

33

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Vol. 2

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

No. 5

FROM THE CONTENTS

From the Sixth to the Seventh World Congress of the
Comintern.

—*L. Sharkey.*

May Day.

—*S. Purdy.*

A Victorian Country Party Government with Labor
Party Support.

—*J. D. Blake.*

Towards the Workers' Daily.

—*R. Dixon.*

Brisbane Meatworkers' Strike; Victorian Doleworkers'
Strike.

MAY ISSUE — SIXPENCE

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

*A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of
Marxism-Leninism.*

CONTENTS

	Page
From the Sixth to the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, by L. Sharkey	1
A Victorian Country Party Government With Labor Party Support, by J. D. Blake	11
One Hundred Years of Australian Trade Unionism, by J. N. Rawling (concluded)	16
May Day, by S. Purdy	24
From Acts of Treason to the Party—To the Fascist White Guard Shot! (From "The Communist International")	28
Towards the Workers' Daily, by R. Dixon	39
The Victorian Dole Workers' Strike, by Alf. Watt	45
Lessons of the Brisbane Meatworkers' Strike, by W.R.	50
Australia Faces Economic Decline, by D. J. Robertson	53
The Incendiaries, by Dimitrov	61
Book Review, by E.M.H.	63

Printed at 116 Dixon St., Sydney, by R. W. Goss, clerk, and E. N. Wiggins, stationer, at 107 Annandale St., for the publisher, H. Gwynne, 162 Macellum St., Sydney.



The Communist Review

Vol. 2, No. 5

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

May, 1935

From the Sixth to the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern.

By L. SHARKEY

"Therefore, the development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilisation inevitably leads, in the final analysis, to the present 'stabilisation' period growing into a period of gigantic cataclysms."—From the Thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, held in 1928.

This statement of the Sixth World Congress was made at a time when capitalism was drunk with so-called "prosperity," when President Hoover was declaring that poverty was banished from the United States for ever, when the parties of the Second International were, as in the case of Britain and Australia, "drunk with Fordism nonsense" and despatching delegations to the U.S.A. to learn the "secret of American prosperity," when the slogan of international reformism was: "Ford has conquered Marx."

The Communist International, however, basing itself on Marxist-Leninist science, using the weapons provided by this science, was enabled to illuminate beforehand, to point to the path which world development must inevitably take.

Drunk with the nostrums of Fordism, Mondism, and capitalist rationalisation, which was to ensure permanent capitalist prosperity, at the same moment as the Sixth World Congress was showing the inevitable break-up of capitalist stabilisation, that august reformist body, the British Trade Union Congress, after declaring that "revolutionary action was futile" and certain "to fail," and also in face of "present-day developments," i.e., improved capitalist technique and rationalisation, the unions could not stand aside, fighting for "sectional improvements" and

telling the "employers to get on with their own job," pompously declared at the Swansea Conference, 1928:

"The third course is for the union movement to say boldly that not only is it concerned with the prosperity of industry, but that it is going to have a voice as to the way industry is carried on, so that it can influence the new developments that are taking place. The ultimate policy of the movement can find more use for an efficient industry than for a derelict one, and the unions can use their power to promote and guide the scientific reorganisation of industry [Mondism, rationalisation.—L. S.], as well as to obtain material advantages from that reorganisation."

Thus we have a typical example of the sanctification of class-collaboration, based on the idea that capitalist stabilisation was permanent and that on the basis of technical developments and "reorganisation" (rationalisation), the reformist leaders, hand in hand with Sir Alfred Mond and Henry Ford, would usher in the new Jerusalem, banishing Marx and his "crude class-struggle concepts" and burying the spectre of revolution for all time, as opposed to the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of the Comintern that the temporary capitalist stabilisation made possible by the defeat of the revolutionary movement after the war through the treachery of Social-Democracy, was on the eve of its break-up.

And how brilliantly has the diagnosis made by the Communist theoreticians, and first of all by Comrade Stalin, been confirmed by the events during the years following the Sixth World Congress. Within a short time, within a period of months, the world economic crisis signified its arrival by the crash on the New York Stock Exchange. The Hooverian-Social-Democratic talk of banishing poverty while capitalism lasts vanished as the mists before the morning sun. The Ford illusion ended in a massacre of his workers, demonstrating for bread, before the gates of Ford's giant factory in Detroit.

America has been the arena, since 1928, of giant strikes and class battles, and has witnessed the growth of unparalleled armies of unemployed workers and dispossessed small farmers and business men. Truly, Marx has triumphed over Ford, and America is to-day a living object lesson of the correctness of Marx's analysis of the development of the capitalist system. The Ford illusion was followed by the Roosevelt illusion, the N.R.A.,

which has already suffered shipwreck, and few to-day there are who will do it reverence.

The capitalist crisis spread rapidly over the world, and became the most profound and long drawn out in the history of capitalism. Industrial and agrarian countries alike were undermined. More than 50,000,000 were unemployed. Such was the manner in which the historic analysis made by the Communist International, sitting in its Sixth World Congress, was fulfilled. What a marvellous triumph for Marxist-Leninist science, and what a catastrophic destruction of the class-collaboration and peaceful evolution (through capitalist prosperity) theories of the reformists.

The Communist International, sitting in its Sixth World Congress, foresaw, as a consequence of the forthcoming world crisis, an extreme sharpening of the class antagonisms and a sharpening of the antagonisms between the imperialist Powers as well as an upsurge of the colonial revolutionary movement against imperialist rule.

The Congress made political preparation to meet the new world situation. This political preparation was known to us a few years ago as the "New Line." The Congress foresaw the upsurge of the masses, the great strikes that have eventuated in all capitalist countries since 1928, the mass unemployed demonstrations in Britain, America, etc., the mass struggles against Fascism in Germany, Austria, France, Spain, and other countries, the unrest in the armed forces, expressed in the British, Dutch, and other naval mutinies, the strengthening of the revolution in China and the colonial countries, and the other revolutionary phenomena of the Third Post-War Period, and clearly realised the treacherous role that would be played by Social-Democracy wherever they had the leadership or influence in connection with these events. Therefore, it was necessary for the Communists everywhere to sharpen the struggle against counter-revolutionary social-democracy. It was necessary for the Communist Parties to win the leadership of the struggles of the masses and independently lead these struggles, sharpening our fight against and exposing the Social-Democratic agents of the bourgeoisie within the workers' ranks, at the same time. Such was the content of the "New Line."

The Sixth World Congress foresaw the growth of Fascism, knowing that the bourgeoisie would everywhere attempt to

drown the revolutionary struggles of the workers in blood and attempt to prolong the life of capitalism by the aid of the Fascist terror. The Social-Democrats would aid the bourgeoisie in its transition towards Fascism. The Social-Democrats would utilise their influence to paralyse the working-class resistance to the capitalist offensive, which had as its objective, placing the burden of the crisis on the backs of the toilers. The Social-Democrats would represent a strike-breaking force and disrupt the workers' resistance, and their whole policy would play into the hands of the Fascist bourgeoisie. Such was the Social-Fascist role allotted to Social-Democracy.

All this was demonstrated in classic form in Germany, where Social-Democracy held the workers back from struggle, split their unity, rejected time and again the united front offers of the German Communist workers, represented Von Hindenburg as the "lesser evil" to Hitler, and fought for Hindenburg against the candidate of the revolutionary workers, our heroic comrade, Ernst Thaelmann, who to-day languishes in a Fascist prison as a consequence of this treachery; which elected Hindenburg, who opened the door to Hitler. Such was the Social-Fascist role of the Social-Democracy, the "bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution" (Lenin), consummated, and which led to the temporary victory of the Nazi terror in Germany.

The rise of Fascism in a number of countries, the repudiation of bourgeois "democracy," is one of the chief developments since the Sixth World Congress. This in itself testifies to the shattering of capitalist stabilisation and the fear of the bourgeoisie of the approaching revolutionary crisis. That they would resort to the most brutal forms of terror, and would be successful, temporarily, was foreseen by Lenin, who wrote in "Left-Wing Communism" on this point as follows:—

"But at the same time, the bourgeoisie sees in Bolshevism only one side—insurrection, violence, terror; it endeavors, therefore, to prepare itself especially for opposition in that direction alone. It is possible that, in single cases, in single countries, for more or less short periods, they will succeed; we must reckon with such a possibility and there is absolutely nothing dreadful to us in the fact that the bourgeoisie might succeed in this. Communism 'springs up' from positively all sides of social life, its sprouts are everywhere without exception—the 'contagion' (to use the favorite and 'pleasantest' comparison of the

bourgeoisie and the bourgeois police) has very thoroughly penetrated into the organism and has totally impregnated it. If one of the 'vents' were to be stopped up with special care, 'contagion' would find another, sometimes most unexpected vent. Life will assert itself. Let the bourgeoisie rave, let it work itself into a frenzy, commit stupidities, take vengeance in advance on the Bolsheviks and to endeavor to exterminate in India, Hungary, Germany, etc., more hundreds of thousands of the Bolsheviks of yesterday or those of to-morrow. Acting thus, the bourgeoisie acts as did all classes condemned to death by history. The Communists must know that the future, at any rate, is theirs; therefore we can and must unite the intensest passion in the great revolutionary struggle, with the coolest and soberest calculations of the mad ravings of the bourgeoisie.

"The Russian revolution was heavily defeated in 1905; the Russian Bolsheviks were beaten in July, 1917; over 15,000 German Communists were killed by means of clever provocation and the artful manoeuvres of Scheidemann and Noske, together with the bourgeoisie and the Monarchist generals; White terror is raging in Finland and Hungary. But in all cases and all countries, Communism grows; its roots are so deep that persecution neither weakens nor debilitates, but rather strengthens it."

That is how the great Lenin saw the course of the world revolution—not a straight road of a cheering army, but one that would meet with temporary reverses and at times heavy blows and losses. How different is this Leninist conception from that of the panic-stricken petty-bourgeois, who scream that all has been lost in Germany and in the other Fascist countries. The bourgeoisie, in the conditions of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, seeing in Bolshevism only "terror and violence," have been frenziedly attempting to stop up this "vent," have been taking "vengeance in advance" on the proletarian revolution during the period between the Sixth and Seventh Congresses of the Communist International, have organised their Fascist civil war armies or are organising them in practically all capitalistic countries.

The struggle against Fascism has everywhere been led by the Communists. Dimitrov set the example of revolutionary

steadfastness for the whole working class. Thaelmann and Rakosi have shown how heroically Communists defy the Fascist hangmen. The question of the organisation of the struggle against Fascism and to assemble the masses for the final victory of the proletarian revolution over Fascism is one of the main problems on the agenda of the coming Seventh Congress. The advance of Fascism has been met with resolute resistance by the workers, following the German events. The Spanish and Austrians took up arms in the struggle against the Fascists. In these armed struggles, the Spanish and Austrian Communists fought valorously, advancing correct slogans, and have considerably strengthened their positions as a result. In France, the united front organised by the Communists succeeded in checking the advance of Fascism. The British Communists have successfully mobilised big masses against Mosley. In Australia, applying the tactics of the united front, our Party succeeded in dealing weighty blows at the New Guards. The Communists in most countries have won many successes in winning the leadership of strikes, in the application of the united front, have increased the influence and raised the prestige of the Parties and greatly increased the polls recorded in elections for the Parties which are still legal or partly legal. The membership of the Parties have grown, and have organisationally consolidated. The workers in strikes are more and more adopting the tactics of the Communists, and the armed struggles in Spain and Austria show the workers adopting the armed methods of Bolshevism in the struggle against capitalism. The Chinese Soviets have embraced one-sixth of the territory of China since the Sixth World Congress. The most frightful terror has failed to break the iron German Communist Party, which, working deep underground, is mobilising the workers for the victorious German revolution.

The period between the Sixth and Seventh World Congresses was a period in which the deviators of all shades were utterly routed on an international scale and the world Communist Party has rebuffed the agents of the enemy who sought to enter the ranks and is firmly united around the Leninist line and around the great leader of the World Revolution, Comrade Stalin.

In the period since the Sixth Congress, the Soviet Union, the base of the world revolution, has strengthened enormously. The Five-Year Plan was a magnificent success. In the midst of the chaotic capitalist world, Socialist planning recorded feats in building the productive forces and improving conditions of the

masses unprecedented in the history of the world. This period saw the uprooting of the kulaks and the victory of collective agriculture and the triumph of Socialist industry, together with the transformation of the Soviet Union from a backward country into the second industrial country in the world.

The growing might of the Soviet Union has reflected itself in the sphere of international relationships, compelling the most powerful and obstinately anti-Soviet capitalist Powers, such as the U.S.A., to accord recognition. The Soviets have carried on the most determined struggle against imperialist war and for the disruption of the interventionist front.

The Communist Parties, in the period since the Sixth World Congress, have been everywhere in the van, not only against Fascism, but against imperialist war and for the defence of the Soviet Union. The Japanese comrades gave an heroic example of resistance to the imperialist war planners at the time of the Japanese occupation of Manchuria and the attack on Shanghai. Big anti-war movements have sprung up in all capitalist countries, influenced by the Communists.

The international situation at the present time is a dangerous one. The imperialists, in particular in Germany and Japan, are preparing to fly at the throat of the Soviet Union. The Communist International, at the several Plenums of the Executive succeeding the Sixth World Congress, has elaborated and developed the line laid down at the Sixth Congress and at the recent Thirteenth Plenum declared that the world is now "closely approaching a new round of revolutions and wars."

Such have been some of the main events and activities of the Communists since the Sixth World Congress, and although the E.C.C.I. justly criticises the Parties for not making the progress, in many countries, that the objective situation implies, at the same time much has been done towards the building of the Parties and the growth of their influence over the masses and the preparation of the masses for the forthcoming decisive battles for the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

THE AUSTRALIAN PARTY SINCE THE SIXTH CONGRESS

Although many shortcomings exist in our work, although we still have not the leadership of the majority of the Australian

working class, the progress made by our Party makes it practically unrecognisable as the Party that existed in 1928. The leadership has changed, the approach of the Party to the problems confronting the workers is utterly different. The outlook and personnel of the Party has been entirely transformed in this period. From an organisation of some 500 members, it has grown to 3000. The Party has spread its organisation all over Australia. In 1930, there was no Communist group in Newcastle, but a few months ago four and a half thousand votes were recorded in that city and a strong District Committee now functions there. And this development could be paralleled in a dozen places. The press has grown enormously, and the Party is to-day a factor in the political life of the country. The influence of the Party in the unions and on the jobs has grown far more than the growth of the membership would indicate. All this and much more was achieved under the guidance of the Communist International and the application of the line of the Communist International and as a result of ruthless struggle against all deviations from the line of the Comintern, a ruthless struggle against "left" opportunism, against sectarianism, and by the destruction of the influence of the Right opportunist leaders inside the Party.

