion as the opiate of the people. (1) Following their antinomian dictum that anything that forwards the class struggle is good and anything that hinders it is evil, the atheistic socialists have at times supported religious freedom in exactly the same way these great internationalists have supported nationalist movements and movements of so-called national liberation, particularly in the so-called Third World, the backwardness of which is always blamed on Imperialism which is somehow said to have drained the wealth out of these countries. (2)

Once the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, religious freedom like all other freedoms are abolished. Like their crusades against *racism*, *sexism*, and every other *ism*, the socialists' support of religious freedom is simply a means to an end.

Creativity: The Arts And The Media Under Socialism

We have already covered this ground to some extent, but I will expand on it here. As a writer who has been hacking away for years and getting precisely nowhere I often find it very frustrating when I see writers with far less talent than myself getting into print regularly, selling millions, and making a great deal of money. I am particularly annoyed when the only talent some of these writers possess is an ability to lie convincingly. (3) Socialists themselves often point to the tabloid press as evidence of the degeneracy of capitalism: lies, nonsense, salacious gossip, poorly written, trivia blown up into front page

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

news, and so on. For once they are not wrong. Who couldn't find, research and write better stories in a more professional manner?

At the time of writing - Summer 1995 (4) - two female authors of doubtful literary talents - Martina Navratilova and Naomi Campbell - are riding high with ghost-written novels. There can be no doubt whatsoever that, whatever the merits of their respective books, both these ladies have got into print solely on account of being who they are. (5) Navratilova is of course the greatest tennis player of all time, while Campbell is a leading fashion model, perhaps *the* leading black fashion model in the world. (6) An unsuccessful hack might look with envious eyes on Navratilova and Campbell, ask himself (or herself) why them rather than me? and reply because capitalism sucks. As indeed it does. (7) But at least under capitalism it is possible for a woman to become fabulously wealthy and a published novelist by playing tennis in Martina's case, (8) or simply by looking good in Campbell's. (9)

Publishing isn't quite a closed shop, but writing books has been more or less sewn up by journalists, academics and a few others. It goes without saying that not all of these authors have much merit, or indeed any at all. (10)

A regular correspondent of mine - and fellow Libertarian - Sean Gabb, editor of *Free Life* - is in much the same position as me and countless others. He is not only at least as good a writer as myself but is an extremely erudite qualified lawyer and historian. A while ago a mutual friend commenting on his work said that he was forever writing excellent articles and sending them off to magazines such as the *Spectator*, and never, or hardly ever, getting anything in print. Sean Gabb and I are far from alone, indeed, the number of talented writers who have never, and will never, get anywhere, is dwarfed by the number of first rate actors and other performers, composers, (11) talented fine artists, and so on.

All the above people have the dubious pleasure every day of their lives, of seeing far less talented people than themselves reaping rich rewards under the capitalist system. At times they see people who are little better than imbeciles having fame and fortune thrust upon them while somewhere out there is another Beethoven, another Shakespeare, another Rembrandt, the world will never even hear of, much less appreciate. There are people who have written novel after novel who have never even had so much as the offer of a publishing contract, much less got into print. Any one of these unpublished authors could be another Charles Dickens.

It is not simply the unpublished author who has a hard time of it under capitalism; let us look briefly at capitalism's staunchest defender, Ayn Rand. Rand was born Alice Rosenbaum, and had the doubtful pleasure of growing up in Russia at the time of the 1917 Revolution; her family were middle class and would certainly have been marked down for liquidation had she not escaped to the West. Rand made her way to Hollywood where she had some good luck, finding work as a screen writer. By the early thirties she was an established name; unfortunately, her anti-communism didn't go down at all well in certain circles, *intellectuals* in particular had a strong aversion to it. (12)

Her novel *We, The Living* was completed at the end of 1933; (13) her agent submitted the book to publishers, (at least she had an agent, most prospective novelists never have the good fortune to be taken on by one). Rand lost count of the rejections; (14) a number of publishing houses had not troubled to disguise the fact that the cause of their rejection was not literary, but political: they saw no possibility of making a profit on a book that denounced Soviet Russia! (15) The book was finally published in 1936.

Another of her books, *The Fountainhead*, which went on to become a bestseller and was made into a film, had twelve rejections prior to publication; it was said to have had "no commercial possibilities". (16) Yet another Rand work, her 1939 play *Think Twice*, was never performed and was published posthumously. This was not the only of her works to be so published, and indeed, many other authors (including Karl Marx!) have obtained recognition only after their deaths. (17)

Many people in Rand's position have an axe to grind with the capitalist system, or if - like Rand - they don't, then it is as good as certain that at times they feel they have, or that they have received a raw deal. For capitalism does often reward mediocrity while turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to talent, or even genius. (18) Libertarians are often said to be in love with capitalism, but the truth is that all Libertarians recognise the shortcomings of the current (so-called) capitalist system, (19) and nobody realises more than Sean Gabb that a writer of his prodigious talents would not simply remain largely unread under socialism but would not even be permitted to write.

The same goes for all artists: poets, rock musicians, fine artists; under socialism these people are among the first to be persecuted, (20) for after it

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

assumes power, the last thing the dictatorship of the proletariat wants is people who rock the boat, radicals, critics of the new order...

Actually, the situation for artists and others is nowhere near as bad as it used to be, due primarily to new technology. With the advent of the home computer, desktop publishing, affordable, quality photocopying, and paper printing plates, (21) it is now not too difficult for any aspiring author to get into print. The cassette tape and the video tape are also extremely affordable. (22) At one time, the capital investment required to publish a book or to press a record was beyond most people's means. Now, anyone with enough commitment can overcome these prohibitive hurdles. The main problems now for authors and artists are publicity and distribution. (23) Rest assured that, however insurmountable the problems of generating publicity and distributing one's work may appear to be under capitalism, under socialism they would be academic, because no one who did not receive explicit state approval would be permitted to publish or perform.

We must now move on, but we shall take another - and quite terrifying - look at the media under socialism after reviewing the prelude and aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution.

Chapter Six: Academia, Education, Health And Medicine

Academic Freedom Under Socialism

There are few areas of human activity where freedom of inquiry is more important than academia; this applies to the social sciences as much as to the hard sciences. Without freedom of inquiry progress is impossible in any field. Hardly a day passes when some academic or other doesn't voice a supposedly controversial opinion in the popular press or other mainstream media. Just because an opinion, idea, theory or whatever is controversial, doesn't mean that it has any merit at all. There is still a Flat Earth Society in existence to this day; the idea that the Earth is flat is quaint if nothing else, but of course, it has no merit at all. In Galileo's day though the idea that the Earth was spherical was extremely controversial, and if you had voiced such ideas in certain circles, like Galileo himself you would have found yourself in deep water. Or even on a bonfire!

