

# COMMUNIST REVIEW

Registered at G.P.O., Sydney, for transmission by Post as a Periodical.

No. 69.

MAY, 1947.

Price 6d.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

### EMPIRE CONFERENCE ISSUE

SPEECH TO EMPIRE CONFERENCE	J. C. Henry	515
CONFERENCE DECLARATION ON PALESTINE		517
GREETINGS TO EMPIRE CONFERENCE		519
<hr/>		
THE NEW ARBITRATION BILL	J. R. Hughes	529
ALL EYES TURN TO PRAGUE	Audrey Blake	530
THE N.S.W. LABOR COUNCIL	J. McPhillips	531
REPLY TO PROFESSOR RAZIN	J. Stalin	534
ATTACK ON SECULAR EDUCATION	"Pedagogue"	535
SIR JAMES JEANS	J. W.	538
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	540
BOOK REVIEW	Julie Latter	542
CAN YOU ALTER CAT NATURE?	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	543

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey

## HENRY'S SPEECH TO LONDON CONFERENCE

Speech to Conference of Communist Parties in countries of the British Empire, held in London, February 26-March 3, 1947, by J. C. Henry, Australian delegate, in general discussion.

COMRADES,

TO this conference I bring greetings and good wishes from the Australian Communist Party.

I wish to express agreement with the aims of the conference.

Because of his great work on behalf of the people over the years Comrade Dutt has won the affection of the Australian Communists and I believe of all progressive people in Empire countries. Today we are again indebted to him for his report to this conference.

I also take this opportunity to thank Comrade Pollitt and the British Communists for having enabled us to come together to discuss common problems.

The problems confronting the peoples of countries of the British Empire are many and varied. The solution of these problems must be sought in the light of the world situation resulting from the victorious people's war against Fascism.

The victory of democracy has opened up a new vista for advancement. All lovers of peace, democracy and prosperity for the people hail with joy the forward march of the democratic peoples in one European country after another. We are aware of the enhanced position of the Soviet Union, the Socialist land, and its shining example in world affairs.

We delegates to this Conference have witnessed big, progressive changes and movements in our countries. But the people have not yet been able to break through the barriers holding back progress as the peoples of a number of other countries have done.

The popular forces in our countries are on the march. These movements are part of the world movement for democratic progress. These popular democratic movements in our countries will continue their advance.

The United Nations and the World Federation of Trade Unions are very important organisations for the peoples of all lands.

There are difficulties, there will be many difficulties. But surely today no-one can doubt that our peoples will surmount these difficulties and gain lasting peace, democratic freedom and a better life.

While the policy of British Imperialism and of reactionary circles in the Dominions and suppressed countries are our immediate concern, the main strength of the old Imperialist order is centred in the great trusts of U.S.A. U.S.A. Imperialism is shaping its course for the domination of the whole world. It is the hope of all the reactionary forces, plotters and groupings which, because of this or that special interest, fear the advance of

democracy most of all. U.S.A. Imperialism is gathering all these reactionaries into its schemes and using them against the national interests of their own people.

The present foreign policy of the Government of Britain, which is dominant in the affairs of the Empire, supported by the Governments of the Dominions, is linking Britain and the Empire countries as a whole with the U.S.A. policy. This linking has been seen in the activities of their representatives on the United Nations Organisation and its various committees; in the development of military strategic bases, the co-ordination of arms, and in the ideological and active war being conducted against Socialist and National Independence, ideas and movements. This policy does not express the economic and political interests of the people of Britain and the Dominions, and violates the aspirations of the subject nations within the Empire.

In his report Comrade Dutt showed the contradictions between the present policy of the Government of Great Britain and the aspirations of the subject peoples and also the contradictions within the partnership of British and U.S.A. Imperialism.

I now propose to explain how I see some of these problems through Australian eyes.

Australia is one of the free Dominions within the British Empire. Because Australia has a relatively highly developed manufacturing industry there are many conflicting interests and struggles between Australian and British capitalist interests and between Australian and U.S.A. capitalist interests. Nevertheless the foreign policy pursued by Australia—which has a Labor Government the same as Britain—has up to date lined the country up on all the more vital questions with the foreign policy of British and American Imperialism.

Australia occupies an important strategic position in the Pacific. Its heavy industry, rich mineral and food resources place its big capitalists in a position where they hope to use the country to make bargains, and to play between British and American capital with the aim of making great riches for themselves and of protecting the system that makes these profits possible from the advance of the democratic movement.

Because of the undemocratic desire to advance at the expense of other people—to bargain, Australia's foreign policy in many major respects does not reflect the interests and needs of the Australian people.