The Right-wingers, Kavanagh and Ryan, refused to operate the decisions of the Sixth World Congress, and Kavanagh, like Lovestone in the U.S.A., declared that "Australia was an exception," that the crisis "would not affect Australia," although it had already begun, that "Moscow, 15,000 miles away, did not understand Australian conditions," and consequently the line of the Sixth Congress did "not apply" to Australia, particularly that part of it that called for a sharpening of the struggle against reformism. Having a majority on the Central Committee, though not of the Party membership, they point-blank refused to oppose the Labor Party with Communist candidates. Their line in relation to the great class battles proceeding at that moment, the timber-workers' strike and the lock-out in the mining industry, was opportunist to the core and utterly subservient to that of the reformist bureaucrats.

The Communist International subsequently declared that the policy and ideology of the Kavanagh group would lead "to the liquidation" of the Communist Party of Australia. With the aid of the International, the membership of the Party waged a fierce campaign against the opportunist leadership and for the

strict application of the decisions of the Sixth World Congress by the Australian Party. The Right wing suffered the same fate that the Right-wing leaders suffered in other Parties—an overwhelming defeat and the liquidation of their opportunist policies and theories.

The struggle against opportunism served as the starting point for the subsequent rapid progress of the Party. The new leadership, although making mistakes of a Leftist sectarian character, tackled the problems confronting the workers in energetic fashion. An effective intervention was made in the coal struggle, which, although we were not strong enough to bring about the defeat of the policy of the bureaucracy and the adoption of a policy that would have placed the mine-workers in a position to obtain a victory, yet laid the basis for the subsequent success of the militants and their policy in the miners' organisation. And from the refusal of the Right wing to oppose the reformists with Communist candidates, we have the continuous growth of the Party polls since the defeat of the "Right." And so in every sphere, in each phase of Party work, improvement has been continuous. The Party is a vigorous fighting force, displaying healthy growth, whilst the remnants of the Right wing are decadent and rotting, a fate to which their line, if followed, would have condemned the whole Party. The fight against the Right wing in our Party made an enormous difference to our subsequent development. The lesson must not be lost sight of, and it assists us to understand the significance of the fight "on two fronts" against the "Right" and "Left" deviations, the fight for Leninism and the line of the Comintern. The Australian Party is now completely united on the basis of the programme and tactics of the Communist International.

Since the defeat of the "Right," the fight against reformism has been very considerably sharpened and strengthened, and the fight against the "Left" A.L.P. leaders in N.S.W. has been a particularly severe one. Mistakes were made in this fight, of a sectarian character, and also in the direction of a tendency to abuse, rather than a concrete exposure of the treachery and betrayals of the reformist leaders. This has been to an extent corrected, and the Party is winning successes in the fight against reformism, particularly in the trade union sphere and among the unemployed. We are laying the basis for the final defeat of reformism in the Australian working class.

Since the defeat of the deviators, with the aid of the Comintern and by ruthless self-criticism, the Party has sought to

overcome many of its shortcomings, to root out sectarianism, to improve our approach to the masses, to raise the theoretical level, to change the basis of the Party from mainly relying on street units and the unemployed, to organisation of Party nuclei in the factory and basing the Party on the employed industrial workers. The Party has won some outstanding achievements in the leadership of strikes and the struggles of the workers, and has considerably improved its work in the trade union sphere. We have achievements to record in all these, and in other spheres, but much remains to be done, many weak spots remain to be yet eliminated. The Party has also attempted to apply the tactics of the united front on a wider scale than hitherto.

The main Party slogans on the eve of the Seventh World Congress are the mobilising of the masses for the struggle for wage restoration, against the war danger and Fascist reaction, around which it strives to establish the united front of the workers, and the Party emphasises that the way out of capitalist chaos is the revolutionary overthrow of bourgeois rule and the establishment of Soviet Australia. The Australian Communists, therefore, look to the Seventh World Congress for further elucidation of the problems that confront the workers, and know that its decisions will be of enormous value to the Australian proletariat and the struggle to establish Proletarian Dictatorship and Socialism in this country.

A Victorian Country Party Government with Labor Party Support.

By J. D. BLAKE

For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, a Country Party Government is in office. This Government, which has just taken over the Treasury Benches in Victoria, is able to continue in existence only as a result of the support given to it by the 17 Labor Party members in the House.

In the State Elections of March 2 the Country Party secured four additional seats in Parliament at the expense of the United Australia Party, with which it had participated in a composite Ministry before the elections.

This increased support for the Country Party was based on the enormous impoverishment of the poor farmers throughout Victoria. During the past two or three years thousands of farmers have suffered bankruptcy and been driven off the land, and thousands more are groaning under mortgages and heavy indebtedness, resulting in a deep ferment in the countryside.

The Country Party was compelled to recognise this, as will be seen from the following quotations from the policy speech of the leader of the Country Party at the beginning of the election campaign:—

"Hundreds of primary producers outside the Commission who have been trying to carry on from their own resources have no possible chance of success unless their indebtedness can be substantially reduced. Because of the low prices of products and the high cost of production, many farmers have lost heart; their equities have disappeared, and unless creditors and debtors can come together on a debts adjustment scheme, bankruptcy or abandonment of vast areas are the only alternatives. Such a course would be disastrous not only to the settlers, but to the State. Our primary industries must be regarded as the foundation of our solvency, for although many farmers are on the verge of insolvency, they have, during the process of their operations, maintained the solvency of this State."

The proposals of the Country Party regarding the farmers were put forward in a very demagogic manner in order to catch the votes of the farmers. The policy speech stated:

"The Country Party strongly supports the following schemes: Security of tenure; reduction of interest to the lowest possible level; the creation of a debts adjustment tribunal vested with powers to secure agreements between debtors and creditors, and the provision of funds to enable cash payments to be made to creditors who are prepared to reduce to satisfactory degree their claims against farmers who are in financial difficulties; provision of funds to assist farmers in payment of interest on farm mortgages; advances to enable farmers to continue production during the 'stay order' period. With the appointment of such a tribunal there would be no necessity for the continuance of the Farmers' Relief Board as at present constituted."

It was upon the basis of such promises as these that the Country Party was able to win an additional four seats in Parliament.

It will be seen from a close study of these extracts from the Country Party policy speech that it has no intention of attempting to bring about any improvement in the lot of the poor farmers; but that on the contrary the real kernel of its schemes is simply the plan to give financial assistance to the creditors of the farmers. These creditors in the main are the big banks, and it is these institutions which will benefit from the proposed "cash payments to creditors." Further than this the so-called cash advances to farmers made during the "stay order" period are generally made to the big farmers with the larger enterprises, and even though such "advances" were made to poor farmers, it would only be another means for increasing their indebtedness. Binding them ever more firmly in the web of debt and interest slavery.

Hence the essence of the Country Party policy will mean the further enslavement of the poor farmers, entangling them more and more in the threads of indebtedness and interest payment to the banks and the State. But the poor farmers did not see this reality in the policy of the Country Party; they saw only the promise of the relief of all their troubles and the easing of their mortgage burden. Hence the increase in the Country Party vote, and hence also the Country Party Government.

After the election the Country Party came to Parliament with four new seats, bringing it up to 20 as against 25 held by the U.A.P. and 17 by the Labor Party. The squabble over portfolios immediately began, with the Country Party demanding stronger representation in the Cabinet.

In the middle of this squabble between the Country Party and the U.A.P., Tunnecliffe, the leader of the Labor Party, sent the following letter to the Country Party:—

"Now that the smoke of the conflict has subsided, it is very obvious from the result of the election that the policy of rural rehabilitation advanced by you in your policy speech and which follows so closely on the lines advocated by me on behalf of the Labor Party, was endorsed by the electors of the State. As you stated, the desperate position of the producers to-day will call for the immediate attention of the new Parliament, and you then proceed to outline very definite proposals for dealing with this issue, namely:

"(a) Security of tenure.

"(b) Reduction of interest to the lowest possible level.

"(c) The creation of a debts adjustment tribunal, vested with powers to secure agreements between debtors and creditors, and the provision of funds to enable cash payments to be made to creditors who are prepared to reduce to a satisfactory degree their claims against farmers who are in financial difficulties.

"(d) Provision of funds to assist farmers in payment of interest on farm mortgages.

"(e) Advances to enable farmers to continue production during the stay-order period.

"Judging by the experience of the past three years, it is now generally agreed that nothing of value in this direction will be forthcoming from the present Administration, and the result of the elections strongly supports this view, as the Nationalists are the only party which has lost seats—both the other parties having made gains at their expense. I therefore take this opportunity of offering you the support of my party to enable a comprehensive scheme of rural rehabilitation to be carried out. Trusting that in the interests of the primary producers and the State generally, you will see your way clear to accept our co-operation in this matter."

This infamous letter of the Labor Party has since become known as "Labor's offer of support without a tag." The basis upon which the Labor Party attempts to justify this open alliance with an openly capitalist party is that it is the only avenue open to the Labor Party to place itself in the position to influence the policy of the Government.

But the point is that the offer was made "without a tag" and purely on the basis of rendering support to the Country Party in the carrying out of its policy of so-called rural rehabilitation, the fundamental basis of which we have already shown to be directed against the interests of the poor farmers in the interests of the big agrarian capitalists. The policy speech of the Country Party previously quoted also stated:

"The United Country Party stands for sound finance, and favors the continuance of the Premiers' Plan until the original objective—the balancing of the State budget—has been reached."

Thus definitely indicating that the Country Party follows exactly the same policy of attacking the wages and conditions of the workers as the U.A.P. Yet the Labor Party offers its support to such an openly capitalist party.

In the past the Labor Party leaders have gone to great pains in their attempts to deny having supported the Premiers' Plan. Now these same Labor Party leaders ally themselves with a party which openly boasts of its support of the Premiers' Plan, and its participation in carrying out their plan.

The important point to be noted in this connection is that this action of the Labor Party does not constitute any fundamental break with the previous policy, but on the contrary is merely the logical outcome of that self-same policy and endorses everything that has been said by the Communists regarding the Labor Party as a third party of capitalism and a party which initiated the Premiers' Plan, which the Country Party now boasts of having carried out.

Almost simultaneously with this new act of treachery the Victorian Executive published its reply to the united front proposals of the Communist Party. This reply was a rejection of the united front proposals. The main arguments put forward as a basis for this rejection were that the principles of the two parties could not be reconciled, that the A.L.P. refused to allow

the Communist Party to have any say in determining Labor Party policy, etc., in addition to a series of attacks upon the Communists, who were charged with being "disrupters," "splitters," etc.

In other words, a complete evasion of the real issue of united struggle for the restoration of wage-cuts and against war and Fascism. Thus whilst attacking straw men in the form of an allegedly proposed alliance between the Labor Party and the Communist Party, the Labor Party enters into a definitely anti-working-class alliance with the openly capitalist Country Party. What further is it necessary to say to indicate the real role of the Labor Party?

On the basis of this offer of support from the Labor Party, the Country Party went forward with its censure motion against the Argyle Government, which was carried by 40 votes to 23 with the support of the Labor members and the ex-Labor Premier, Hogan.

Later the Country Party formed its own Ministry, and here it is interesting to note that in the new Ministry Hogan, the ex-Labor Premier, has been given the portfolio of Minister for Agriculture. How remarkably history develops—Hogan, who was expelled from the Labor Party for his support of the Premiers' Plan as a "left" gesture on the part of the Labor Party in an attempt to differentiate itself from the Premiers' Plan, now finds himself in a Ministry also pledged to carry out the Premiers' Plan, and supported by those self-same Labor members who took part in his expulsion from the Labor Party!

The new Country Party Government is already beginning to feel the strain. In the first place it was able to assume office on the basis of a demagogic programme of rural rehabilitation and relief for the unemployed, and it will only be able to continue in office by showing signs of carrying out some of its promises in order to placate the growing discontent in the towns and countryside.

In this regard the Commonwealth has allocated £375,000 to Victoria for rural relief; it is clear that this sum will not change the position of the poor farmers one iota. The recent mass strike of the unemployed workers throughout Victoria compelled the Government to grant increases which increase the expenditure on dole payments by £30,000 per year, and this is on top of the fact that the unemployment relief fund is in debt to the extent of £100,000.

To cap it all, the meeting of the Loan Council, from which Dunstan, the Country Party Premier, expected to secure huge sums of money to finance his plans, has been postponed for six weeks; and all indications go to prove that the Loan Council will make no additional allocations to Victoria.

Hence the shaky position of the new Government, because of its minority position in the House, is rendered even more shaky by the fact that it is unable to finance any of the demagogic promises upon which it came to office.

These developments indicate the depth of the differences and antagonisms between the various sections of the bourgeoisie. The treacherous role of the Labor Party, and the fact that out of it all will come a more intense drive against the toiling masses; with the various capitalist parties attempting to overcome their differences by joint struggle against the workers and farmers.

One Hundred Years of Australian Trade Unionism.

By J. N. RAWLING

(Continued from last issue)

The defeats of 1890 and following years brought results of momentous importance in their train. The unions declined—thousands of workers deserting them—and were thus weakened, although not to the extent that the employers had hoped. About 1894, there were 50,000 unionists in Australia. But, by the beginning of the new century, that number had just about doubled itself—in 1901 there were 97,000 unionists. By 1908, the number had risen to a quarter of a million, and, by 1919, to 628,000, a number representing 50 per cent. of all employed men over 21. Unionism was thus quick to recover from defeat, spreading into every avenue of labor: school-teachers, journalists, musicians and women following the examples set by the skilled and unskilled workers in industries. The organisation of women was at first slow. We have already mentioned the Melbourne Tailoresses' Union of 1882. Little

progress was registered until 1910, but, by the outbreak of the World War, there were 23,000 women unionists—a number which was trebled by the end of the war, a striking index of the rate of the industrialisation of women during the war.

Two other results of the defeats of the early 'nineties were linked together and were to breed disaster after disaster for Australia's workers during the next forty years—and the evil effects of them are still hampering progress towards freedom. They were the creation of the Labor Party and the crippling of unionism by means of compulsory arbitration. The stinging defeats could not by themselves have held up the progress of unionism. In order utterly to cripple the unions, to emasculate their fighting spirit, these other two developments were necessary, because the economic storm, for which the crushing of working-class resistance was, for the employers, a necessary prelude, must inevitably have led to more and more struggles which, because of the lessons learned in 1890, would have brought victory after victory to the workers. The economic crisis of 1893 meant reduction of wages on top of the reductions enforced by the employers' victories over the strikers, meant unemployment and soup-kitchens. Further resistance was necessary. During the years that followed 1890, that resistance was nullified by Labor-in-Politics.