In spite of their commitment to the scientific method, and their (supposed) willingness to throw out any hypothesis, theory or law that is patently wrong, scientists are tardigrade beasts. Virtually every new idea in science has been ridiculed and scorned by scientists before it has been accepted as the new wisdom. It was the great German physicist Max Planck who said that "The new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." (1)

Long after scientists have accepted the value of a new hypothesis or theory, or have framed a new law, the general public and the media continue to give spurious credence to proven nonsense. (2) The best examples of this are the controversies surrounding astrology, the Loch Ness Monster, flying saucers, spirit mediumship, psychic "spoon-bending", and other such nonsense. (3) Anyone who has studied the scientific literature of these subjects will realise that such *controversies* exist only in the media.

Astrologers call their art a science; Marxists call their philosophy a science. (4) One would expect therefore that the *science* of Marxism-Leninism would welcome free inquiry. The reality is that Marxists and their fellow travellers have been in the forefront of all opposition to free inquiry in fields which conflict with their dogma; they were politically correct long before that term was invented.

The most obvious example of the socialist suppression of free inquiry and free debate is in the so-called inheritance/environment controversy, with particular regard to the difference between intelligence quotients between different races. Nay, they go even further than this, they claim that race has no meaning in the biological sense; they actually deny the evidence of their senses and would have us do likewise. (5) Thus, when decent and respectable scientists such as Arthur Jensen and Hans Eysenck have stated their views on race and intelligence, they have been subjected to threats, intimidation and outright violence, as well as a racial inquisition by egalitarian academics. (6) Eysenck has stated that, like the controversy over the paranormal, the controversy over race and intelligence exists only in the media. (7) He might have added that this *controversy* has been manufactured by leftist pressure, polemicising and intimidation, (8) principally by smearing all hereditarians as practitioners of scientific *racism*, or even Nazi race science.

The obvious inequality of man - and the biological inequivalence of men and women - is an insurmountable stumbling block to the advent of their *workers' paradise*, and must be stamped on at every opportunity. (9)

Serious as is the war on race science by socialists, communists and their fellow travellers, the suppression of academic freedom in another field set the entire Soviet Bloc back a generation; I am referring here to Lysenkoism. The Soviet "scientist" Trofim Denisovich Lysenko (1898-1976) rose to prominence with *vernalization*, the practice of soaking and chilling winter wheat so that it would give greater yields than spring wheat. This wasn't his discovery although he palmed it off as such. (10) Lysenko was a Lamarckist, a follower of Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829). Lamarck believed in the inheritance of acquired characteristics, which was by no means an absurd belief in his day, at least it was no more absurd than the then widely held belief, first postulated in the Seventeenth Century, that the world began in 4004BC. (11) Be that as it may, Lamarckism was discredited everywhere by the 1930s. Except in Soviet

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

Russia. Lamarck's only lasting contribution of value to history appears to have been his invention of the word biology. (12)

Lysenko's particular brand of Lamarckism endeared him to the Soviet bureaucracy, and he became "*dictator of Communistic biology*" during Stalin's régime; as a result, education and research in standard genetics were virtually outlawed. (13) As well as promising increased grain yields Lysenko claimed that wheat plants raised in the appropriate environment produce seeds of rye, which is equivalent to saying that dogs living in the wild give birth to foxes. (14)

The rest is a matter of historical record; as stated, Lysenko set Soviet biology back a generation. Under a world socialist government there would no academic freedom at all. Indeed, aside from Lysenkoism and race issues, we in the West have already had a big dose of politically correct socialist science in the AIDS scam. The best evidence indicates that the root *cause* of AIDS is homosexual-related filth; in the words of the Chief Rabbi, Sir Immanuel Jakobovits, AIDS is "the inevitable price for moral negligence or turpitude". (15) However, socialist queers and their friends in the mainstream socialist and communist movements have succeeded in spreading the lie that we are *all* equally at risk from AIDS. Ironically, these normally so terribly "*anti-racist*" friends of the oppressed haven't shrunk from practising their own form of *racism* by accusing Africans of being primarily responsible for the spread of this modern day plague.

In October 1986, the homosexual socialist activist Peter Tatchell wrote in the left wing journal *7 Days*: "Contrary to the mythology that Aids is a gay plague, the overwhelming majority of people with Aids are heterosexual, including as many women as men...Most of these Aids cases are in central Africa...In Africa it is estimated that 6% of the total population is now infected but in some countries it is much higher - 25% of the Malawi population, 23% of the Ugandan population..." (16)

This is not an isolated example of the organised homosexual movement's scapegoating others for their folly, filth and sin. It is more than likely that any future socialist government would, under pressure from its powerful homosexual wing and its sympathisers, (17) ban outright any research in any field whatsoever which led, or was likely to lead to, politically incorrect conclusions about their lifestyles, or indeed to any detrimental interpretation of socialist propaganda. Of course, such academic censorship has nothing whatsoever to

do with science, and will, if unchecked, lead us into another Dark Ages as Lysenkoism did to the Soviet Union, only a hundred times worse.

Freedom Of Education Under Socialism

It follows from the above discussion of the suppression of academic freedom under socialism that whatever freedom of education exists under the socialist government of the future will be minimal, so we needn't dwell on this. Suffice it to say that all private schooling will be outlawed, all religious education will also be outlawed, (18) and anything that does not conform to the prevailing dogma will be ruthlessly suppressed. This could - and very likely would - mean, that your children would be indoctrinated with such niceties as "gay lessons", and indeed this has already happened under the guise of promoting *equal opportunities* and combating the mythical disease of *homophobia*. (19) Much other socialist-indoctrination disguised as education would follow.

An important point which must not be overlooked here is that, just as socialists advocate religious freedom as a short term, tactical manoeuvre, so do they advocate - or appear to advocate - freedom of choice for parents to educate their children. Many inner city areas of Britain now have large Moslem populations, and socialists attempt to win them over by claiming to combat *racism*, promises of more government funding for education, and the like. It goes without saying that under the socialist government of the future, the children of Moslems will also be indoctrinated with "gay lessons" and all the other paraphernalia of socialist indoctrination, and, in the first instance, funding for Moslem schools, and later the schools themselves, will be phased out.

Health And Medicine Under Socialism

The National Health Service was introduced in Britain in 1948 and has much to be proud of. We in Britain have often heard horror stories about the consequences of falling ill or suffering serious injury in the United States, which does not have a *free* health service. Whenever you go abroad on holiday or on business, it is a priority that you arrange proper medical insurance. Private medicine has been criticised for being mercenary; other complaints often heard are that the current two tier system encourages moonlighting by consultants, poaching of the best staff from the NHS by private health operators, and so on. These are serious criticisms, and it would be wrong to attempt to make light of them. Again though, the socialist *solution* is seen as taking the whole system under state control, and again, this is no solution at all.

One of the arguments used frequently to denigrate private medicine is the claim that the rich are able to buy themselves a better quality of healthcare than ordinary working people, and to some extent to jump the queue. This is true, but the queue will not disappear under socialism, the factors of production are always limited. (20) All the evidence indicates that under socialism the hospital queue grows even longer than under a health care system which contains an element of *laissez faire*.