In essence the major aspects of this policy link Australia with the Tory foreign policy still followed by Mr. Bevin, Britain's Labor Foreign Minister. This policy seeks to obstruct and defeat democratic developments in Europe and to divide and crush

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD BE SENT  
TO THE EDITOR,  
COMMUNIST REVIEW,  
695 GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY,  
AND SHOULD BE IN BY THE FIRST  
OF THE MONTH.

the National Independence movements of the colonial peoples. It is a policy of alliance with U.S.A. Imperialism for these purposes and for the creation of a military bloc in preparation to give effect to this policy by armed force.

Unfortunately the Australian Foreign Minister has often been used as a toady of the Imperialists of Britain and America. This has had the effect of straining relations between the Australian people and the peace-loving and democratic peoples of other lands, and preventing that co-operation so necessary for the common good.

The military aspects of this policy are indeed serious. In Australia a rocket-testing range is being developed at great expense. There is much talk of linking industries to war needs. Under the slogan of Empire Defence, military bases are being developed.

Taxation to provide these measures is a burden on the standard of life of the people at a time when more houses, better social services, higher wages and better prices for farm products are but a few of the things urgently needed.

Why are these measures being taken? The United Nations has not asked Australia to take these measures!

Those who champion this policy speak of defence. But the question is defence against whom.

Do her near neighbours threaten Australia's independence? Does the new Republic of Indonesia threaten Australia? Of course not.

Do Malaya, Burma or India threaten Australia? No!

Does China threaten Australia? No!

Does Japan threaten Australia? It certainly should not, because Australia together with the Allied nations occupies Japan, a defeated enemy country, and a democratic peace must ensure the removal of any such danger.

Does the Soviet Union, which is also a country bordering the Pacific, constitute a threat to the independence of Australia? The foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which has always been consistent, should remove any such doubts. Neither are there any economic reasons or military developments which could be interpreted to constitute any such danger.

If none of these peoples threaten Australia, then who does?

Britain does not do so. It would be ridiculous to suggest such a danger from Britain.

Then there remains only the U.S.A. The policy pursued by those in control of the political destinies of that country can be interpreted as constituting a threat to Australia in common with many other lands.

Are these so-called defence measures being taken to defend our country against any such possible threat? Certainly not. These measures taken under the slogan of 'Empire Defence' are being developed as part of the general military strategic plan formulated between British and

American Imperialists under the leadership of Wall Street, New York.

Then against whom are these military measures in Australia being prepared?

First, as an effort to make Australia a strategic base of Imperialism in its struggle against the peaceful democratic advance of the peoples of Europe and the Soviet Union.

Secondly, for the purpose of making Australia an advanced base of Imperialism against the National Independence Movements and struggles of the colonial peoples for democratic self-determination.

To my way of thinking the present policy of the Australian Government is actually placing the independence of the country and future of its people in jeopardy.

The Australian people need democratic neighbours. They need good relations between themselves and all other peoples, but of great importance is the question of good relations between our people and the peoples of Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Ceylon, India and China who, together with New Zealand and the Philippines, constitute our nearest neighbours.

The Australian people need this for peace and to assist national prosperity.

But Imperialist domination of the colonial peoples prevents the development of these countries and of firm, friendly economic and political relations between our people and the peoples of these countries.

Therefore, the interests of the Australian people require that the old system of relationships between the colonial countries and Britain and the self-governing Dominions should end and that a new system of relationship that corresponds with the reality of the situation should be established.

Such a system of relationship should be based on the principle of the democratic self-determination of nations. If this principle is applied it would allow the colonial peoples to develop the productive capacity of their countries and enrich their life, facilitate trade and good relations on the basis of equality to the mutual benefit of all peoples and in fact the whole world.

Foreign policy is the cardinal question in the struggle for peace, economic co-operation and security. The problem is to unite all democratic elements for a foreign policy that will express the real interests of the nation.

As I see it this is the cardinal question not only in Australia but in the other Dominions and in Britain in relation to a democratic solution to both foreign policy and relations between the self-governing countries and the present colonial nations and peoples within the Empire.

In assisting to develop such unity and in striving to influence a better attitude on questions of foreign policy, and also to demonstrate to the world that there is a strong section within the country which supports a different policy to the

official policy of the Government, the working class in Australia has found it necessary at times to take independent action, even where this conflicted with official policy.

Some independent actions taken by the Australian workers in this regard were:

The ban on the export of scrap iron to Japan in the days leading up to the aggressive war launched by Japan in the Pacific.

The series of actions commencing at the end of the war in the Pacific and continuing up to the present time in support of the Indonesian people in Australia and the Republic of Indonesia.