The representation of Labor in Parliament was not altogether new. In 1859, in Melbourne, we find an instance of a stonemason who worked at his trade during the day and sat in Parliament at night, and in 1881 the unionists of Balmain (Sydney) were paying a salary to one of their comrades whom they had elected to Parliament. He afterwards ratted. Three years later, the inter-colonial Congress through the Parliamentary committees to lobby measures through the Parliaments of the various colonies. But, in 1891, the final step was taken—all of the elements of success being present to ensure fruition to the hopes of the would-be politicians. It was the year of defeat and disillusionment. Leaders, themselves more than half responsible for the defeats, could point to those defeats as arguments for parliamentary action instead of industrial organisation and direct action. All had seen how the Masters and Servants Act had been rigorously employed against the strikers by the Government in the interests of the employers. The military had been used extensively. They had heard military officers giving orders to "fire low and lay them out." They had seen their comrades sentenced to long terms

of imprisonment. They had seen, in short, the capitalists using their State machines to defeat them. But they thought that the State was a neutral organ which could just as easily be used by them against the employers. So they were prepared to support Labor politicians to seize control of the machine. Moreover, a Labor Party in Parliament was made possible by the inauguration of payment of members.

Nor was this only a move on the part of Labor politicians. The proposal to set up a Parliamentary Labor Party met with the support and endorsement of the capitalist Press, the employers and pastoralists' organisations, and even the bourgeois political parties—"if they had grievances, they should endeavor to have them righted by constitutional means." And Spence, of the Australian Seamen's Union, told his followers, in 1890:

"It is clear that only through the ballot-box can we expect to destroy the power of monopoly and obtain justice. Even were every man a unionist we could not beat combined capitalism, especially when it is aided by governments in sympathy with it, who allow even the laws of the country to be violated in the interests of a class."

The tragedy was that the workers were convinced that a Labor Party on the other hand would be allowed to violate the laws in the interests of the working class, that it would desire to do so—and history shows us that it did not even desire to do so!

In the June, 1891, elections, 36 Labor members were returned, but the party soon split over the question of a pledge, and it was not till 1904 that the group of pledged members made any great progress—the "solidarities" (McGowen, Cann, W. M. Hughes, J. C. Watson, et al) gaining only fifteen seats in 1894 and the "independents" (led by Joseph Cook) twelve. In Queensland, four seats were gained in 1892, sixteen in 1893, and twenty-three in 1899. Ten seats were gained in Victoria in 1892 and eight in South Australia. In the first Federal elections, sixteen Labor members were returned for the House of Representatives and eight for the Senate.

The procedure of the Labor Party in the early stages was to gain concessions by holding the balance of power between the old parties. For example, between 1894 and 1904, in N.S.W., no party had an absolute majority, and for the first half of that period Labor supported Reid and, for the second half, Lyne. Then the party grew at the expense of the Liberals and became the official Opposition. From 1905 to 1909, there was a Liberal-

Labor coalition in South Australia and, in the Commonwealth Parliament, Labor kept the Deakin Government in office for two years. The older parties fused, the Labor Party grew and soon gained a majority of seats. In 1910, Labor came to power in N.S.W. and in the Commonwealth. By the end of 1915, Labor was in power in all Australian parliaments except Victoria. The following year the question of conscription split the party asunder and everywhere, except in Queensland, it lost power. It regained power again in N.S.W. in 1920, and in the Commonwealth not till 1929. The promises of 1891 have brought us to—1935!

Among the measures "gained" by Labor's support of a capitalist government was compulsory arbitration. In 1901, in N.S.W., the Lyne Government upon the demand and with the support of the Labor Party, passed its Arbitration Act, which set up a Court of Industrial Arbitration. Since that time, the arbitration system, under various guises into whose multiplicity we cannot go here, has been fastened on unionism. In the other States similar measures were adopted. In the Commonwealth Parliament, it was the Deakin Government, kept in power by the Labor Party, which passed the Federal Arbitration Act. In all the States, the arbitration Acts and the arbitration courts have been used to give legal sanction to repressive measures and to the use of armed force against strikers and men locked out. Instances will be given as we proceed.

On the credit side of the balance sheet of the 1890 defeat and its results, may be placed the impetus given to the centralising of workers' organisations. We pointed out in last issue that this process has taken three forms: the setting up of a general staff (in the shape of Trades and Labor Councils or Australian Conference), the federation of State unions and the amalgamation of craft into industrial unions.

We have already shown how Trades and Labor Councils were early set up. But 1890 showed that they had little control and were not efficient or authoritative enough to act as general staffs. The years that followed showed them developing into more and more conservative bodies, consolidating and protecting the interests of the trade union bureaucracy, job-conscious and their own emancipation achieved. The All-Australia Conferences saw also the necessity for one general staff for the whole continent. In 1891, the Conference held in Ballarat adopted a scheme for an Australian Federation of Labor. But that is as far as it got.

Similarly, in 1913, a Grand Council for Australia was set up, but it did nothing, and the 1917 strike came to show the necessity for unity more pressing than ever. After the war, there were many One Big Union schemes which were wonderful on paper. The interstate conference system was continued and a Council of Action and a Commonwealth Industrial Disputes Committee successively sought to be a General Staff of Industrial Labor. In 1927, the Australasian Council of Trade Unions was set up. But its history has proved that a Commonwealth-wide union of Trades Hall bureaucracies can be no different in character from any individual one of those Trades Hall bureaucracies. To-day it still exists—doddering in mental and moral decay.

The other two processes mentioned—federalisation and amalgamation of unions—have gone on steadily, especially during and since the war. In 1912, there were only twelve unions interstate in their scope, while in 1919 there were 36. In those two years, too, there were 432 and 394 separate unions respectively. In 1912, there were 22 unions with membership of over 5000 each, and in 1919 there were 26 such unions—in this latter year these 26 embraced 62 per cent. of the organised workers, that is 6 per cent. of the unions numbered in their ranks 62 per cent. of the organised workers. Since 1919, the processes of federalisation and amalgamation have gone on steadily.

In addition, the ideas of industrial unionism have gained ground. During the six or seven years before the war the influence of the I.W.W. was very strong and, again, immediately after the war, as we have already pointed out, there were many schemes for the establishment of One Big Union. For example, the A.W.U. widened its constitution to include all kinds of workers, and the Miners' Federation set up the Workers' Industrial Union of Australia, of which itself was to be one, and remains the only, section. There were many "cart-wheel" schemes, one of which laid down: a national industrial council to which were to be affiliated national industrial departments—six in number: Agriculture; Land and Fisheries; Transportation and Communication; Public and Civil Service; Manufacturing and General Production; Construction; Mining. Each one of these was to be sub-divided. The peculiar thing about the scheme was that its importance lay in the fact that it was to be relied on as a weapon in the fight that the propagandists who put it forward saw was rapidly approaching. There they were in the industrial trenches

awaiting the enemy's offensive and, instead of attempting to use the forces and organisations at their disposal, they draw beautiful schemes of perfect organisations, which will be set up IF only the enemy gives us time and IF the workers see the necessity for them, and which will work when set up IF a bureaucracy does not injure the ball-bearings.

That was the fault that lay in all these schemes: an undialectical, Utopian scheming about how to fight and how to organise instead of fighting and organising together; trying to organise the workers instead of organising with them. In Australia, surely every form of organisation has been used or attempted. The past fifty years have seen practically everything tried at least once. We have now many of the things the lack of which we blamed for our failures in the past, and we have learned that it is not the form of organisation that matters so much as the direction and content—not the form that a bureaucracy would impose from above, but the form achieved by the workers themselves by their own experiences and their own planning for ends they themselves desire. It is the task of Communists and militant workers—those who would be advisers and leaders in the struggle—to work thus with the rank and file. It is thus that the modern methods of militant groups, of minority movements, of shop committees, of rank and file control have brought successes and stronger organisation, while the cart-wheels have been relegated to the museum. By thus working from the bottom will industrial unionism be finally achieved in its one real essential: unity!

One curse that doctrinaires have not been able to place on Australian unionism is that of dual unionism. This, Australia has been spared, although there have been, at various times, beginnings of it. The militants have not been divorced from the masses in the unions. The I.W.W. was, in part, an attempt to create one union to include all the militants, and both the S.L.P. and the A.S.P. sought to base themselves upon new militant unions to be created after a paper pattern. Fortunately, these efforts were not crowned with success.

The unions of Australia have waged some stirring battles during the course of their chequered history. Unselfish in sacrifice for the common good, imbued with the spirit of unity and solidarity and spontaneously class-conscious have the workers of Australia been in many a campaign with the forces of capitalism. The tragedy is that so often were their efforts nullified by bad leadership, bad tactics and, what is worse, by rank treachery and

base betrayal. Especially have the coal-miners and the miners of Broken Hill fought and organised magnificently. The writer well remembers the exciting days of 1909, when confident of victory and with the spirit of self-assurance the miners of the northern fields were brought face to face with the naked class-war waged by the Wade Government and with the long-prepared treachery of Labor-in-politics. Wade had prosecuted the wheelers of the Newcastle district when they went on strike in 1895, and had issued summonses against the **locked-out** coal-lumpers in 1907. He had helped to break the tramway strike of 1908 and, in the same year, had sent the striking rock-choppers to jail. Never was there a more conscientious masters' servant than Wade. It was he who sent mounted and foot police, armed with carbines and revolvers, to Broken Hill in 1908, to force the miners to accept lower wages, which until they did accept, the mine-owners had locked them out. A riot was faked there and men arrested, amongst them Tom Mann, and these were transferred to **Albury** for trial—in the interests of "justice"! In 1909, Wade used against the coal-miners his new Industrial Disputes Act, which empowered the police to make arrests even if the question of striking was merely being talked about. It was under this law that Bowling, Brennan, Gray, Lewis and Burns were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. This act was coupled with the treachery of Holman and Hughes, then on the eve of becoming Ministers of the Crown, in the State and Federal spheres respectively. In May, 1910, the "Sydney Morning Herald" eulogised Hughes, who, it said, "has attained quite a distinction as a strike settler." Fitzpatrick, Wade's political offender, named, in the House, in June 1910, Grahame as one of the Labor members who asked Wade to arrest Peter Bowling, and Fred Flowers, Labor M.L.C., said: "If it were necessary to put 50 men or 100 men in gaol to enforce the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, it should be done." Holman and his party wished the strike ended and Peter Bowling out of the way before the elections which were destined to put him and it upon the Government benches for the first time. To the eight-hour banquet in 1910, Wade was invited by the committee! At the banquet he was unable to attend, but was represented by a Minister! And Peter Bowling was still in gaol! Lord Chelmsford, the Governor, was there, and Lord Mayor Allen Taylor, whose wife had just before become notorious by wearing jewellery valued at £70,000 at a ball to raise £500 in aid of the poor! W. M. Hughes, by then Federal Attorney General, was too sick to be

present—his union, the Wharf-laborers, having protested against the inviting of Leg-irons Wade. The toast of the King, upon the death of whose father a few months previously the Trades Hall had been draped in black, was honored, as were also those of the Governor-General and State Governor, and of the Federal and State Ministries—the Federal Ministry just then introducing its Compulsory Training Bill and the State Ministry lewdly exulting over its victims of Newcastle and Broken Hill rotting in gaol with the approval and blessing of Holman, Hughes and the official Labor Party. The whole—a picture of the goal to which a quarter of a century's sacrifice and toil on the part of the rank and file had brought the industrial and political wings of the labor movement.

But there were more betrayals ahead! How history repeats itself! Industrial action—betrayal—political action ("leave it to the politicians")—disillusionment—industrial action—betrayal—and so on, over and over again. Thus has history tried to teach the workers of Australia lessons they must learn. 1890-91—failure—Labor Party formed with the aid and blessing of the capitalist Press! 1909-10—betrayal—formation of Federal and State Labor Governments—with the aid and blessing of the capitalist Press (the "Sun" particularly!). 1929-30—betrayal—formation of Federal and State Labor Governments—with the aid and blessing of the capitalist press! Shall the round be repeated much longer? Shall not the workers realise that the fine machinery of trades unionism, built up over fifty years, is efficient enough if only it is captured from the bureaucracy, and if it is controlled by the rank and file?—and that upon themselves and not upon politicians sent to Parliament must be based the struggle for their own emancipation? The victories of Wonthaggi and of the relief workers in various parts are proofs that lessons of the past fifty years are being learned.

A hundred years ago workers were beginning to organise to better their conditions. Ever since, in their struggles, they have been brought up against capitalist class dictatorship and have learned that every struggle is a political fight against the State. They have tried to create a political party that would simply take over control of the State machine. Their final lesson is that the State is not a neutral machine but the executive committee of a class. Signs are everywhere that they are beginning to put their trust in a party which not merely envisages the final overthrow

of capitalism, but works and struggles with them in their every fight for their every demand—the Communist Party.

(Concluded)

[Authorities consulted: Heaton's "Modern Economic History"; Sutcliffe's "History of Trades Unionism in Australia"; Spence's "Australia's Awakening"; Tom Mann's "Memoirs"; Child's "How Labor Governs"; Files of "Sydney Morning Herald," "The International Socialist," "The Pan-Pacific Worker."]

MAY DAY

By S. PURDY

May Day is symbolic of the struggles of the toilers of the whole world against capitalist oppression and exploitation—for freedom and democracy—for Soviet power and Socialism.

During the nineteenth century the masses were struggling for better wages, shorter hours, and freedom of association. In 1886 a great strike wave commenced in U.S.A. on May 1. At the foundation meeting of the Second International, held in 1889, it was decided, on the basis of the American struggles, to hold in all countries where labor was organized, mass demonstrations on May 1, 1890, to demand the eight-hour day.

May Day, born in struggle, had become the international fighting day of the revolutionary world proletariat. Later, during the period of rapid capitalist expansion—the period when opportunism dominated the Second International, and its leaders became lieutenants of their bourgeoisie, May Day was robbed of much of its international significance and revolutionary content.

With the world war of 1914, the establishment of Soviet power in Russia in 1917, the formation of Communist Parties throughout the world, the struggle to restore May Day to its original character assumed higher forms. The newly formed Third (Communist) International assumed the role of leader in the struggles of the masses against capital, and proceeded to make May Day once more an international day of struggle.