In 1993, a young girl named Laura Davies underwent specialist treatment in the United States at enormous expense. The King of Saudi Arabia alone donated £150,000 to an appeal fund. In June 1992, the four year old underwent a 16 hour liver and bowel transplant operation. Later she underwent further massive surgery but, sadly, died in November 1993. It doesn't take much of an imagination to see the sort of arguments that socialists can employ here. However, the fact that the King of Saudi Arabia - one man - put his hand in his own pocket and coughed up the sum of £150,000 does tend to refute the claim that the mega-rich are all worthless parasites. Under socialism there would have been no such angel of mercy, and Laura's treatment would still have had to be paid for. Who would have paid for it? And by what criteria would she have been treated?

It is possible, even likely, that a four year old girl would have been treated every bit as expediently under socialism, but what about someone who was not so

attractive? This brings us to another, and quite sinister, aspect of socialised medicine, its use as a form of people control, in particular, to persuade people against their wills to conform to certain lifestyles.

On August 13, 1993, a 47 year old lifelong smoker named Harry Elphick, died while awaiting a heart bypass operation. His death caused a wave of controversy in the print and telecommunications media, and in medical circles, because he had been refused treatment on account of his habit. Mr Elphick had a history of coronary heart disease and suffered from angina. He needed a heart bypass operation but was told by the consultant at Wythenshawe Hospital, Manchester, that he wouldn't be considered for one until he stopped smoking. He stopped, but not in time. He was buried the day he was due to be admitted for tests, having gone six weeks without smoking a cigarette.

The case of Harry Elphick was by no means an isolated one. At the time a lot of blather appeared in the media about doctors having to make rational decisions about the management of finite resources, as they do, and as we have already stressed, but there can be no doubt that the refusal to operate on Harry Elphick had as much to do with social policy as with medical judgment.

Between 1920 and 1933 the United States went through the era of Prohibition during which it was illegal to manufacture or sell any drink with more than .5% alcohol content on pain of a \$1,000 fine or 6 months in gaol. (21) Prohibition was considered a great social disaster and was eventually abandoned. Many other practices have been prohibited under régimes socialist and non-socialist, including of course the prohibition of hard drugs, which is still with us, and not least the prohibition of certain religions and political philosophies.

The total monopoly of health services by the state offers a more effective form of tyranny than almost any other. Any practice - whether related to health or not - could be outlawed on pain of the removal of the right to medical treatment. If this sounds too bizarre and too outrageous to consider, the reader should think again. A government that has a total legal monopoly can do exactly as it likes, and that includes in the fields of health and general welfare.

Chapter Seven: A Closer Look At Today's Socialists

Paying Their Dues

The Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party publishes a weekly newspaper. There are many other well-established socialist publications. The *Morning Star* is published daily. By contrast, the declared arch-enemies of socialism, the so-called fascists publish monthly journals and broadsheets. Although in the United States, the far right is generally far better funded, there can be little doubt that for all its professed share-the-wealth dogma, the far left in Britain is extremely wealthy. This wealth comes not only from its patrons, from the capitalist foundations and trusts it professes to despise, from left wing councils, (1) and from its business fronts, (2) but from ordinary rank and file members.

In the Spring of 1995, a small right wing journal published a contribution schedule (Registration form) for the Socialist Workers Party which shows how much members are expected to pay each month. For a single person the subscription ranges from unemployed at £4 per month to £6 for students to £24 for someone earning £500 per month to a staggering £400 a month for someone earning £2,000 a month. (3) This is a political party that doesn't contest elections and which is forever denouncing the rich as parasites. Although one can only admire the dedication (or gullibility) of the SWP's grass roots membership, no organisation which demands 20% of its members' net earnings has the right to denounce the rich or anyone else as parasitic. Under an SWP-style socialist government everybody would be expected to pay even heavier dues, not to the party, but to the state. Remember, under capitalism, man works for profit; under socialism, he works for the *common good*, ie for the state.

A Closer Look At Today's Socialists: The SWP and the CPGB

The time has come now to take a closer look at the rhetoric of contemporary socialists. We shall do this by examining a short book by leading Socialist Worker and journalist Paul Foot, and a pamphlet by the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

The Socialist Workers Party is without doubt the leading Trotskyite organisation in Britain. In July 1990, it published *THE CASE FOR SOCIALISM: WHAT THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY STANDS FOR*, which was written by Paul Foot, one of its more high profile members.

Apparently what the SWP stands for is "real socialism". The (former) Soviet Bloc and everybody else who professed to practise socialism were really capitalists who were simply pretending. This is not simply dead wrong but a total and wilful distortion of the true nature of Marxism-Leninism. The usual SWP twaddle - as you'll realise if you've ever argued with one of its members - is that the former Soviet Union practised, not socialism, but State Capitalism. The Revolution was both glorious and successful, but was usurped by Stalin. The truth is that it was the great Lenin himself who introduced State Capitalism. According to Marxist-Leninist theory, Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, (4) capitalism itself being the highest stage of human development to date, and one which will be succeeded - inevitably - by socialism. According to Lenin, State Capitalism was introduced as a transitional stage, (5) in reality he introduced it because it soon became obvious that total socialism (ie absolute collectivism) doesn't work. (6) Just how ludicrous is socialism in practice can be seen from the chaos that resulted from the short lived régime of Béla Kun in Hungary.

Béla Kun - From Fanaticism To Farce

Like Lenin, Kun was a law graduate. He was also a great admirer of Lenin and as soon as he took power in Hungary in 1919 he set about putting the full Communist programme into practice. Although he set up one of the first communist dictatorships, Kun's name is rarely heard in even communist circles today. Anyone who reads his entry in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* will soon realise why. (7)

Kun planned to convert the peasants to communism by force; seldom do forced conversions to any philosophy have favourable consequences, none less so than to communism. *Britannica* tells us "Kun's programme was to 'arm at once, and forcibly transfer every industry and all landed property without conservation into the hands of the proletariat.' At first he collaborated with the Social democrats, but soon shouldered them aside, nationalized all banks, all concerns with over 20 employees, all landed property over 1,000 ac., every building other than workmen's dwellings. All jewellery, all private property above the minimum (e.g., two suits, 4 shirts, 2 pairs of boots and 4 socks) was seized; servants abolished, bathrooms made public on Saturday nights; priests, with the insane, criminals and shopkeepers employing paid assistants were declared incapable of the active or passive suffrage."

The current writer has no information on the state of Hungarian bathrooms in 1919, but obviously they were far fewer and farther between than they are nowadays. Can you imagine, dear reader, the sort of lunacy compelling people to open up their bathrooms to the great unwashed would lead to, even in this day and age? Kun introduced a new currency; like all communists he didn't realise that money has no intrinsic value, and as soon as people stop believing in it, it isn't worth the paper it's printed on. The new currency was boycotted and "the urban population starved, while prices soared." (8) Kun was in power for less than five months before the peasants had had enough; he was thrown into a lunatic asylum - the best place for him - but escaped to Austria.

A Closer Look At Today's Socialists: The SWP - continued

Returning to Foot, with *de rigueur* socialist disrespect for truth, the author whitewashes Soviet Russia and blames its subsequent plunge into tyranny on Stalin. On pages 14-5 he gives the impression that Karl Marx was some kind of "anti-racist". The reality is that Marx was both a vicious anti-black bigot and a gutter anti-Semite, the latter notwithstanding his own Jewish origins.