So, with each succeeding year, the Communist Parties becoming stronger, strengthening the fighting capacities of the workers, introducing into the labor movement an ever-growing Socialist consciousness, we find the militant traditions of May

Day once more coming to the surface. The May Day celebrations and demonstrations assume a more revolutionary character and bring within their scope ever larger numbers of workers.

In the U.S.S.R., the two outstanding and main public holidays are May 1 and November 7. The free toilers of the Soviet Union, on May 1, demonstrate their freedom, their Soviet democracy, their struggle for Socialism, and its higher life and culture. On May 1 our class brothers of the Soviet Union demonstrate their determination and ability to defend every inch of their Socialist fatherland against the vulturous designs of imperialism. In every part of that far-reaching area seemingly endless processions will march, denoting the invincible aims of the international proletariat. On the Red Square in Moscow, worker delegates from all parts of the capitalist and colonial world will gather to watch the stupendous procession pass by and hear the speeches of the Soviet leaders. Later the worker delegates will be entertained by the Moscow workers. The whole of the U.S.S.R. will be decorated with lights, class slogans, and banners. Here, more than anywhere else, will be expressed the mighty, magnificent class solidarity that belongs only to the international proletariat. Only here, and in Soviet China, will the red banner of our class fly from the public buildings—only here and in Soviet China will the Governments sponsor the playing and singing of our anthem, the Internationale. With the Government in their hands, the workers of the U.S.S.R. can fittingly celebrate May Day.

In the capitalist world, the workers will also demonstrate and celebrate on May 1. But what a difference. Here our class will not have the aid of the State apparatus—here our class will demonstrate for improved living standards, against Fascism and war, their international solidarity, not with the aid of the various Governments, but in spite of them, in some countries, more or less legally, but in the most democratic, with a number of restrictions. In Fascist countries, the demonstrations will take place in face of the most ruthless suppression, but they will take place. The fears of gaol, of torture, of death will not prevent our comrades from overseas from extending the hand of class solidarity.

That which Engels wrote on May 1, 1890—"And the spectacle of this day will make the capitalists and landlords of all nations recognise that to-day the proletarians of all lands are indeed united. Were Marx but with me to see it with his own eyes!"—

applies even more in 1935. Were Engels and Lenin also here to see it with their own eyes!

Proletarians of all lands, led by the Third International, with its Sections in all parts of the world, are being welded into one mighty united front against capitalism. The Communists, the world over, united under the creation of Lenin, the mighty Third International, intensify the struggle against the splitting tactics of the reformist Social-Democratic Parties—leading an ever-increasing army each succeeding May Day in the struggle for immediate demands, against Fascism and war, for Soviet power and Socialism. The Third (Communist) International, which is personified in such heroes as Dimitrov, Thaelmann, and Rakosi, and at the head of which is the mighty architect of Socialism, Stalin, fights to maintain the revolutionary content of May Day.

In Australia, May Day, 1935, promises to overshadow anything previous. In all parts of the Commonwealth demonstrations and celebrations will be held. The militancy displayed in the recent Melbourne Labor Day celebrations augurs well for May Day. But it is in N.S.W. that most progress is to be noted. In the past, under the influence of reformism, the trade unions have either not participated, or, where they have, the demonstrations, in the majority of cases, have been of a reformist character and often held on a day other than May 1. This year, great advances have been made. Under pressure from the unions, May 1 has been declared a public holiday in Newcastle. A broad May Day Committee, representative of the masses, is busily organising for a militant demonstration, with a sports programme to follow.

On the Northern coalfields, with the whole-hearted support of the Miners' Federation and other unions participating, everything points to a bigger and better May Day than ever. Of great importance is the declaration of the Miners' Federation in support of May 1. No longer are the Northern miners prepared to have their celebrations side-tracked to the first Monday in May. This year it is unanimously agreed that they will demonstrate with the rest of the world's workers, on May 1.

Similar events are taking place on the Western and Southern fields. As in the North, here also, the miners constitute a big and important part of the population. And here also the Miners' Federation is very active, putting its whole weight into ensuring mighty May Day demonstrations of class solidarity on May 1.

On the Northern, Western, and Southern coalfields the mines will not be manned on May 1. The miners, their wives, and

children will celebrate the international workers' day.

In Sydney, the position is different. In past years, due to reformist influence, the workers have not left the workshops, nor has the strength of the unions been utilised to have May 1 declared a public holiday. The same condition will operate this year.

In the past few years, the reformist trade union leaders have totally ignored May Day, hoping that it and its militant traditions would die. However, under the influence of the Communist Party, the wish of the reformists has not been fulfilled.

Important unions, such as the A.R.U. and A.E.U., have participated in past May Days, and due to militant pressure, the reformist leadership of the Sydney Trades and Labor Council were forced to make a show at supporting a May Day celebration. After heated debates, the Trades and Labor Council decided to support a demonstration on Sunday, May 5, in opposition to an alternative proposal for the night of May 1.

For the Labor Council, this was a progressive step. In view of this, the Communist Party and militant trade unionists generally decided to support the May 5 demonstration and give it a militant content. But May 5 can never be a substitute for May 1; therefore, as the leader in defence of the revolutionary traditions of May Day, our Party decided to hold lunch-hour meetings on May 1 and a rally at night.

Then the N.S.W. elections came on the scene. It was unofficially announced that the Labor Party will hold a pre-election rally on May 5. The Trades and Labor Council is not officially approached on the matter. Police permission is held back for the Trades and Labor Council procession on May 5. The reformist leaders of the Trades and Labor Council (who are also members of the A.L.P.) pretend they know nothing of the latter's plans, refuse to finalise the matter one way or the other, and will not consider the alternative proposal for a celebration on the night of May 1.

The actions of the reformists clearly expose the fact that they are not concerned about May Day, and that they hope, by confusing the issue, to disorganise the May Day preparations and make demonstrations and celebrations impossible. However, the Communist and other militant workers will not allow this to happen.

The A.R.U., Miners' Federation, Seamen, and other unions are determined that May Day shall not go past uncelebrated. Large numbers of workers in other unions are also of the same

mind. This is a force which, together with the unemployed, Anti-War Movement, Communist Party, and other working-class organisations, cannot be so easily brushed aside.

May Day, 1935, will be celebrated in Sydney—with the support of the officials in the Trades and Labor Council if they are prepared to continue, or without them, if necessary.

In Australia, May 1, 1935, will mark a further milestone in the development of the Australian labor movement.

The demonstrations this year will be far greater in both quantity and quality. The Australian workers will express their determination to struggle for improved living standards, against Fascism and war, for Soviet power and Socialism. By so doing, they will also express their international solidarity.

They will go forward from May 1, 1935, with the firm determination to not only win May 1 as a public holiday in Newcastle, but over the whole of Australia—to strengthen their organisation and follow the lead of the miners by closing the factories to come on to the streets on May 1.

From Acts of Treason to the Party —To the Fascist White Guard Shot!

[From the Leading Article in the Journal "Communist International"]

When the shot was fired in Leningrad and the leader of the Leningrad workers, the fiery tribune of the revolution, the friend and companion-in-arms of the great Stalin—Sergei Mironovich Kirov—fell, laid low by a bullet, the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. and the revolutionary workers of the whole world realised one thing clearly, namely, that the shot was fired by a class enemy of the proletariat, a lackey of the Fascist bourgeoisie and an agent of international imperialism.

But when further investigations disclosed the whole truth, then proletarian indignation, contempt and hatred knew no bounds. Sergei Mironovich Kirov was assassinated by despicable renegades, traitors, Judases—by members of the former anti-Soviet Zinoviev group who had joined hands with those in the

camp of the bloody Fascists and White Guards, and had adopted Fascist methods of struggle against the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

* * * *

"The counter-revolutionary Fascist reptiles must be crushed! Death to the murderers and their accomplices; no quarter to the enemies of the people! Greater Party and revolutionary vigilance on all fronts of the struggle of the proletariat and Socialist construction! We must take better care of our proletarian leaders!"—such was the unanimous voice of the workers and collective farmers in the land of the Soviets at hundreds of thousands of meetings of protest against the crime committed by the Fascist-White Guard assassins, meetings at which the just verdict of the Supreme Court, which sentenced the organisers and perpetrators of the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov, was greeted with enthusiasm.

* * * *

You, Social-Democratic workers, cannot understand how it is possible that the anti-Soviet Zinoviev-Trotsky bloc, which was at one time a fraction within Communism, could take the path of terror and anti-Soviet Fascist-White Guardist struggle against the leaders of the Soviet State and the Communist Party.

Is such a development unexpected or unusual? Of course not! The history of the Communist Parties has proven that those elements who launch an anti-Party struggle against the Leninist line of the Party and against its leadership invariably find themselves, in the last analysis—provided they continue to be obstinate—in the camp of the worst enemies of the proletariat.

In the ideological struggle of the revolutionary Marxists against the revisionists and later against the centrists of Social-Democracy, the great Lenin foresaw, more than 30 years ago, the eve of the revolutionary battles of the proletariat; he foresaw that having sharpened all points of dispute and having concentrated all differences of opinion on points which had an immediate bearing in determining the conduct of the masses, the proletarian revolution would place the Menshevik Party on the other side of the class barricades. This is precisely what happened. In order to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets, the Bolsheviks had, by means of an armed uprising, to overthrow the bourgeois-landlord Government of Kerensky, the Government of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

To-day the proletarians of the whole world should remember that in those decisive days of 1917, the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group were not with the insurgent proletariat, but were in favor of agreement with the Mensheviks, who, with the Junkers, defended the accursed system of capitalist slavery. What is more, they were a strike-breaking, treacherous and perfidious group. At the time when the Bolshevik Party, under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, was preparing to storm the fortress of capitalism in Russia, Zinoviev and Kamenev, who had up to that time waged a sharp struggle within the Party against the armed uprising and against the seizure of power by the proletariat, and who were severely defeated within the Party and its Central Committee, treacherously wrote to the non-Party press and divulged to the bourgeoisie the decision of the Central Committee regarding the armed uprising. Lenin called this a strike-breaking act and direct treason to the proletariat. Lenin gave a popular explanation to the workers of the meaning of the shameful conduct of these cowards and deserters from the front of the Socialist revolution.

"Is it difficult to understand," said Lenin, "that it is permissible to be either for or against a strike BEFORE the Centre comes to a decision on the question, but that AFTER a decision has been made in favor of a strike (and an additional decision has been made to conceal it from the enemy), it is strike-breaking then to agitate against the strike? Every worker will understand this.

"Kamenev and Zinoviev have BETRAYED to Rodzianko and Kerensky the decision of the Central Committee of their Party regarding the armed uprising and as to concealing from the enemy the preparations for that uprising.

Lenin demanded the expulsion of the strike-breakers and traitors—Zinoviev and Kamenev—from the Party.

The day after the proletariat had conquered power, Zinoviev and Kamenev repeated their treachery by proposing to cede the power won to the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries by forming a "coalition" Government of all the so-called "Socialist parties." They conducted negotiations with the Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and agreed to remove Lenin from the post of chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and to replace him by the counter-revolutionary Avksentyev or Chernov.

No wonder Lenin did not consider this treacherous line pursued by Kamenev and Zinoviev in the October days to be accidental. It was bound to come to the fore, as it actually did in the years when Neo-Menshevism began to constitute itself in the Soviet Union under the ideological leadership of Trotsky.

As the great Lenin did in the past, so the great Stalin, who continues Lenin's work, foresaw, in the theoretical and tactical disputes which took place in the years of the reconstruction period, the inevitable and open transition of the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition, at that time only a Social-Democratic deviation within the Communist Party, to the class enemy, to the Fascists and White Guards. While in Lenin's days the main and basic question which divided the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks was that of the dictatorship of the proletariat (and prior to that the question of the hegemony of the proletariat as the embryo of and as the stepping stone to the dictatorship of the proletariat), so later, when the dictatorship of the proletariat had already been won, the basic question which divided the Bolsheviks and the neo-Mensheviks into irreconcilable camps was that formulated by Lenin and brilliantly developed by Stalin, namely, the question of the possibility of building Socialism in one country.

"I think," wrote Stalin in 1926, "that lack of faith in the victory of Socialist construction is the basic mistake of the new opposition. It is a basic mistake, in my opinion, because all the other mistakes of the new opposition spring from it. The mistakes of the new opposition on the question of the New Economic Policy, State capitalism, the nature of our Socialist industry, the role of co-operation under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the methods of fighting the kulaks, the role and importance of the middle peasants—all these mistakes are the outcome of this basic mistake of the opposition, of their lack of faith in the possibility of constructing Socialist society with the efforts of our own country."—Stalin, "Leninism," Vol. I, p. 308.

But whoever denies the possibility of constructing Socialism in the U.S.S.R.—and this was the common platform of Zinoviev and Trotsky—must inevitably turn to the path of capitalist restoration, no matter how much he embellishes it with "Left" phrases. This ideological foundation brought about the anti-Soviet demonstration organized by the Trotsky-Zinoviev "opposition" on November 7, 1927, and subsequently the treacherous Fascist shot in Leningrad. The vile chain of treachery, hypo-

critical double-faced recantations, and unprincipled anti-Party blocs with every fragment of former oppositions both Right and "Left," both inside the C.P.S.U. and in the other parties of the Communist International, finally brought this most despicable of all oppositions—the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group—to establish CONNECTIONS with the terrorist interventionist "Leningrad Centre," which was its own product. Thus was closed this ignominious chain of uninterrupted treachery, brought to a close by laying bare the odious Fascist-White Guardist face of the dregs of the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group.

But the leaders of Social-Democracy will tell you, Social-Democratic workers, that the Zinovievites and the Trotskyites are Marxists. And Marxists are opponents of individual terror.

But is it not clear that the counter-revolutionary Zinoviev-Trotsky bloc ceased long ago to be a Marxist group? It uses "Marxist" phrases only to cover up its role of vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and to mask its White Guard-Fascist essence.

From its very inception, the Trotsky-Zinoviev platform contained within itself a poisonous seed capable of developing into White Guard bandit practice. It made declarations from the very beginning about the "Thermidorean degeneration" of the Soviet Government and of the Party; from the very beginning, while still a fraction within the Party, it formulated the famous analogy with a speech made by Clemenceau, the meaning of which was, that it planned to stab the Party in the back should intervention take place.

It is, therefore, not accidental that when the underground anti-Soviet group of Zinoviev-ites became active in the Soviet Union in 1933, the ideological leader of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc abroad formulated a thesis on the struggle against the Soviet power by means of violence. On December 7, 1933, a year before the despicable murder of Comrade Kirov in Leningrad, the "Noe Veltblume" printed an article by Trotsky entitled "Two Perspectives of the Soviet Union." In that article, Trotsky openly formulated the question of armed methods of struggle against the leaders of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party. "In the U.S.S.R.," he said, "it will be possible to compel the bureaucrats to hand power over to the proletarian vanguard [i.e., the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites.—Ed.] only by the use of force. The lackeys will immediately begin to sing in a chorus that the 'Trotskyites,' as well as Kautsky, preach armed

uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat. But let us continue."

The counter-revolutionary Trotsky explained further on wherein he differed with Kautsky, who called for an armed uprising:

"In any event, it will not be a question of an uprising against the dictatorship of the proletariat, but of removing [By force!—Ed.] a malignant sore."

Thus did Trotskyism pave the way ideologically for the terrorists!

To coincide with what point did Trotsky time this "removal of a malignant sore," this disorganisation of the leadership of the Soviet Government, to use the words of the indictment against the "Leningrad Centre," by acts of terror directed against the leaders of the Soviet power so as to bring about a change of the existing policy in the spirit of the so-called Zinoviev-Trotsky platform?

To this question the seasoned wolf of counter-revolution gave a clear and unequivocal reply:

"The correlation of forces [Necessary for such a murderous act.—Ed.] will be established by some great historical trial, such as may even be a war."

This despicable calculation on intervention needs no commentary.

* * * * *

Your Social-Democratic press is attempting to convince you, Social-Democratic workers, that the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov is witness to an alleged accumulation of discontent among the masses of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., bordering almost on a "crisis" in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is allegedly compelled to resort to mass terror in order to save itself. The workers in all countries will enjoy a hearty laugh at this counter-revolutionary nonsense, which the Social-Democratic leaders have clearly hired from the Fascists. The underground anti-Soviet group lived its own life, completely isolated from the masses, a life which had nothing in common with that lived by the workers and peasants in the U.S.S.R. The difficulties which faced the construction of Socialism rallied the Party and the toiling masses of the U.S.S.R. to overcome them as speedily as possible, while these difficulties brought joy to the Zinoviev group and roused them to anti-Soviet struggle. The tremendous successes achieved by Socialism filled the workers with pride in their country and stimulated them to undertake a

still more enthusiastic struggle to build classless society: their effect on the Zinoviev anti-Soviet group was only to embitter them and to urge the most degenerate elements in the group to take to terror, and to establish ever-closer contacts with the Fascist bourgeoisie.

The terrorists began to shoot at the leaders of the proletariat because the victory of Socialism had become undisputed, and because their hopes for mass movements against the Soviet Government had disappeared. Only one road remained—namely, that of White Guard terror and of foreign intervention.

In 1933 already the dregs of the Zinoviev group (which began to get active about that time) bolstered themselves up with the hope that the measures taken by the Soviet Government would collapse and that its internal and external difficulties would become intensified. We should call to mind that new difficulties were disclosed in the villages at the end of 1932 and the beginning of 1933, difficulties connected with the Socialist re-education of collective farmers. This called for new efforts by our Party and for new methods of Party work in the village, so as to make the collective farms Bolshevik farms, and the collective farmers well-to-do.

It was at this period that Comrade Stalin delivered his speeches regarding work in the village, and which provided the Communists with a programme in this sphere for the coming years.

We should call to mind that this was also the time when the Fascists came to power in Germany and when the danger of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union from the east and from the west was sharply intensified.

These external and internal difficulties were the nutritious soil in which the seeds of the anti-Soviet activity of the Zinoviev group flourished. The group awaited an intensification of these difficulties; they awaited intervention.

But the mighty Party frustrated these calculations of the enemies of the proletariat. Under the brilliant leadership of Stalin it defended the cause of peace and strengthened the international position of the Soviet Union. The diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union by the U.S.A., the establishment of friendly relations with France and with the countries of the Little and Balkan Entente, the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations, such were its consistent successes in the realm of international relations.

Thanks to the gigantic advance of industry in 1934 (the production of cast iron and steel increased by 45 per cent., as against last year)—the U.S.S.R. established itself firmly in the second place in the world and in the first place in Europe as an industrial country.

We have achieved victory on the agrarian front by the fact that, despite drought and crop failure in a number of regions, but thanks to Bolshevik organisation and the advantages of the collective farm system, we have gathered 250-300 million poods of grain more than in 1933, and more than at any time in the existence of the Soviet Government! Finally, the abolition of the card (ration) system for bread and for a series of other commodities of broad consumption—a measure which speaks of a vast improvement in the supplies of foodstuffs and industrial products in the hands of the Soviet State—testifies that a most important step has been taken on the road toward ensuring the fulfilment of the instructions of the Second Five-Year Plan regarding the increase, by two to two and a half times, to take place in products consumed by the masses in the Soviet Union.

It was in these conditions of the progress of Socialist industry and of the advance of agriculture that the shot was fired—an act of desperation expressing the mortal agony of the capitalist elements in the land of the Soviets who are dying off and have been smashed up, but have not as yet been wiped out. It was a shot of revenge for the gigantic victories being achieved by Socialism. It was a shot of political revenge against a leader who in Leningrad smashed up the remnants of the accursed Zinoviev anti-Soviet group. Thus, we must bear in mind that to the degree that our forces grow, our enemy will not become more and more tame and harmless, as the Right-wingers have asserted. On the contrary, the more hopeless the situation our enemies are in, the more willingly will they resort to "extreme measures," to the weapon of individual terror as the only weapon of struggle of people doomed in their struggle against the Soviet Government.

Not a single worker, not a single collective farmer belonged to this boxed-up terroristic group, which lacked any contact whatsoever with the masses. These people—the Zinoviev offspring—were parasites on the mighty body of Socialist society. These people—the dregs of the Zinoviev group—established contact with foreign interventionists and attempted to use snake bites to disorganise the Soviet power and its victorious construction of a classless Socialist society. In vain! These

vipers have been crushed. Great is the sorrow of the workers and collective farmers of the land of the Soviets for their slain leader! But the march ahead of millions of builders of Socialism is victorious, and the rifle is firmly held in the hands of the guardians of the peaceful Socialist labour.

The Social-Democratic leaders are attempting to tell you, workers, that the execution of White Guard-Fascist bandits in the U.S.S.R. is "barbarism" allegedly unworthy of the great land of Socialism.

What a fake is such agitation calculated to deceive you, Social-Democratic workers! These impostors themselves understand quite well that the severe measures applied by the Soviet Government against the handful of bandits is the revolutionary self-defence of the proletariat against capitalist-Fascist barbarism. The White Guard-Fascist terrorism to which the leader of the Leningrad Bolsheviks, Sergei Mironovich Kirov, beloved by workers and collective farmers, fell victim, is a clear manifestation of capitalist barbarism. This is the very terrorism which is being applied on a mass scale by the Hitlerites in Germany, who torture their victims in the dungeons of the Gestapo, who shoot hundreds of workers while "attempting to escape," and who simulate the alleged suicides of the strangled and tortured heroes of the proletarian struggle. This is the very terrorism which covered the mining regions of Asturias and the workers' quarters of Oviedo in Spain with blood.

It is only thanks to Soviet power that the Soviet workers and collective farmers and the U.S.S.R. as a whole have rid themselves of this capitalist-Fascist-barbarism. The workers and collective farmers have destroyed the last capitalist class—the kulaks, who, while drawing their last breath have also attempted to use a sawed-off gun. Now these dastardly remnants of the anti-Soviet Zinoviev group and tens of hired White Guard assassins smuggled over the borders of the U.S.S.R., are attempting to introduce these criminal tactics of underhand assassination into the land of the Soviets!

The Soviet proletariat and the Soviet Government will not tolerate the growth in the Soviet Union of this capitalist barbarism, imported from fascist countries, and finding support in the insignificant capitalist elements within the Soviet Union who have been smashed but not yet fully wiped out. The Soviet Government has taken and will continue to take the most severe measures of revolutionary self-defence against such barbarism.

It should be clear to every worker that the proletarian State whose great aims are materialising, which is victoriously building classless Socialist society and which is transforming the great dreams of the whole of toiling humanity into life, will defend all this that is being built up from the encroachment of capitalist barbarism and White Guard-Fascist terrorism, and shoot any person found guilty of transplanting this capitalist barbarism from without, from the countries of Fascism into the country of Soviets!

At the same time, the Social-Democratic leaders—defending White Guard terrorism and aiding and abetting the Fascist assassins—are raising their voices "in protest" allegedly in the name of civilisation, justice, humanity, etc., etc.

What a pitiful and contemptible sight!
Once when looking at such a picture, which has repeated itself more than once in the course of the class struggle of the proletariat, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin exclaimed in anger:—

"... and our 'men with their cases,' the dregs of the bourgeois intellectuals who call themselves 'Social-Democrats' and 'Socialists,' sing the praises of the bourgeoisie and blame the revolution for any manifestation of ferocity or for the inevitable severity of the measures used in the struggle against especially sharp cases of ferocity, although it is as clear as daylight that this ferocity is a product of the imperialist war [And we would now say of the Fascists and White Guards.—Ed.] and that no revolution can release itself of SUCH consequences of the war [And now of Fascism.—Ed.] without a lengthy struggle, without a series of severe measures of repression."

Yes, there is a vast difference between the mass Red terror of 1918-1919 in Soviet Russia and the present shootings of a pack of White Guard terrorists. At that time the revolutionary workers and poor peasants, surrounded on all sides by White Guard armies, were making short shift of the counter-revolutionary elements of the bourgeois and landlord classes who at that time were still strong in our country. That was a form of civil war against classes, which although conquered, were nevertheless still strong by virtue of their connections and the funds still in their possession, etc. Now the Soviet State is still further consolidating its revolutionary legal code. The decisions of the November Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. are one big step forward in this direction. Now the sword of

proletarian justice has fallen upon a miserable handful of White Guard-Fascist terrorists, the majority of whom penetrated into the U.S.S.R. from abroad, from capitalist countries; it has fallen upon a handful of counter-revolutionary degenerates, who had neither connection with the masses nor influence upon them. The whole of the toiling population—through its workers and peasants' Soviet Government—has executed these criminals to teach others to keep their vile murderous claws from the land which is constructing Socialism and not to violate its peaceful toil by perfidious shots from the underground haunts of the White Guard-Fascists.

Soon after the murder by the White Guardists of the Soviet Ambassador in Poland, Comrade Voykow, L. Kamenev, one of the contemptible leaders of the Zinoviev group, attempted to mumble something against the execution of twenty "MOST ILLUSTRIOUS" ones in reply to this crime, under the pretext that these executions would alienate from the U.S.S.R. sections of bourgeois pacifists in the West.

Comrade Stalin at that time replied that:

"What are we to say of this reactionary-liberal philosophy? We can only say this of it, that its authors would like to see the U.S.S.R. toothless, unarmed, prostrating itself before and capitulating to our enemies. Belgium was once 'stained with blood,' and this was depicted at one time on cigarette cards. Why should not the U.S.S.R. be 'stained with blood'—then everybody would feel sorry for it. No, comrades! We don't agree with that! Let all these liberal-pacifist philosophers betake themselves to the devil with their 'sympathy' for the U.S.S.R. With the sympathy of the millions of toilers, everything else could be fixed. And if it is essential that somebody should be stained with blood, we shall do everything possible to ensure that some bourgeois country is beaten till blood flows, stained with blood, and not the U.S.S.R."

In 1935, the same as before, these principles of conduct, formulated by Comrade Stalin, remain immutable laws of the revolutionary defence of Socialism against capitalist barbarism, and bear the unqualified approval of all workers and collective farmers.

Towards the Workers' Daily.

By R. DIXON

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to proceed to the publication of a newspaper twice weekly, as from the first week in August, and further to work toward the issuance of a daily paper, is a decision of historic importance. It is a product of the sharpening class struggle and of the growth of the revolutionary movement and its press in this country. Our whole experience has shown that in its forward march the Party must continually improve and perfect its weapons. Since the 4th Plenum, particularly, much has been developed in the way of new methods of work and leadership in order to correspond to the changing conditions. Many improvements have been recorded, also, in the field of mass propaganda and maintained in Western Australia and Victoria. Proposals are in hand for the issuance of District papers in Queensland before the end of this year. The "Workers' Weekly" has improved, not merely in size, but more important still, in content. Its pages reflect the close connections of the Party with the masses.

These developments, however, important as they may be, are not now sufficient. To-day we must recognise that a weekly paper, no matter how excellent it is, cannot meet the demand which the intensity of the class struggle and the strength of the Party makes upon it. Changes must be made in our methods of propaganda and agitation, and the first essential in this direction is the issuance of a new paper twice weekly, to be followed by a "Daily Worker" at the earliest possible moment.

The first Communist newspaper published in this country appeared on December 24, 1920. It was called "The Australian Communist" and was issued weekly. In the following year the word "Australian" was dropped and the paper continued as "The Communist." Later, a further change was made, and on June 22, 1923, it appeared under the title "The Workers' Weekly."

The appearance of "The Australian Communist" coincided with the struggle to unite the revolutionary forces in the labor movement into one united Communist Party to clarify the basic question of Marxism-Leninism.

The struggle was waged against the anarcho-syndicalist tendencies carried into the working-class, mainly by the I.W.W.,

against the sectarianism of the various Socialist groups, and against reformism. Later, after the publication of the paper under the name of the "Workers' Weekly," it became the main weapon in the struggle against liquidationist tendencies and the opportunism of Garden and Co.

In 1929 the struggle which led to the shattering of the Right wing grouping in the leadership of the Party took place. The defeat of this grouping at the 1929 Congress marked a turning-point in the history of the revolutionary movement of this country. It was the starting point for the most ruthless struggle to uproot and destroy the opportunist theories and practices which had fastened on to the Communist Party. With the development of the struggle against Right opportunism, the vital need to destroy "Left" sectarianism also presented itself.

It was in the struggle on these two fronts—against Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism—particularly in the years from the end of 1929, that the strategy and tactics of the Australian Communist Party were hammered out and clearly formulated.

In all of these struggles the "Workers' Weekly" and its forerunners were of vital importance. They were the main weapon for the waging of the struggle against deviations and for turning the face of the Party to real mass work.

We are now approaching the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the first Australian Communist newspaper. At the time of its publication the Communist Party had been in existence only two months. It was weak and poorly organised. Even as late as 1929 the membership of the Party did not exceed 500. To-day, however, its membership borders on the 3000 mark, and its influence amongst the masses is very extensive.