The American Jewish author Nathaniel Weyl has written that "...the belief that some races are innately more able, more vigorous, and more intelligent than others...was the consensus opinion of educated men in Marx's time. It was a view held by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Abraham Lincoln, and other American statesmen. Philosophers like David Hume and Montesquieu concurred in it." (9)

This is indeed true, and although the *racism* of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln (the Great Emancipator) have likewise been written out of the history books, it is common knowledge in certain circles that they were anything but egalitarians. (10) However, the *racism* of Karl Marx and his mentor Engels went far beyond a belief that blacks, and others, were genetically inferior. According to Weyl "Strangely enough, the so-called secret conversations of Adolf Hitler are less suffused with hatred and destruction than Marx's contributions to the Marx-Engels correspondence." (11) Yet in spite of this, "Publicly and for political reasons, both Marx and Engels posed as friends of the Negro. In private, they were antiblack racists of the most odious sort." (12)

Although they may not be infused with either an intense hatred of the Negro or an overtly patronising attitude, there is little reason to believe that today's leading (white) socialists are any less cynical about non-whites than they are about the workers they profess loud and long to support. Certainly they ruthlessly exploit both in the furtherance of their ideology of anti-capitalist hatred. (13)

Returning to Foot's book, the reader is told that "Marx argued that all human history was dominated by a tussle for the wealth between classes, one of which took the wealth, and used it to exploit the others." (14) We have already

disposed of this nonsense; Marx, and Foot and his ilk would have us believe that the likes of capitalists such as Bill Gates and Richard Branson, and corporations like Marks & Spencer are simply expropriators of wealth rather than creators of it. While it is probably a little unfair to take Marx to task for promulgating this view, Foot, who lives more than a century later, has no excuses. Furthermore, he has seen the evil effects of the philosophy Marx did so much to create, so if Marx can be dismissed as a well-meaning crackpot, Foot can only be denounced as a mischief-maker.

Foot tells us that workers have to seize the wealth of their so-called exploiters: (15) "Exploiters who amassed their power and wealth by robbing workers were not sentimental or namby-pamby about it. They would hold on to their wealth and power, if they had to, by force. They would never surrender that power and wealth, however intellectually or morally unjustifiable it was." (16) One can argue of course that men should not have power over other men, and that the power of the state should be dispersed. Foot and company do not want to disperse or destroy such power though, rather they want to bring it all under their control. His claim or inference that people should surrender their wealth because it is immoral for them to be wealthy is totally fallacious.

We have refuted this fallacy already (that of the redistribution of wealth), along with that of the class struggle, but we reiterate, if it were left to the likes of Foot to decide how much personal wealth we should be permitted to accumulate, and if we were left to obey the likes of Foot (and his idol Trotsky) in order to eat, we would all be in serious trouble.

Foot continues: "The new millionaires who emerged in the 1980s, almost to a man, are people without any noticeable skill, intellect or ability. They are expert only at playing the stock market or sacking workers - the two activities most likely to make a fast million." (17) While there is, unfortunately, more than a grain of truth in this claim, it is not the remorseless quest for profit that makes workers redundant but new technology. However, until such time as the capitalist system can be reformed, (18) we will all of us have to live with its evil consequences. That being said, capitalists who do not invest their capital soon become ex-capitalists, so money saved by sacking one set of workers will usually be reinvested elsewhere.

Foot is on even weaker grounds when he claims that the rich are rich because they have robbed other people's labour. (19) Again, while there are such creatures as the idle rich, the likes of Bill Gates, Richard Branson, Anita

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

Roddick and so on are people who have built vast business empires, and although they enjoy a standard of living and lifestyles that most people would envy, they haven't got where they are today by lying on their backs. (20)

A much more serious grievance, and one Foot doesn't raise, is that of the grotesquely inflated salaries paid to certain chairmen of formerly nationalised industries. Recently, even certain Conservatives have commented unfavourably on this sort of thing, and there have been calls for legislation to cap top people's salaries. One chief executive who came under fire was Cedric Brown, the Chairman of British Gas. In June 1995 the *Times* reported that while British Gas had axed or was about to axe 25,000 workers due to "Restructuring", (21) Mr Brown had been awarded a 75% pay rise which took his salary to a cool £475,000.

Small shareholders didn't like this much, and over 4,500 of them attended the company's AGM where many of them voiced angry opinions, (one fellow even took along a pig named Cedric!). The small shareholders voted overwhelmingly against the reappointment of 4 directors including Brown, but the big institutions (which hold 97% of the votes) had other ideas. (22)

Cedric Brown was not the only chairman of the former nationalised industries found to be earning a mighty salary. The Chairman of Eastern Electric was on £242,000 a year and the Chairman of North West Water was on £338,000. Opposition leader Tony Blair called for the government appointed-regulators to stop "these excesses". (23) Although even Conservative politicians realised that this sort of indulgence represented the unacceptable face of capitalism, the government rejected legislation. Wider share ownership and such grass roots protests as that effected by the angry British Gas shareholders are to be encouraged, and are, in the long run, likely to have a positive effect. But even if they don't, most people would prefer a pig named Cedric to a latter day Soviet bear.

Returning to Foot, on page 57 he carps that "If the people of Zambia paid *everything* they produced to the bankers and investment companies who have loaned their country money, it would still take them three full years to pay off the interest charges." Like all socialists, Foot is wilfully blind to the creation and control of money. He doesn't even think to ask where money comes from, because he doesn't care, and like all socialists he is concerned with enslaving the people rather than with liberating them.

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

On page 60 he endorses higher taxes; we have already seen what such higher taxes lead to. On page 61 he states baldly that "Most rich people, however, are rich through no ability of their own." This is obviously something the Oxford-educated Foot knows a lot about. Exactly how much of his standing as a long time tabloid journalist is due to ability, and how much to his having been born with a silver spoon in his mouth?

Page 69: "Socialism means that the means of production are owned and controlled by society so that what is produced can be shared out according to people's needs. Socialism is founded on the idea of equality, which means that most people will get the same." On page 70, he sounds as though he really believes that a brain surgeon and a refuse collector will work for the same money. Leaving that aside, let us return to the second part of that first sentence: "what is produced can be shared out according to people's needs." My needs are a new 486 computer with a gigabyte hard disk, a chauffeur driven limousine and a villa in the South of France. That's only my needs, wait until we get onto my desires.

Doubtless you, dear reader, have similarly modest needs and desires. If you haven't, the next man certainly has. The very fact that there are such things as thefts, robberies, burglaries, frauds - simple, complex, great and small - is surely proof enough that people's perceptions of their needs and desires often exceed their means. Somehow, under socialism, all this is going to be done away with. The worker will produce, and, if his neighbour *needs* more than he produces, he will share it with him. There will be no poverty because if you are hungry, your neighbour will feed you. And there will be no destitute people either, because Paul Foot, like Béla Kun, will order you to open up your bathroom to the local dossers on Saturday night, and maybe put them up on your sofa as well. Oh boy! The most frightening thing is that these bozos actually believe this cloud cuckooland stuff.

That's not all though, don't forget that according to Comrade Foot, "Socialism is founded on the idea of equality, which means that most people will get the same." At the time of writing, judges are paid salaries of nearly seventy thousand pounds a year. (24) The far left are forever carping on about the supposedly exorbitant salaries of judges, MPs and the like. But there is a method in this apparent madness. Members of Parliament were initially unpaid. Even today, most magistrates are unpaid, which in effect means that there are very few working class magistrates. (25) Paying such people, and

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

paying them well, actually widens the franchise, particularly to people from working class backgrounds. The reason judges are (apparently) so highly paid might also have something to do with making bribes less attractive. (26) Under socialism though, there will be no need to worry about that. Not only will no one be rich enough to offer judges bribes, but judges will be academic anyway. If they exist at all, their function will be simply to rubber stamp Executive policy. Including in criminal trials. (27)

Page 70: "The socialist argument is that people are far more likely to do what they want to do, and what they are best able to do, if the reward for everything is roughly the same..."

The only thing wrong with Foot's logic is everything. While it is certainly true that many wealthy people, people of independent means, retired people, etc, do work at what they choose, including voluntary work, there is a vast gulf between the voluntary worker and active pensioner, and a world in which everybody does what they want and what they are best at. (28) According to Foot, a doctor who has to train for seven years will receive the same remuneration as a car park attendant. A senior factory manager with thirty years experience and a great deal of responsibility will receive the same remuneration as the man who mops the floor. And of course, they will all be blissfully happy with this state of affairs. We have though, omitted a minor - or perhaps not so minor - qualification. What Foot actually says is that "*most* people will get the same." (Emphasis added). It doesn't take too much imagination to realise that Foot and his chums in the SWP - who will be telling everybody else what to do - are not *most* people. (29)

On page 71, Foot refers to public ownership of the means of production and states or implies that this will not include consumer goods. Bear in mind though dear reader, that it is not merely the ghosts of Lenin and Trotsky that will haunt this nightmare world, but the ghost of Béla Kun. Will your bathroom, your motor car (if the state gives you a permit for one), or even your bed, be counted as consumer or as capital goods?

Still on page 71: "...the whole point of the public ownership of the means of production is that more is produced and shared out, not less."

The proof of that pudding is the collapse of Communism. Professor Quigley relates that after the Second World War, Russian soldiers were amazed that "exploited" German workers owned wristwatches; their standard of living was that much higher. (30) Such startling revelations are not difficult to find. The

gulf between the United States and the Soviet Union was even greater, (see page 57).

On page 73, Foot tells us that socialism will be controlled from below, "democratically", of course. This is what the planned economy is all about. Foot himself will play no part in controlling this *workers' paradise*; indeed, considering his bourgeois origins, he'd be most fortunate to escape being shot as a class enemy.

A Noble Exception

Although Paul Foot is living in cloud cuckooland, the *de rigueur* claims of socialists that the profit motive can be done away with is not a total nonsense, but this requires a re-evaluation of the meaning of the word profit. The most obvious examples are the fields of creativity (eg the arts, including literature and music) and the voluntary sector. Many are the poets who have never got into print; the current writer has corresponded with two novelists, one of whom had at the time - several years ago - written five novels without having one published. At one time I knew personally an extremely talented composer and performer - primarily a classical guitarist - who had composed, according to his own reckoning, two thousand or more pieces of music; he has had very little published. The world is full of such people, doubtless you, dear reader, know of some such person, or several of them. You may even be one!

Similarly, there are many millions of people throughout the world whose voluntary work earns them no financial reward, sometimes leaves them out of pocket, despised by certain sections of the public, or even endangers their lives. (31) However, whatever drives such people - creativity, a sense of duty, or perhaps even some base motive - it is a total fantasy even to suggest that the world can be run along such lines. There is a vast chasm between writing a novel, performing a song, or manning a lifeboat on an ad hoc basis, and sweeping the streets five days a week for thirty years. Or training for several years as a doctor or an architect and then working at somebody else's whim for as long as that person pleases, whether or not that person is Leon Trotsky, Paul Foot, or some other collectivist.

As a confirmed Social Crediter, the current writer recognises that the purpose of the financial system should be to distribute the goods and services the community can produce rather than to act as a *de facto* system of punishment and reward, but again, there is a vast chasm between a sound financial system - one which delivers the maximum goods and services with the minimum effort - and one which condemns people to a life of poverty and suffering simply because its purchasing power devolves primarily from credit which is created at no cost as book entries by privately-owned corporations against the real wealth of the community.

A Closer Look At Today's Socialists: The SPGB

If you haven't heard of the Socialist Party of Great Britain that is hardly surprising, it is diminutive and devotes half its time to promoting socialism and the other half to attacking an organisation it refers to as "The Socialist Party of Clapham". According to its literature the SPGB was reconstituted in June 1991, (32) and has since then been at war with a rival of the same name. The reader may find this amusing, but it is by no means unusual. Indeed, the nastiest hate literature produced by socialists and communists is directed traditionally not at either their capitalist *oppressors* or the mythical fascist menace but at other socialists. (33)

In its 1995 pamphlet *SOCIALIST STUDIES* NO. 16, the SPGB kicks off with a swipe at the establishment which creates a public which is "docile", wallowing in "political ignorance, general indifference, apathy and prejudice against Socialism". (34)

On the very same page it refers to "the so-called communists of Russia" and on the next page makes the stock charge that "*Socialism has never been tried*". [Their italics.] Obviously Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and perhaps most of all, Béla Kun, would turn in their graves if they realised that not only had they never tried socialism but had never even been committed to it. Lenin's collected works run to 56 volumes, (35) most of which are devoted to espousing the cause

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

of socialism. And Béla Kun certainly practised socialism, communal bathrooms and all.

On page 3, people who do not accept the *facts* of socialism - in particular the concept of class struggle - are "mental and social slaves", while those who live off the labour of other people are said to be parasites. One of these parasites is mentioned - but not named - on page 19. He (or she) is the anonymous benefactor who donated £20,000 to the Socialist Party of Clapham. Obviously had this person donated this money to the SPGB, the party would have been rather more restrained, polite even. Perhaps they'd have addressed their benefactor as Comrade Parasite.