Despite these fundamental changes, however, the leading Party paper has remained a weekly publication. The reason for this rests precisely in the fact that the growth of the Party and its further organisational consolidation was necessary before a paper could be published more frequently. Moreover, the publication of a daily newspaper, which must be our objective, is an enormous task.

Lenin declared: "The publication of a newspaper is a capitalist enterprise in which the rich invest millions and millions of roubles." When the capitalist newspapers of this country are surveyed, then the truth of this statement becomes patently obvious. Millions of pounds have been invested, enormous profit-making enterprises have been established, and which have the

purpose of the "systematic, unceasing, daily, million sale perversion and deception of the poor, of the exploited and the oppressed masses" (Lenin) in the interests of the ruling classes.

It is in face of this colossus and for the struggle against it that a "Daily Worker" must be issued.

The Labor Party, despite its organisation, apparatus, resources, contact with the trade unions and great mass following, has been successful in launching and maintaining only two daily newspapers in this country, the "Labor Daily" in New South Wales, and the "Daily Standard" in Queensland. These papers cannot be regarded in the true sense as representing the standpoint of the proletariat. Take the "Labor Daily." It is the voice of the members of the "Inner Group," a weapon to assist in their Tammany practices, an organ to propagate their shameless demagoguery and deception. It prostitutes the name it carries and the movement it presumes to represent. The Labor Party Press definitely competes with the Press of the bourgeoisie in the falsification of so-called public opinion, in helping to perpetuate the rule of capital. It is supported by sections of the ruling classes and devotes considerable space to advertisements, which is the main source of revenue for capitalist newspapers.

There is need for a real working class daily newspaper which will participate in and give daily leadership to the struggles of the toiling masses against capital. The establishment of this paper is bound up with the struggle against the Labor Party, for the advancement of the working class to new victories can be accomplished only in face of the opposition and attacks of the Labor Party and its press. To-day there is widespread disgust with the Labor Party. The masses are turning from it and are coming closer to the revolutionary movement. This is revealed, not only in the figures showing the organisational growth of the Communist Party, in the increased votes at elections, but also in the rising strike movement which to an increasing extent proceeds under revolutionary leadership, in the growth of militant unionism and the mass support for a united front against the employers. This whole process, however, develops far too slowly. It must be speeded up, and for this a Communist newspaper, published daily, is necessary. A weekly publication cannot possibly give that leadership and be that agitational weapon which to-day is so necessary. It must compress a week's news into one issue. This fact dictates the character of the paper. Much news that is important is crowded out. The material published must be more theoretical and therefore heavy. The

agitational content is reduced. Very often the "Workers' Weekly" must content itself with a criticism of events rather than giving leadership to them. Thus, for instance, strikes very often commence and finish inside of a week, and all the "Weekly" can do is record the event and point out the successes and shortcomings as a guidance to future actions. A daily paper, however, would be in the thick of the struggle, nailing every lie of the capitalist press, exposing the treachery of the reformists, pointing the path to victory, rallying the workers to take this path, and mobilising public opinion and support for the strikers. Such a newspaper would raise the enthusiasm of the strikers, would inspire them to further efforts, and would be a greater guarantee of victory.

Such a newspaper "would become a part of an enormous pair of smith's bellows that would blow every spark of class struggle and popular indignation into a general conflagration" (Lenin).

Thus the further sharpening of the class struggle, the more rapid decline of the Labor Party and the growth of Communism is to a considerable degree bound up with the establishment of a "Daily Worker."

The most immediate step in this direction is a twice-weekly publication. Such a paper in itself will be a big advance, and will undoubtedly be a great factor hastening the development towards a daily paper.

The more regular production of our revolutionary press is not merely a political question, but also it presents organisational problems of considerable magnitude. We lack the great financial resources of the bourgeoisie, which have enabled it to establish great enterprises equipped with the most modern machinery and to develop smoothly working organisations for the collection and editing of news, for the technical production of the various papers and their distribution.

We are, however, able to call on other resources. Our strength against capital lies in the working class. The success of a twice-weekly publication and also a "Daily Worker" depends first of all on our connections with the masses and the degree to which we are able to rally them to our support. Hence the campaign to establish and maintain a twice-weekly publication, as well as the drive for a "Daily Worker," must be integrated with every phase of mass work.

The production of the paper, its content and distribution, is a collective task for the whole Party. Its maintenance as a more regular publication is going to call for much self-sacrificing effort

from all Party members and for much assistance from our sympathisers and readers.

Finance is the most immediate, the most important, as well as the most difficult problem, for on it, in the main, depends the successful establishment and maintenance of a more frequent publication. The C.C. is calling for a press fund of £2000, to be realised by the end of the year. All possible energy must be thrown in to obtain this fund, for it is the guarantee not only of the launching but, more difficult still, of the maintaining of a twice-weekly paper. Connected with this question of finance goes that of the introduction on a much more systematic scale of business methods in the handling of the paper and the moneys from sales. This has been and still is a continual bugbear, in so far as the "Workers' Weekly" is concerned. Units, sections, and even districts have been very lax in payments to the centre. Delays in the despatch of moneys and under-payment for "Weeklies" received are still frequent. In addition to this, it still happens that units and also sections often divert "Workers' Weekly" money for other purposes. This is nothing less than downright misuse of funds, and such practices must be completely stamped out. With the issuance of a paper twice weekly, all moneys will need to be remitted punctually and fully.

The production of the paper will call for additional technical forces and their better organisation; it will call for a strengthening of our editorial forces and the further extension of the system of worker correspondents. In this latter connection particularly will we depend on the collective efforts of the whole Party for the supply of interesting and up-to-date news. It must be remembered that in the sphere of news collection the bourgeois press has at its disposal an army of reporters, sub-editors, and editors with long experience and who are specialists in the collection, quick production, and presentation of news in an interesting manner. Certainly, we could not and do not intend to develop a similar form of organisation as this. Our paper depends on the voluntary but collective assistance of the whole Party and its sympathisers. What we lack in the way of highly paid reporters, etc., we must make up for by extending the organisation of worker correspondents to connect our paper with all industries, factories, and every phase of the life and activity of the workers. The news collected must deal with strikes, struggles, the conditions of the workers; it must cover all events and happenings in the daily life of the workers which are of interest to them. This will mean that we shall present

a different kind of news from that of the bourgeois press, news in which the workers are directly interested. It will bring the paper closer to the masses and result in a strengthening of their support for it.

Added to these questions is that of the distribution of the paper. A twice-weekly, and more still, a daily paper, presents problems of distribution distinct from those of a weekly. Facilities must be developed for the more rapid handling of the paper and for the better organisation of sales. The distribution of the bourgeois press is based upon a whole system of news-agents, paper stands, paper sellers, and paper runs. The existing avenues they use will be closed to us in the main, but we can learn much from this method. A network of distribution centres or agents will need to be established, around which are organised groups of sellers. Special attention must be given to factory sales. All points where large masses of workers pass going to or coming from work should be covered. Street sales should be developed, and also paper runs. At the same time, forces should always be working to break new territory.

The immediate task confronting the Party is to rapidly increase the sales of the "Workers' Weekly," improve the methods of its distribution, and to make plans for distributing the paper twice weekly as from the beginning of August, 1935.

The whole Party membership must know that whilst there has been a gradual increase in the sales of the "Workers' Weekly," this increase lags far behind the rate of organisational growth of the Party and its influence amongst the masses. This, despite the fact that the size of the paper has been increased and its content improved. The reason for the lag in the sales of the "Weekly" rests with the Party membership. It is due to neglect, which arises from underestimation of the role of the press, on the part of the units, S.C.'s, and D.C.'s. These weaknesses must be overcome. The district committees, section committees, and units must plan to systematically improve the sales of the "Workers' Weekly." This demands the drawing in of additional forces, as well as a better distribution of work in all Party organs.

These are only some of the problems which the more regular issuance of our press will entail. It will be seen that it places greater tasks and will call for greater efforts on the part of the whole Party. The solution rests in the better organisation of existing forces so that the whole Party membership will be

participating in real mass work in the factories, unions, and amongst the unemployed. With firm and well-organised connections at these points, no task will prove too great or too difficult to overcome.

The Victorian Dole Workers' Strike.

By ALF. WATT

On Tuesday, March 19, some 300 sustenance workers on the National Park job ceased work. Two days later (Thursday, March 21) a conference of the organisations affiliated to the Trades Hall Central Unemployed Committee declared all sustenance jobs in the State "black."

Thus began the most widespread unemployed struggle in the history of Victoria.

What was the background of the struggle? For some time it was evident that the work for sustenance scheme (whereby men performed certain classes of work in return for their sustenance) was breaking down beneath its own weight. Increasingly large numbers of men were being struck off work and reduced thereby to the lower rate paid when work was not performed. At the same time systematic attempts were being made to extend the scope of the scheme by having jobs included which were not covered by the original scheme.

The conditions of the unemployed were being steadily worsened by other means. The Permissible Income Regulations were operated with infamous brutality; rising food prices were met, not with increases in pay, but with reductions in the hours worked; the clothing issue had become an insult, so meagre and in many cases dilapidated were the hand-outs; rents were rising, the rent allowance of 8/- per week increasingly difficult to obtain, and a wave of evictions was sweeping the State.

There were many evidences of the gathering storm. Particularly were the unemployed revolting against being asked to do work at sustenance rates which should have been done full time at award rates and conditions. Strikes took place against this at Collingwood (Kane's Bridge job), Footscray (700 men involved), Altona, and other places. The strike at National Park, which

marked the commencement of the all-out stoppage, was against the dismissal of three men who had refused to do work which should have been full time work.

A rapid extension of the strike took place. Before the Conference on the 21st, all of the Fitzroy and Collingwood men were out, and the Carlton men had resolved to strike as from the Monday. Within a few days after the all-out decision, it was estimated that up to 17,000 men were involved. (There are, however, no accurate figures available.) Right up to the end, it continued to spread in the country districts, and on the day when the struggle was suspended (April 2), Mildura downed tools.

Terms offered by the Argyle Government on March 25—an increase in sustenance allowances, but the withdrawal of wood, clothing, rent, etc., allowances were unanimously rejected by the men.

A high level of solidarity was maintained throughout, and "scabbing" was almost non-existent. The united front character of the struggle was strongly marked, Communist and A.L.P. workers fighting together in complete accord everywhere.

Although the A.L.P. had used the grievances of the unemployed for propaganda purposes in the recent election, the strike was not, as some believe, the outcome of Labor Party manoeuvrings. The reformist leadership tried to prevent it. Before the conference on the 21st, Monk and Beardsworth (secretary and president of the Trades Hall Council), Lees (secretary of the Central Unemployed Committee) and Tunnecliffe, had agreed to an armistice for a fortnight without consulting the men. Their efforts failing, they lost no opportunity of trying to break the strike. Their treacherous attitude is summed up in the following extract from their organ, the "Labor Call," April 4. Referring to the unemployed they wrote: "Let wisdom prevail and give the new Country Party Government a chance to make good. An upheaval at this stage would be playing into the hands of Argyle's Fascists. Don't be baited!"

The C.U.C. Conference on March 21 decided on the setting up of a Central Strike Committee as the "authoritative organ throughout the strike," to be composed of two delegates from each local strike committee. The name was later changed to the Central Unemployed Strike Committee. But while this committee was by resolution the "authoritative organ," the C.U.C. Conference was the body to which the unemployed in the suburban residential and country areas look for a lead.

Thus, the C.S.C., on which Lees had but little or no influence, was forced to work through the C.U.C. Conference, where his influence was stronger, and in between conferences to a large extent through Lees and the Executive. Only towards the end of the strike was the position changing in favor of the strike committee. This obviously hampered considerably the militant leadership of the strike.

Of considerable importance are the demands of the men, which are:

(1) That in lieu of sustenance, the Government provide full time work at award rates and conditions for all unemployed. Failing this, 100 per cent. increase on the higher rates of sustenance for all unemployed whether worked for or not.

(2) The immediate raising of the Permissible Income Regulations to the level of the basic wage. Pensions, children's wages, or income of relatives not to be included in P.I.R.

(3) That all country relief work be on a voluntary basis.

(4) That the Public Assistance Committees be abolished.

(5) Free rent for all unemployed, and the immediate stoppage of all pending evictions.

The capitalist Press, the Government, the Parliamentary Labor Party and the T.H.C. Executive were united in raising the demand for full time work to the exclusion of the other demands. The strikers concentrated on the other demands. Full time work for all unemployed would mean their employment in Government or private industry, or on developmental works which would normally be done out of ordinary Government revenue—and the dangers of the demand were recognised by them.

An unemployed strike is different from a strike of employed workers. More relief is needed, and it is needed immediately. Further, the fact that it causes no economic dislocation means that sharp methods have to be used to bring pressure on the Government. Demonstrations, both central and local, mass deputations, widespread propaganda, mass activity—in short, quickly raising the level of the struggle to a higher place—are necessary if success is to be achieved. And it is here that the reformists did their worst.

Take the matter of relief. Early in the piece the local strike committees were notified that collections were not to be made at the factories, that this would be handled by the trade unions. Yet little or no attempt was made to do this, and in only an

infinitesimal number of factories were collections made. A Central Relief Committee had been formed to co-ordinate relief activities, and to canvass the city area. But Lees had the credentials and collection lists, and, despite repeated requests, would not hand them over. Again, on Friday, 29th, when the relief position was serious, Lees, without any authority or justification for his statements, told the Central Strike Committee that the Government would pay the men on the Saturday, seeking thereby to stop the local relief activities.

The efforts of the Party fraction to raise the level of the strike by City demonstrations were also consistently fought by the reformists—so successfully that apart from Labor Day, it was not until the day before the strike was suspended that one was organised. Although the plans for this were changed at the last minute, it undoubtedly had a big effect on the terms offered the next day.

Assisting the reformists were the Trotskyites, who have been able to penetrate the ranks of the unemployed in some suburbs. On the Central Strike Committee this group was solid in its opposition to central demonstrations, although on most questions they were forced, for obvious reasons, to line up with the Party fraction. In Carlton, where they are strongest, they carried on a lying campaign against the Party, prevented the holding of a local demonstration previously decided on, and, having got control of the local strike committee at the beginning of the strike, prevented the broadening of the strike activities.