On page 6, the new realism of the Labour Party is attacked. The City elite are not at all unhappy with Labour now, and may well ditch the Tories at the next election. On pages 7-11, the party offers an explanation of the phenomenon of inflation. This is caused by the government pumping in an excess of banknotes. Inflation, we are told, is a form of hidden taxation. This is a common view, and one that is not entirely inaccurate. However, it is not simply an increase in the money supply that causes inflation, but an increase in the money supply out of all proportion to the goods and services available. Also missing from this equation is the little matter of interest rates. It is interest - in particular, high interest rates - which cause inflation more than anything else. If the government needs money it can raise it by taxation, print it (or create the credit), or borrow it at interest. The most cost efficient method is undoubtedly to create its own credit, but a study of this would take us far beyond the present analysis. (36)

More nonsense about the class struggle appears on pages 10-1 and the pamphlet endorses the views of Karl Marx (naturally). On pages 12-4 is a discussion of class. It would be pointless to dissect all the nonsense that appears here, but the claim that "the function of politicians and their advisors is to act in the interests of the capitalist class" is more than a little unfair not only to Labour politicians but to the politicians of all parties throughout the world who have striven, often against mighty vested interests, to improve the lot of the common people. (37)

While the SPGB are neither as large nor as nasty as the SWP, they, likewise, have nothing to offer the common people, and the adoption of the policies they advocate would lead not simply to the destruction of what remains of our rapidly dwindling freedoms but to the wrecking of the economy.

Chapter Eight: A Straight Look At Bolshevism In Practice

The Revolution Before And After: A Potted History Of Bolshevism

The following account - which is largely non-contentious - has been included to show what sort of men the Bolsheviks were, and the result, in practice, of the adoption of hard line socialist policies. The word that best sums up the Bolsheviks is scum. For that is precisely what these men were. Scum. They were scum after they seized power, and they were scum before they seized power.

Although communist theory goes back to Karl Marx and indeed way back before him, the history of Bolshevism begins with Lenin. On May 8, 1887, Lenin's elder brother, Alexander Ulyanov, was hanged along with four other conspirators for plotting to assassinate the Tsar. According to at least one source, he seems to have been totally unrepentant, and there can be little doubt that this had a profound effect on the young Lenin. (1) Lenin took an interest in radical politics himself, and was active in the Social Democratic Party (the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party). The Second Congress of this party was held in Brussels and London from July 30, 1903, and it was at this congress that the split occurred between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. While Lenin led the Bolshevik faction, Julius Martov led the Mensheviks. At this time the Bolsheviks were in the majority, (2) but by 1908 all the leading Bolsheviks bar Zinoviev and Kamanev had deserted Lenin. Both men were executed by Stalin in 1936, (3) as, incidentally, was the aforementioned Marxist-Leninist lunatic Béla Kun. This was Kun's reward for his fanatical devotion to both Lenin and Communism. (4)

In spite of their professed ideal of sharing the wealth, the main priority of the Bolsheviks was to raise money to maintain their organisation and to spread their ideology. We should not deride them for this; even organisations which seek to restructure capitalist society on a not-for-profit basis have no alterna-

tive but to work - for the present - within the confines of the capitalist system. However, as Lenin's biographer points out "The Bolshevik Centre had to be maintained at *all* costs - and money had to be raised by *any* possible means." (5) [Emphasis added.] These means included *political marriages*, forging currency, donations from wealthy sympathisers and, not the least, robbery, in one case with appalling loss of life. One wealthy sympathiser, the Moscow millionaire Sava Morozov, subsidised the Bolsheviks to the tune of 12,000 rubles a year. (6) As with our latter day socialist millionaires, the poor fellow obviously didn't realise just how much the recipients of his largess hated him for the crime of being rich, nor what sort of fate they had in store for him. Morozov didn't live long enough to find out; he committed suicide in 1905. He was said to have left a large legacy for the promotion of Bolshevism; he and many other bourgeois supported the Bolshevik cause, with Lenin's full knowledge. (7) This is the equivalent of German Jews financing Hitler in the full knowledge of the Nazis' programme of exclusion and expulsion. (8)

The Bolsheviks' criminal methods of raising money were called *expropriations*; Lenin's biographer refers to those who objected to expropriation squads - in particular Plekhanov and Martov - as squeamish. (9) Lenin spent most of his life exiled abroad. Another leading Bolshevik who spent a great deal of time in (internal) exile was Stalin. On one occasion Stalin defended a man who had robbed a peasant before an ad hoc court of political exiles. "The thief is a product of capitalist society", he argued, "Instead of condemning him for his act, he should be recruited, because men of this type are necessary for the fight to destroy the capitalist order." (10) For a man like Stalin it was but a short step from condoning an act of theft from a poor man for an obviously selfish purpose to the justification of murder for a *higher* purpose. It was he who organised the greatest Bolshevik *expropriation* of all, the Tiflis post office robbery of June 1907.

The sum expropriated here was estimated from 250,000 to 341,000 rubles. This was not so much a robbery as an act of mass murder which involved the killing and maiming of literally scores of people when the Bolsheviks opened up on a post office convoy with guns and bombs. (11) Most of the people murdered during the course of this robbery would have been ordinary working people. This terrible act shows the Bolsheviks in their true colours.

To be scrupulously fair to the Bolsheviks, they were neither the first nor the last *idealists* to resort to criminal activity in order to finance their *higher*

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

purpose. But even Hitler did not resort to such methods, and although shortly after his accession he murdered some of his most loyal supporters - in the Roehm purge - the tyranny of the Nazis was directed almost exclusively at the Jews, the communists and other groups they had declared their *jihad* against. Even the Nazis didn't tyrannise the common people whom they claimed, as did the Bolsheviks, to seek to liberate. (12)

Axelrod and Plekhanov wanted to break with the Bolsheviks over their criminal activities; Martov even appeared as a witness against them at the party investigation. (13) Unfortunately for the rest of mankind, the Bolsheviks survived. In May 1912 the party journal *Pravda* was founded. As most readers will realise, this has the unfortunate translation of *Truth*. The Social Democratic Party's first paper, *Iskra* (ie *The Spark*) had been published since December 1900. It was printed in Germany and smuggled into Russia. (14)

In March 1917, the Tsar abdicated, and a provisional government was established by Prince Lvov. The Lvov government gave way to that of Kerensky, who issued a general amnesty for Communists and other revolutionaries including Lenin (who had been in exile since the abortive coup of 1905). Lenin was in Switzerland at this time; Trotsky was in New York.

In 1972, the American Conservative and conspiracy theorist Gary Allen published a best selling book called *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* in which he claimed that the Bolsheviks had been sent into Russia by Wall Street bankers. This claim is not new, and has in fact been a cornerstone of anti-Semitic ideology since the time of the "Russian" Revolution. Usually the (Jewish) Bolsheviks are said to have been in the pay of the International Jews of Wall Street. It has often been claimed that Lenin and even Stalin are Jews; both these claims are false, (15) and because of this nonsense and the taboo surrounding the Jewish Question, this subject has been avoided like the plague by serious historians.

However, in 1974, the established scholar and Revisionist Historian Antony C. Sutton published a thoroughly documented study, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, which put the involvement of Wall Street bankers in this affair into context, in particular Sutton demonstrated that the Gentile firms of Rockefeller and Morgan were the prime movers rather than the American Jew Jacob Schiff and the Jewish firm of Kuhn, Loeb. Whatever motives Wall Street *Insiders* may have had for financing their alleged avowed enemy, it is nowhere disputed that the German High Command sent Lenin and his crew

into Russia in the famous "sealed train". (16) The Bolsheviks then proceeded to seize power and give the oppressed people of Russia a heavy dose of the *freedom* they had promised them. It was Lenin, incidentally, who declared that freedom is so precious that it must be rationed. (17) Their slogan, he said, must be "Arm the proletariat in order to vanquish, expropriate, and disarm the bourgeoisie!" (18) [The reader should contrast this with the activities of socialists and communists in the *peace* movement throughout the Western democracies in the 1950s-80s].

All the Bolsheviks' talk of freedom went out of the window from the day they seized power. On November 10, 1917, the Soviet Government published a decree curtailing freedom of the press, accompanied by the assurance that the repressive measures were only temporary and would become inoperative as soon as the new régime took firm root. Six days later, this was justified by a decree of the Soviet Central Executive Committee on the grounds that "The re-establishment of the so-called freedom of the Press; viz. the simple return of printing offices and paper to capitalists, poisoners of the people's conscience, would be an unpardonable surrender to the will of capital, that is to say, a counter-revolutionary measure." (19)

This *temporary* curtailment of freedom is not unique to the former Soviet régime. During the Second World War, most of the freedoms Britons and others were supposedly fighting to preserve were destroyed. Including, most especially, the right to protest against the war itself. (20) Many other freedoms which were won only by our ancestors spilling their precious blood have been destroyed into the bargain, usually at the behest of some allegedly *oppressed* minority, aided and abetted by socialist fanatics.

Whatever, it is not generally realised today that as well as shutting down the so-called capitalist press, Lenin and company shut down the socialist opposition. Lenin ordered the disbanding of Workers' Opposition groups within the Party, (21) and the great man himself said that to tolerate such opposition socialist newspapers "is to cease to be a Socialist...The state is an institution built up for the sake of exercising violence. Previously this violence was exercised by a handful of moneybags over the entire people; now we want...to organize violence in the interests of the people..." (22) There you have it, *we* want to organise violence. David Shub points out candidly that from May 1918 "there have been no independent newspapers in Russia. The limited rights which the Liberals and Socialists had enjoyed under autocratic Tsarism were

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

denied to all by Lenin." (23) In other words, the cure was worse than the disease. But there was much worse to come.

Lenin advocated the mass murder of the ruling dynasty, (24) and the Romanovs were indeed murdered. He also ordered mass terror against the Kulaks, (25) and this too the Bolsheviks carried out. The promised restructuring of society didn't simply involve mass murder however, but the ethos of working for others, ie for the state. Needless to say, the common people had other ideas. David Shub tells us that "[t]he peasants refused to plough their land, because there was no incentive for cultivating more than was needed for immediate village consumption." (26) Substitute the word profit for incentive in the previous sentence and you'll understand why communism/socialism has never worked and can never work, it runs contrary to human nature. (27) In *Tragedy And Hope*, Professor Quigley comments on this tragic era of human history, and the picture he paints is no better. By 1920, industrial production was only about 13% of the 1913 figure, and money was printed so freely that the ruble became almost worthless. (28) True, the First World War had caused devastation, but that would not have accounted for the almost total economic collapse.

By March 1921, even many die-hard Bolsheviks had had enough, and the sailors of Kronstadt revolted. This revolt was crushed mercilessly by that great champion of the working class Trotsky, who put a former Tsarist general in charge of the suppression. (29) This was in spite of the sailors refusing to shed "needless blood". (30) When several Red Army regiments mutinied and refused to fight the sailors, the Cheka shot every fifth soldier. Trotsky personally ordered the murders; men were shot "like ducks in a pond." (31) Never let it be forgotten that these men: Lenin, Trotsky, and in some quarters, even Stalin, are still worshipped as heroes by our contemporary socialists.

After Kronstadt, Lenin reintroduced capitalism under the guise of New Economic Policy, (32) because the period of "War Communism", which lasted from 1918-21, had proved unmanageable. [We have already touched on this briefly]. "In 1918 Lenin had regarded private enterprise as anathema. Now he admitted that private trade was indispensable for restoring Russia's economic health." (33) And he actually called the new system State Capitalism! (34)

The Myth Of Stalinism

When Lenin died in 1924, a power struggle took place between Stalin and Trotsky. (35) Stalin won, and Trotsky fell from grace, was exiled, and finally, murdered in Mexico in August 1940. The expulsion and subsequent murder of Trotsky has allowed his followers to portray him as a kind of saintly figure, the human face of communism as it were; the tyranny effected by Stalin has, to some extent, made this necessary. However, having read this far, the reader should be under no illusions as to the true nature of any member of the unholy trinity of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. These were men who engaged in all manner of nefarious schemes prior to their accession of power - the Tiflis post office robbery for one - who advocated terror and suppressed all opposition (even the socialist opposition), during their accession, and after they had consolidated power, ruthlessly suppressed and murdered even their, at one time, most devoted followers, in the Kronstadt mutiny. All three men were totally evil, all three were totally committed to the *ideals* of communism, and if Lenin had lived, or if Trotsky rather than Stalin had succeeded him, the course of history, though following a different path, would have been every bit as bloody. Moreover, the track record of communism/socialism has been essentially the same in every other country where these fiends have come to power: Red China and Cambodia are two equally terrible examples of the *success* of socialism and the *freedom* enjoyed by the people who suffer under it.

The only major difference between Stalin and Trotsky is that while Trotsky was a true internationalist, advocating world revolution, Stalin was both more practical and more efficient. Stalin's slogan was, or might have been enunciated as, "Communism in a single country". (36) It appears that the Soviets genuinely believed that the filthy Imperialists had nothing better to do than plot the overthrow of their glorious *workers' paradise*; this led to the belief that the country must be industrialised at breakneck speed, and that the peasantry must be broken by terror and reorganised. Everyone who stood in their way had to be crushed. (37) But the reader should have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the differences between Stalin and Trotsky were purely tactical; they sought exactly the same end by different means, and were both prepared to trample over, and murder, anyone who stood in their way.

The same applies to their successors, be they the New Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party or any of the hundreds of communist and socialist parties scattered throughout the world today. There is no such thing as socialism with a human face.

How Socialism Has Survived - The West Lends A Hand

The dichotomy of Capitalism v Communism which we in the West have been spoon-fed by leftists and by our own establishments, is not merely a distortion but is dead wrong. The history of the triumph of socialism in Russia has been rewritten to such an extent that there are serious problems with any attempt to assess it fairly and accurately. We have seen already that the Bolsheviks were aided by Wall Street *Insiders* from the word go. Another pleasant fiction is that the capitalist nations, in particular the United States, sought to crush the Soviets by whatever means. Again, this is simply not true. During and after the terrible famine of 1920-1 which the lunatic pseudo-economics of the Bolsheviks had created, the American Relief Administration came into the country and fed as many as ten million persons a day (in August 1922). (38)

Throughout the 1930s it was all but impossible to voice any criticism of the Soviet Union in the United States, in *intellectual* circles at least. Recall the experience of Ayn Rand, (see page 31). On August 23, 1939, the Soviets signed a non-aggression pact with the Nazis. Less than a fortnight later the Second World War was underway in earnest, and the Soviet Union's servants in the West did everything in their power to undermine the war effort. One British communist, Douglas Hyde - who was news editor of the *Daily Worker* - wrote of "the phony war", as indeed it was, a war that "was not our war. It was a war between rival imperialisms with several millions of workers in uniform as the unwilling pawns." (39)

In June 1941, Hitler showed himself in his true colours and attacked the Soviet Union. It was only then that the Imperialist War that Douglas Hyde and his fellow communists spoke of became a glorious struggle against fascism. A

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

new enthusiasm for Soviet Russia sprung up in the West; it is difficult to say how much of this was due to war propaganda, but for the duration of the rest of the war it had a profound effect. It led also to increased economic assistance to the Soviet Union. The extent of U.S. and more generally Western aid to the alleged avowed enemy was revealed by Stalin himself when he claimed, truthfully, that "...two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with United States help or technical assistance." (40)

The full extent of this aid to the Soviet Union by its capitalist *enemy* has long been reliably documented; it does not appear to have been diminished significantly if at all by the phony red scares of the McCarthy era and the resulting witch hunts of domestic communists.