Monks, Lees, and Co., carried their sabotage still further. Despite a resolution of the C.U.C. Conference on March 25 that two representatives of the C.U.C. and the C.S.C. be present at all future deputations to the Government, they continued to negotiate behind the backs of the strikers, and gave assurances to the Government that the terms arrived at would be accepted by the men. One letter and two telegrams from Shepparton to the C.S.C., urgently asking for information, were impounded by Lees (he denies having received the telegrams), who also, on Wednesday, April 3, rang up Ballarat, told them the men were to be paid, and the strike was off.

It was not until the last few days that the passive character of the struggle began to change in the suburbs. Then 200, led by four women and marshalled by four others, demonstrated in Footscray, about 150 in Prahran, and 100 women in Port Melbourne demonstrated to the Charity Organisation. This turn

should have been made earlier, and should have been developed over the widest possible field.

In this we paid the penalty for the weakness of our unemployed work over the past period, when our fractions were not meeting or working properly.

The other two points of our general line, however, were effectively applied (viz., democratically elected local and central strike committees, and the united front for the purpose of waging the struggle), although we were not able to gain the sole leadership.

Another weakness was a tendency to hide the face of the Party in many places.

Terms offered on April 2 by the new Country Party Government were: (a) All-round increases in sustenance averaging about 33 per cent; (b) rent, wood, etc., to remain as before; (c) a promise of a big public works programme which would give each man six months' full time work per year.

These, while not the full demands made, are an important partial victory for the unemployed, and it would have been a mistake to reject them. The critical relief position, coupled with the Government's offer that the men would be allowed to make up the time lost at the higher rates if they returned to work, and the barrage of Press propaganda to the effect that the strike was over, made it necessary to accept them.

But not, though, as the end of the struggle. Only as a breathing space in which to prepare for a bigger battle.

The Central Strike Committee is remaining in existence, with an elected executive to do organising work. In the localities the old committees of the organisation are being strengthened by the inclusion of the best elements of the strike committees; where no organisation previously existed, one is being built.

The job of the moment is that of building one united organisation under democratic control. That means also breaking the domination exercised over the C.U.C. by the T.H.C. Executive through their tool, Colonel Lees.

In this respect Lees' influence has waned considerably since the beginning of the strike.

A special clause in the resolution of March 25, calling the strike, made it "binding on the C.U.C. Executive," in itself a motion of no confidence. Collingwood later demanded Lees' resignation, and the C.S.C. are recommending to the next C.U.C. Conference that a committee of 15 be elected to draw up a plan

of reorganisation of the C.U.C., with the election of the secretary and T.H.C. delegates by the Conference.

That the T.H.C. Executive clearly realises the danger to them in the new development is to be seen in their letter to the C.U.C. Executive repudiating the C.S.C. and refusing a room in which to meet.

Building the fractions, recruiting the best of the activists who came forward in the strike, the building of a strong, united unemployed organisation under democratic control, with intensive preparations for a renewal of the strike—these are the tasks which face the Party in its unemployed work in No. 4 District.

Lessons of the Brisbane Meatworkers' Strike

By W. R.

In 1931, the Moore Government purchased from Swifts Ltd. their meatworks at Cannon Hill, Brisbane. These works were altered for the purpose of centralising the slaughtering of cattle and sheep for local consumption and also for the purpose of chilling meat for export.

The Meat Board was set up as the controlling body on behalf of the Government. The board approached the Arbitration Court for a separate award to cover the Abattoirs.

Carney, State secretary of the A.M.I.E.U., appeared for the Abattoirs workers.

The court, after hearing the argument put forward by the board, that is, continuity of work (which, according to the Meat Board, would result from the establishment of the Abattoirs), granted a reduction in wages to the extent of 8/11 below the basic rate paid under the export award, which applied to other meatworks, which was equivalent to an all-round reduction of 9½ per cent.

The meatworkers throughout the State had already suffered severe wage-cuts under the Premiers' Plan, but on the advice of their officials accepted the new award.

Several times between 1931 and 1934 the Abattoirs workers, through the local delegate board, took up the question of the

restoration of the 9½ per cent. wage-cut, especially as it was found that the continuity of employment only existed for a small proportion of the men employed.

The officials, however, intimated that they had inside information, and that the Meat Board intended to restore the wage-cut in the near future. (During the strike, the officials contended that Sunners, chairman of the board, had promised to increase wages when the Abattoirs became profit-producing.) In this way, the officials managed to side-step the issue.

However, the meatworkers became more persistent, and eventually, through the delegate board, set up a committee for the purpose of formulating a programme of demands. It was here that the question of the 40-hour week without reduction in pay, the payment of statutory holidays, and the extension of the annual holidays from one week to two weeks were discussed and included in the demands.

At a stop-work meeting, the men demanded that the Meat Board be approached with this programme and asked to state its intentions on the matter. It had by this time been proved that the net profit for three years had amounted to approximately \$66,000. Besides this, the Meat Board had granted concessions to the master butchers, and the charges made to the big pastoral companies had been substantially reduced.

The men from the very beginning were for direct negotiation with the Meat Board, remembering what the court had done to the retail section and to the fellmongers' section.

The board, however, refused to confer on the matter. The Abattoirs workers decided to remain from work until the Meat Board would confer with their representatives.

It is obvious that the main issue around which the struggle developed was the restoration of the 8/11 per week wage-cut.

The officials, from the very beginning, were against the strike; but seeing the determination of the rank and file, they supported it in order to retain their influence over the meatworkers.

This was apparent from the very beginning. Carney was determined to confine the strike to as small a section of the workers as possible, and opposed all attempts to extend the struggle.

A.M.I.E.U. members were left to work in the Abattoirs, handling meat which had been slaughtered by the master butchers, who were scabbing on the strikers. The carters who delivered the meat to the retail shops, and who were also

members of the A.M.I.E.U., were allowed to continue to do so, even after the master butchers were reinforced by scabs recruited in the country. The suggestion that mass picketing be organised under the leadership of picket captains was opposed by the reformist officials, who claimed that the organiser, who had a permit to visit the works, could watch the proceedings in the interests of the strikers. They called for men to picket the shops controlled by Anderson and Cameron and the Red Bank Meat Company, which had been declared black, yet at the same time members of the A.M.I.E.U. were allowed to deliver meat to these shops and to serve it to the customers.

The pickets were withdrawn when instructions were issued by the police headquarters and forces sent to prevent picketing.

The question of financial assistance was opposed by Carney, who declared it would be a sign of weakness to approach other unions for financial assistance, yet at the same meeting the question of paying strike pay to part-time workers affected by the strike was discussed.

The offer of financial assistance, which came from quite a number of unions, was turned down by the strike leaders.

The need for a propaganda committee was obvious from the very beginning, the capitalist Press coming out against the strikers with lying statements.

But the Strike Committee, which was under the influence of Carney, made no attempt to frustrate the lies appearing in the capitalist Press by issuing leaflets stating facts, or sending speakers to explain to the workers in other meatworks, as well as other industries, the reasons for the strike.

Along with this we find the Labor Government coming out against the strikers. Forgan Smith, Labor Premier, on his return from the South, said:—

"If once it were conceded that by threat of a hold-up men could take complete control of a public utility, then public interests would have disappeared, and industrial anarchy would result. I hope that the good sense of the workers involved will prevail and that they will realise the advantage of retaining the rights of the Arbitration Court system which has conferred many benefits upon them in the past. I repeat that the points in dispute should be dealt with by a proper tribunal, and that tribunal is the Arbitration Court of Queensland, to which the unions have the right of access."

They also refused to grant any form of relief to the strikers' families.

The Labor in Politics Convention made the support of Arbitration the main topic of discussion, and in a snide way attacked the strikers.

Though it was often stated that the strikers should have gone to the Court with their grievance, and the Press urged the Government to force them to the Court, nothing was said about the Meat Board being compelled to go to the Court, though both were parties to the award.

Not content with the narrow sectionalised form of struggle that had led to the temporary defeat of the strikers, the officials attempted to send the strikers back to work in a mood of despair, suggesting that no body of workers could win against a Government.

That this is incorrect is obvious by the victory of the Wonthaggi miners, who defeated the Victorian Government after 21 weeks of struggle. But this and other strikes that have taken place were conducted in an entirely different manner.

In the first place, the Wonthaggi miners were led by militant, class-conscious workers.

Secondly, the rank and file elected a broad leadership to assist the officials, and these were welcomed by the leadership.

Special organisations were set up to raise finance, money being collected in all parts of the Commonwealth. A propaganda committee was set up to explain to the workers in other industries and to the public generally what were the causes of the strike, and thus frustrated the lies that appeared in the capitalist Press.

The sugar workers in North Queensland, the Goodyear strikers, besides numerous strikes that have taken place in the coal industry, adopted these methods and were victorious.

From the commencement of the strike, the militant meatworkers' group emphasised the necessity of broadening the struggle, first of all in their own industry.

They urged the setting up of a picket committee for the purpose of organising mass picketing of the Abattoirs.

They pointed out the necessity to call a mass meeting of all members of the A.M.I.E.U. for the purpose of explaining to them the cause of the strike, the necessity for financial assistance, and to make preparations for active participation of these workers in the struggle.

They explained the folly of the policy of going home and "sitting down," and how it would lead to defeat.

Leaflets were issued throughout the meat and other industries popularising the militant trade union policy regarding strike struggle.

They explained to the workers that if they were to be victorious, the methods adopted by the Wonthaggi miners, the sugar workers and the Goodyear rubber workers, must be adopted in this struggle.

At the same time the group was weak numerically and inexperienced in trade union procedure, with the result that they made very little impression at the mass meetings, and Carney with his glib tongue was allowed to carry on with very little opposition. Previous to the strike the group in its bulletin had not popularised the militant trade union policy, explaining how the struggle should be conducted, the functions of the various committees, and so on.

Apart from mentioning the victory of the Wonthaggi miners and other strikers, they made no attempt to compare the methods adopted by militant trade union leadership with those of the reformist officials.

It was not until the strike had commenced that the militant trade union policy was explained in detail, with the result that the strikers were sceptical about our proposals and preferred to leave Carney & Co. leaders of the strike, despite Carney's past record.

Personal contact with the strikers was not made until the second week of the strike, but when contact was made the results were good, ever-increasing numbers coming along to meet and discuss the tactics that must be adopted to bring victory.

The group in the past had shown some indifference to the lower trade union positions, under-estimating the importance of these. Yet in this struggle the local Delegate Board automatically became part of the Strike Committee. It is obvious that if the group had in the past treated these positions seriously, it would have been possible to have group members elected to the Delegate Board and during the strike carry the militant policy into the Strike Committee.

The group must learn by the mistakes of the past. They must keep in touch with those with whom contact was made during the strike, visiting their homes, explaining to them the need for militant organisation, impressing them with the import-

ance of attending the trade union meetings regularly. They should be drawn in to assist with the Bulletin, which must take up the daily issues of the meatworkers, explaining how the rank and file can eliminate these and what is necessary before this can be done.

The group must win the influence and demonstrate to the members of the union their abilities of leadership.

It will be necessary to present a constructive programme and policy which will be understood by the workers and must struggle for the realisation of this policy, demonstrating its correctness and contrasting it with that of the reformist officials.

In the union there must be built up a group with a thorough understanding of trade union procedure.

The group should now prepare for the trade union elections which will be held in June, remembering the importance of the lower trade union positions, which must not be neglected.

The meatworkers must be prepared for future struggles for the restoration of wages and conditions taken from them in the past.

Australia Faces Economic Decline.

By D. J. ROBERTSON

"The Sydney Morning Herald," commenting on the impending elections in Queensland and N.S.W., strikes a musical note when it declares as follows:—"Preliminary music of the coming State elections is in the air. Parts of the band may be heard off-stage rehearsing popular tunes and the more delicate instruments are tuning up." "Old Granny" could have added that the electors of the Commonwealth could have listened to a perpetual, never ceasing chorus by the occupants of the N.S.W. and Federal treasury benches, under the batons of B. S. B. Stevens and Joe Lyons. This unending refrain has been dominated by "prosperity," "national reconstruction," "rural rehabilitation" and "better times," yet a jarring discordant note is intruding, the volume of the chorus cannot drown the raucous voices or obliterate the many signs of decay, the discord grows stronger day by day.

The jarring discordant notes in the "prosperity chorus" are the many signs of economic chaos in the financial fabric of the Commonwealth. The trade returns, the Commonwealth Statistician's figures, the utterances of the politicians and the economists, the impoverishment of the Australian workers, relegate the claims of the "prosperity choir" into the limbo of make-believe, and blow sky-high the "prosperity" bubble of Stevens and Lyons.

The Federal Assistant Minister, Mr. Thorby, a member of the Australian delegation to England, speaking at the Carlton Hotel, Feb. 4, 1935, stated: "Our country is confronted with a problem created by a world in which nearly all countries are sellers and few are buyers, and by the fact that 96 per cent. of our exports are primary products. Those which are produced under Australian conditions have to be marketed against the keenest competition in the world." Let us then examine the problem confronting Australia from the premise that "96 per cent. of our exports are primary products."

Australia's overseas trade (i.e., exports) has declined in the six months ending December 31 by £10,716,000, while the export of bullion and specie has increased by £323,000. The drop in exports from £53,284,000 in the first six months of 1934, to £42,891,000 in the second period, is a knotty problem for the Australian Governments, a problem interwoven with and rendered more acute by the large increase in imports during the period under review. The value of imports has soared, the sum total for the six months ending December, 31, was £38,111,000 as compared with £29,557,000 in Jan.-June, 1934. The excess exports for Jan.-June was £23,727,000, a very favourable trade balance, but in six months, the trade balance is drastically reduced, by the decline in exports and the increase of imports, to £4,780,000.

The above figures indicate that the favourable balance of trade manifested in the opening months of 1934, is being undermined. A continuation of this movement will result in an adverse trade balance, which can have serious results for Australian economy. Hence the delegation to England, sponsored by the Lyons Government, which has, as its object, the opening of the British markets to Australian producers on a more extensive scale than Britain proposes at the present time.

Let us look a little more closely at this problem and examine the values of the primary products, when export values have declined by £10,716,000. In this period, wool values declined by

£15,605,039, a decrease of approximately 50 per cent., the returns from Australia's Golden Fleece, dropping to £16,853,213 from £32,458,252. These figures do not really disclose the position of the producer (i.e., the man on the land), whose income is based upon the prices per bale and lb. of wool. The National Council of Wool Selling Brokers of Australia fulfil this task in their returns, which indicate that the average price of wool in July, 1934, was £19/3/11 per bale, and in December of the same year the average price was £12/1/3. Expressed in values per lb., wool prices were 18.9 pence in July and 9.7 pence in December, 1934. This tremendous decline in prices coupled with decreased exports must hasten the ruin of many small and middle farmers.

The wool stocks in store in Australia amount to 1,071,427 bales, and Prof. O. E. G. Shann, the Australian economist, states: "There is more wool left for sale, but the prices this season are so much lower that the depletion of the full year's export total on this one account (wool) will CERTAINLY pass the £21,000,000 mark." This bourgeois economist points to a further drop in wool values, and a contraction of Australian revenues, but hastens to assure the startled pastoralists and wool growers, by delving into the dim and distant past, that the Commonwealth has experienced lean years in wool returns, but has been compensated by increased returns from wheat, hides, butter etc., and draws the conclusion that 1934 is no exception to this rule—Shann's Soothing Syrup.

Mr. A. E. Heath, official representative of the N.S.W. Government in London, visited the Leipzig Fair (Germany), inspected the production of wollstra, a substitute for wool, noted the commodities that could be manufactured with it, commented on the low production costs of this substitute and issued a grave warning to the Government of the Commonwealth as follows:—

"Nobody pretends that wollstra is as good as wool, but I was strongly impressed by the extent to which a nation under stress will use it willingly. It is already used for men's suits, women's dresses and swimming costumes, and is sold at a price midway between cotton and wool, while the production costs are likely to decrease. The demand is so heavy that merchants say that if supplies were available, they could be sold six months ahead.

"The German process is attracting interest in France and Italy, and unless Australia provides means for Germany to buy wool, the increasing adoption of wool substitutes may gravely affect wool sales in the next five to ten years. I do not want to

create an alarm; there is no great immediate menace; but the seeds of a real menace to the Australian wool trade are there. Those who may be inclined to disparage wollstra ought to remember the quality of the early rayons and artificial silks." ("S.M.H.," March 14, 1935.)

The demand for wollstra is so heavy that "if supplies were available, they could be sold six months ahead," whilst the market for wool is listless, prices are low and vast stocks remain unsold. Other countries are interested in the German process, and as they are "nations under stress," i.e., beset with economic and political difficulties, Mr. Heath fears that these countries will turn more and more to the use of the wool substitute, wollstra, and further deprive the Australian wool-growers of overseas markets for their staple export commodity—wool.

Mr. Heath emphasises that the "seeds of a real menace to the Australian wool trade are there," and intends to furnish the N.S.W. Government with a full report of wollstra, its uses, its production, and to stress the need for Australia to arrive at reciprocal trade agreements with other countries to preserve their markets and to oust this dangerous rival.

The trade returns for butter, another primary product, are also very illuminating and reveal the serious position of another section of the primary producers of the Commonwealth. Within recent years, the production and export of butter has come to occupy a more important niche in the economic life of the country. Hence the need to closely scrutinise the figures and the monetary returns for butter.

In Jan.-June, 1934, 109,654,000 lb. of butter was shipped overseas. In the six months ending December 31, 1934, butter exports increased to 112,135,000 lb., but the monetary returns show a decline of £280,291, which emphasises sharply the critical state of the butter export trade—a greater volume of commodities for less money. The "Land and Producer" pleads for the safeguarding of the butter industry by export regulation as follows:—"The broad view taken by prominent leaders in the industry is that this bad advertisement for Australia (inferior grades of butter) should be kept at home and that efforts be concentrated on raising the choicest for export." In brief, export the choicest grades of butter overseas, sell the inferior grades on the home market at top prices, and in this manner compensate the producers for the reduced returns from the world markets.

The decrease in wool and butter returns are slightly counter-balanced by additional wheat exports, another very important export commodity. The amount of wheat shipped overseas rose by approximately 4,000,000 bushels in 1934, while the value increased by \$642,721. Again, these export figures and values do not reflect the true position of the producer, who has consistently sought Government aid on the plea that the present prices for wheat are utterly inadequate to cover production costs. Let us look, not at the export figures and returns, but at the price received per bushel. In the past six months the price received per bushel was $3/7\frac{1}{2}$, an increase of one-sixth of a penny over the ruling prices in Jan.-June, 1934. In N.S.W., the stocks of wheat in the terminal elevator and country silos aggregated 22,747,000 bushels on February 7, 1935, as compared with 20,477,000 bushels on the same date last year.

The quantity of milk exported declined 25 per cent. Raisins, citrus fruits, apples, and currants bring reduced prices on the world's markets, and the reduction to the Australian growers amounts to £1,667,432. These trade statistics reveal a serious position for Australia, whose economy is maintained by export trade, and "96 per cent. of our exports are primary products," i.e., wheat, wool, butter, currants, etc.

Despite increased values for many commodities, the trade returns are the omens of a deepening of the crisis in Australia. Preposterous and ridiculous theories are advanced to explain the decline. D. A. S. Campbell states "that the diffusion of purchasing power throughout the economic structure, that is the result of expenditure on public works [Read "work for the dole."—D. J. R.] creates demands, some of which can only be satisfied with imported articles" ("S.M.H.," February 10, 1935).

These high-sounding phrases are easily refuted by a perusal of the trade statistics. If Campbell's assertions are correct that "the expenditure on public works creates demands, some of which can only be satisfied with imported articles," the trade statistics would reveal a greater importation of the necessities of life. To the contrary, the trade statistics disclose an increase in the values of machines and machinery from £5,661,269 to £9,532,666, and the value of motor bodies, chasses, cycles, and motor parts has also increased from £1,235,750 to £2,626,184. The increases in these two items amount to £5,261,831, and the sum total of the increased value of imports is £8,553,000.

The workers employed on public works are not likely to purchase items such as outlined above, and Campbell's non-

sensical claims reveal the bankruptcy of bourgeois society and its apologists.

The Federal Government reacted to the tremendous drop in exports and the increased value of imports by stating "that the scope for concessions was limited," by appointing additional members on the delegation to visit England, and by intensifying the attack on the workers and small farmers in Australia. S. M. Bruce's words on January 31, 1935, "We have entered upon what are destined to be the most critical years in Australian history," are implemented by the recent trade statistics, and the omens of decay have been vividly illustrated and noted by Governments and the bourgeoisie.

The above factors indicate that the Australian bourgeoisie are entering "a period of the maturing of nation-wide crises in individual capitalist countries" (Manuilsky) and that in the capitalist world there is developing "a period of the maturing of the revolutionary crisis of the world capitalist system" (Manuilsky).

The Fourth Plenum resolution stated: "The slight improvement of production in some industries, the small reduction in unemployment, the increase in the price of wool—factors which have called forth much demagoguery and praise from the capitalist class and its politicians, do not mean that the crisis is passing. On the contrary, it can be stated that the upward tendency which commenced in 1933 and is continuing into 1934 cannot be maintained so that capitalism will find an economic way out of the crisis. The improvement taking place can only pave the way for a greater crash."

This brilliant analysis of Australian financial conditions, embodied in the Fourth Plenum resolution, is confirmed daily by the public statements of the economists and politicians and by the trade returns. The decisions of the Fourth Plenum are a landmark in the history of the Australian Party, a seven-league shoe towards the Bolshevisation of our Party, and the tasks enumerated in the resolution are burning and vital directives to the members in their day-to-day work.

The Incendiaries

By DIMITROV

Moscow, February 27, 1935.

A year ago to-day the world proletariat wrested Georgi Dimitrov from the clutches of German Fascism. February 27, 1934, was the day on which Dimitrov, Tanev and Popov arrived in the Soviet Union. On the occasion of the anniversary of this event Georgi Dimitrov has written the following article entitled "The Incendiaries":—

That which I repeatedly declared as I stood before the Court must be proclaimed to-day, on the anniversary of the Reichstag fire, to all the world: the Reichstag fire was an act committed by the German Fascists, who made use of the unfortunate Van der Lubbe as their tool. There is no doubt that the real instigators and organisers occupy leading positions in Germany.

That is what I said a year ago in the evening of the day when we at last found ourselves on the free soil of our socialist fatherland, when I was first interviewed by representatives of the Soviet and foreign press. To-day, a year after our release and two years after the criminal Reichstag fire, this assertion is confirmed by new documents, not the least among them being the letter written by Karl Ernst.

In the meantime, the dastardly firing of the Reichstag has been followed by the Bartholomew massacre of June 30. On this occasion those who carried out the provocation were murdered by those on whose orders they had acted. National socialism showed its true countenance more plainly than ever. Since this time the process of disintegration in the ranks of the national socialists has continued. Thousands of former misguided supporters of national socialism are to-day fighting on the side of the revolutionary German workers and peasants in the growing proletarian united front against the Fascist dictatorship—in the united front, the initiator and driving force of which is the heroic Communist Party of Germany, with its imprisoned leader Ernst Thaelmann at the head.

Fascism suffered a severe defeat at Leipzig. By the united

class struggle of the German proletariat and peasantry it will suffer its final defeat, which will ultimately mean the emancipation of the German people from the barbarous rules of the Thyssens and Krupps, and the setting up of the Soviet State.

In the evening of the day we arrived in Moscow, a year ago to-day, my first words were words of thanks to the international proletariat, to the workers and collective farmers of the Soviet Union and all honest intellectuals and members of the middle class throughout all the world, who had defended us and secured our release. The great victory over Fascism which our acquittal and our release constituted, was the practical result of the realisation of the fighting united front of the masses of toilers, numbering millions, in all the world against Fascism. It was the work of living, unvanquishable proletarian solidarity. At the same time it was the signal for the further development of the united front of struggle of the proletariat, of the Communist, Socialist, Christian, Anarchist, and non-party workers in all countries against Fascism and war.

By a militant united front the proletariat will also secure the release of its imprisoned champions, **Thaelmann, Rakosi**, and thousands of others.

And through unrelenting and irreconcilable class struggle, in contrast to the social-democratic class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and constantly strengthening the united front, the working class, allied with other sections of toilers in town and country, with the Communist International at the head and under the firm and wise guidance of the leader of the world proletariat, **Stalin**, we shall also achieve the final victory over capitalism, over its crises and war catastrophes.

BOOK REVIEW

How to Kill a Revolution.

"How to Make a Revolution." By Raymond Postgate. Hogarth Press, 1934.

A book which sets out "to discover what are and what are not practical instruments of revolution to-day" will appeal to thousands who ardently desire a drastic social change but do not see how it is to be brought about. The author offers impressive credentials: "for fifteen years his main study has been the patient investigation of revolutionary movements since 1793." He is widely known in particular for his "Bolshevik Theory," published 15 years ago—a book which, for all its arrogance and condescension, did much in its time and in its way to spread an understanding of the principles of the Russian revolution. All the more necessary is it, therefore, to point out bluntly that this new book represents 15 years' decay and offers nothing but Dead Sea fruit.

For 200 pages Postgate reviews the theory and practice of revolution. Marxism, Syndicalism, Anarchism and Blanquism are airily rejected to his satisfaction, and heavy historical artillery is levelled at the General Strike, Armed Insurrection and Communist Tactics. "The only remaining method is consequently constitutional parliamentary"; the concluding pages are devoted to a Socialist Sunday School scheme for organising the wasted horse-power of devoted lesser functionaries of the Labor Party to put ginger into the next British Labor Government.

To get at this result, the author has to steer an uncertain course. One would have imagined that in such a treatise special attention would be given to the Russian revolution, which, after all, was actually carried through. But Postgate spares himself the necessity of considering 1917 by (in the section devoted to "theory") disposing of Leninism in one page and declaring it synonymous with blatant opportunism, and (under "practice") failing to mention such a minor incident at all.

Having excluded reference to 1917, he plays at length with titbits gleaned from his historical researches; lest even these disturb his thesis, he finally petulantly stamps on his playthings and calls them "only historical curiosities" (page 145).

In the process the writer finds it necessary to spit on the Marxist theory which illumined his path in 1920. He blandly dismisses the Dialectic, which he conceives, not as a method of thinking, but as an arbitrary pattern into which thinking is forced. "With slightly more hesitation we may reject also the whole system of Marxian economics—pure economics, that is to say" (page 21). One of Blanqui's chief claims to honor is his "dislike for theoretical argument" (page 114). Agnosticism thus covers a narrow practicality which, as often, is a form of obscurantism.

Incidentally, Postgate loses no opportunity of spitting on the working class and its revolutionary leaders. Babeuf is "eccentric and slightly demented" (page 34). The economic crisis to him means only "a vast reserve of helpless men who will, sooner or later, be willing to become blacklegs" (page 186).

So far does he get from Marxian realities that he argues that the capitalist Press will cease to be capitalist if a government controls the main sources of advertising revenue (shades of Theodore Fink!), and that Fascism is nothing more nor less than a petty-bourgeois class movement (shades of Thyssen!).

Postgate's main concern, however, is to annihilate the Communist position. While millions of workers believe that revolution CAN be "made" by Communist methods, the way is not open to acceptance of his refined suburban parliamentarism.

In the first place, the main argument in a rambling and confused chapter significantly headed "Marxism, Fascism, Leninism," is that the Communist International deliberately encouraged the victory of Fascism in Germany because ". . . it will probably lead to a fresh war, and out of the ruins and sufferings of that war a real revolutionary upheaval will result" (page 57). Thus, without the slightest attempt to produce evidence, he "convicts" Communists of deliberately inviting fearful devastation and slaughter.

Secondly, not content with wanton perversion of the Communist position, he introduces the necessary Edgar Wallace touch with "disclosures" of Communists' "secret" methods. In the style of a professional pimp he reproduces a routine report of a meeting of the Communist fraction of the London Labor Research Department in 1923, with a view to arousing ignorant fear of something presumably conspiratorial and sinister in the systematic use of initials to identify individuals.

Having branded the Communist movement as some kind of sea-serpent, Postgate finally complains that a Communist Party threatens the unity of the working-class by running parliamentary and municipal candidates; "it should keep its hands strictly off the proper business of political parties" (page 197)—advice distinctly reminiscent of that to the Labor Party from Liberal spokesmen forty years ago.

At the very time this book was being printed, history was giving Postgate's thesis an unmistakable answer. In Spain the Labor movement was headed by just such Leftist gentry as Postgate's father-in-law and patron saint, George Lansbury, the leader of the British Labor Party; as a result, the workers' revolution was defeated, as these "leaders" were interested only in keeping it within "safe" bounds. Only in the province of the Asturias, where the central Socialist leadership was unable to restrain the masses' determination or to interfere with the creation of powerful workers' councils, was the revolution carried through. Had Communist leadership extended, not only through Asturias but through all Spain, the Spanish revolution would have been "made." Acceptance of this lesson from Spain involves flat rejection of Postgate's calculated pessimism.

E. M. H.