The works of Antony Sutton reveal the full extent of Western (in particular U.S.) technical and other assistance to the Soviet Union; his books are thoroughly documented; they cannot be refuted, so the powers-that-be do not even try; the media has largely ignored them. Among other things, Sutton reveals that in May 1929 the Soviets signed a \$13 million deal with the Ford Motor Company, the plant, later known as Gorki, was subsequently converted to military operation. (41) "Every single Soviet weapon system has semi-conductor technology which originated in California and which has been bought, stolen or acquired from the United States." (42) And, quoting a former Soviet Defense [sic] Military official: "Without U.S. help the Soviet military system would collapse in [one and a half] years." (43)

Revealing as this is, the lowdown on the Soviets' inferior productive capacity is perhaps even more so. In 1957 the Soviet Union had 3.3 million telephones, 3.58 per hundred persons; the US had 49.8. In 1964, there were 919,000 automobiles in the Soviet Union, all produced in Western-built plants. The US had 71.9 million! (44)

In short, the former Soviet Union was able to survive only because it was propped up by capitalism for the entire duration of its existence. (45) In other words, socialism cannot survive unaided. The full ramifications of this are of enormous significance; if the entire world were to be run on socialist lines, it wouldn't run at all. The inevitable result would be the starvation of hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of people, as well as their total enslavement and brutalisation. World revolution would not mean, as Trotsky and company promised - and probably sincerely believed - the regeneration of man, but a return to the Dark Ages, or even to the Stone Age. (46)

Leon Trotsky: An Amusing Anecdote Or Two

We have seen the sort of people who make up the socialist elite, and the reader will, doubtless, recall Paul Foot's comment that under socialism "most people will get the same". Just as Paul Foot is not *most* people, neither was Leon Trotsky, for while he was living in exile in New York, this champion of the downtrodden and the oppressed appears to have done very well for himself. In his autobiography, which was published in 1930, Trotsky wrote that all manner of rumours were circulated about him, but "My only profession in New York was that of a revolutionary socialist." (47) In practise this meant writing for the small circulation emigré press and giving a few lectures. The income he would have derived from this does not tally with his lifestyle at that time; Antony Sutton finds Trotsky's explanation unconvincing; (48) another author believes that Trotsky may have dabbled in the film industry. (49)

Whether or not this champion of the working class was indeed bankrolled by American bankers - Jewish or otherwise - or whether he was at one time an aspiring Kirk Douglas (or more likely Charlie Chaplin), he certainly appears to have lived well in capitalist America. The Trotskies rented a house and were a little disappointed when their Negro janitor absconded with the rent. (50) However, their faith in human nature was revived when they found both their rent and their property which at first they thought had disappeared. Trotsky wrote that "The janitor had taken the money of the tenants who had already received their receipts; he did not mind robbing the landlord, but he was considerate enough not to rob the tenants." He and his wife were deeply touched: "it seemed as if a corner of the veil that concealed the *black* problem in the United States had lifted." He called the janitor "A delicate fellow". (51) Doubtless the landlord had harsher words for him.

One reason the Trotskies lived so well in the United States was because Lev Davidovich spent a lot of his time poncing off socialism's staunchest supporters. In 1930, he wrote "In the United States there is a large class of successful and semi-successful doctors, lawyers, dentists, engineers, and the like who divide their precious hours of rest between concerts by European celebrities

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

and the American Socialist party." (52) It is people like this who have always been the backbone of the socialist movement. And people like this who have always been the first to go up against the wall come the revolution. Incidentally, throughout his life, Trotsky seems to have had no or little trouble moving about; how many workers at that time could afford to move from the Soviet Union to the United States and back? How many of them could have afforded to travel to Spain, and to Mexico, and to take their families with them?

Trotsky was far from the only such "revolutionary" who flitted from country to country with apparent ease and little or no declared income; as stated, Lenin spent much of his life in exile. Other socialists have devoted enormous time and effort to stirring up trouble, and organising expensive conferences and demonstrations: (53) where did the money come from? Where does it come from?



Returning to Lev Davidovich, one of the people who entertained the Trotskies was a certain Dr M. Mrs Trotsky and her sons were taken out for jaunts by the good doctor's wife, and on one occasion when the happy party visited a tea room the boys asked their mother: "Why doesn't the chauffeur come in?" (54) How could anyone have ever given these *revolutionaries* the time of day?

Not that it was all play and no work for everybody's favourite working class hero. Trotsky studied the economic history of the United States and found that exports grew during the war. The growth was so great that it astounded him. This seems to have led him to the belief that capitalism wants war. (55) Of course, capitalists often do profit from war, but before they can so profit from a war, there has to be somebody to start one. Certainly socialism has started more than its fair share of wars this century. And we should never forget that the likes of Trotsky and Lenin are at war with us all of the time; whether you realise it or not, whether you want to confront them or not, they are fighting you unremittingly in the class war.

Interestingly, Trotsky glosses over Kronstadt in his autobiography; there is no mention here of the rebellion proper. And certainly no mention of shooting workers like ducks in a pond, probably because such "untypical" socialist-inspired brutality would not have gone down too well with his concert-going doctor friends in the American Socialist Party.

Seven years later, Trotsky published a damning indictment of socialism, *The Revolution Betrayed*. (56) In the first chapter he asks what has been achieved, and concludes not a lot: "In the *best* metal foundry, according to the acknow-

FREEDOM UNDER SOCIALISM?

ledgment of its director, the output of iron and steel per individual worker is a third as much as the *average* output of American foundries." (57) He refers to the dying away of the state as a "sociological theorem"; (58) and states baldly that "In a communist society, the state and money will disappear. Their gradual dying away ought consequently to begin under socialism." (59) It is now more than half a century since Trotsky's assassination, and three quarters of a century since the glorious revolution he and his kind foisted onto the Russian people, and to some extent onto the rest of mankind. The withering away of the state is no nearer than it ever was, but still Trotsky's acolytes continue to proclaim that it is just around the corner and that when it does arrive all will be milk and honey. Which is surely proof enough that socialism is less a science than a religion.