The present action of the Australian waterfront unions in giving effect to the decisions of the W.F.T.U. on Franco Spain by banning the export of commodities from Australia to Spain.

In Australia the struggle against Imperialist ideology is of the utmost importance. This too, applies in the other Dominions and in Britain. Such a struggle against Imperialist ideology, especially where it can be expressed in actions as well, we find helps the whole movement for a change in foreign policy.

All advanced thinkers realise the important role the British working class must play in making these changes possible. This is in every way consistent with its own struggle for socialism.

Much closer co-operation is needed between the labor movements of Britain and of the Dominions, who also have an important part to play. A closer understanding of common problems between the labor movement of the self-governing countries and the National Independence movements of the colonial countries of the Empire should be still further developed; for only in this way can be solved the great problems that confront our peoples today.

The Australian labor movement, because of its position in the national life of the country, the influence of the Government in Empire affairs and because of Australia's strategic position in the

colonial world, has an important part to play and needs to play that part in its own interests.

I believe that the policy I have outlined to you in relation to foreign and Empire affairs is suitable to the national interests of Australia because it is in the interests of the workers, farmers, town middle class and of sections of capital not tied to the great monopolies.

The labor movement has gone some of the way. It has been able to keep the political parties of monopoly capitalism out of office. The Labor Party is in power in both Federal Houses and in five out of six of the State Parliaments. But the national movement for peace, the expansion of democracy and prosperity, needs to be greatly strengthened.

The problem on this field is to change the present foreign policy of Australia and help end the policy of Mr. Bevin, which does not serve the interests of the Australian or British people, replace it with a democratic attitude to the peoples of other lands and to assist on the basis of common interests the suppressed peoples in Empire countries to win democratic self-determination and the development of the productive capacity of their countries to the mutual benefit of all.

The Australian Labor Movement has some special responsibilities in regard to peoples within Australian territory. These responsibilities relate to the aboriginal people of Australia, the people of the Torres Strait Islands, of Papua and of the Mandate of New Guinea.

The spirit and proposals of Comrade Dutt's report to this Conference constitute, I feel, a very valuable contribution to clarity on Conference problems and provide an excellent basis for our discussions.

Long live the unity of the Labor Movement! Greater strength to the National Independence movements of the colonial countries, for upon these movements rests the solution of the problems confronting our peoples!

## EMPIRE CONFERENCE DECLARATION ON PALESTINE

THIS CONFERENCE of representatives of Communist Parties in the British Empire extends its warmest greetings and pledges its full support to all the people of Palestine who are struggling for national liberation against the military, political and economic domination of British Imperialism and the economic penetration and strategic plans of American Imperialism.

We protest against and condemn the regime of brutal colonial oppression which weighs upon Palestine. We extend our deepest sympathy to the masses who suffer under this rule.

We call for the ending of the imperialist policy which seeks to retain Palestine, not only as an

outlet for oil and point for the military control of Suez, but as the strategic base protecting imperialist interests throughout the Middle East, against the interests and rights of its peoples, with the consequent threat to the peace of the world.

We are of the firm conviction that all who love freedom and who seek peace in Palestine and throughout the world, should unite to demand and secure the immediate withdrawal of the British troops from Palestine, the abrogation of the Mandate, and the creation of a free, independent and democratic Palestinian State, which will guarantee equal rights of citizenship with full religious freedom

and full opportunities to develop their culture to all its inhabitants, Arab and Jewish.

Only thus can Palestine achieve freedom and security, not only from the military forces of Imperialism, but from the economic domination of foreign capital which, in whatever guise, seeks to exploit the peoples of Palestine and crush their movement for national liberation. This is not a matter for Anglo-American manoeuvring. Let the United Nations support the people of Palestine in their struggle to secure the independence of their country now.

We greet the rising forces of the Arab National Movement, which is daily gathering strength throughout the Middle East in the struggle for liberation, and the growing forces among the Jewish masses in Palestine who realise that they have a part to play in the common struggle with the Arabs to free Palestine from the Imperialist hold.

We warn all Jewish people that Zionism, which seeks to make Palestine or part of Palestine a Jewish State as an ally of the imperialist powers and their base in the Middle East, diverts Jewish people from the real solution of the problem of anti-Semitism, which is along the lines of democratic development and full equality of rights within the countries where they live. It is in the interests of Palestinian Jewry to oppose the Zionist conception which seeks to put them in the position of being an instrument of imperialism in the Middle East, in opposition to the struggle for National Liberation in Palestine, in opposition to the progressive forces in the democratic countries in Europe, and against the Soviet Union.

But not only has Anglo-American Imperialism used Zionism in pursuit of its policy of divide and rule; it also seeks to secure the support of reactionary Arab elements to strengthen the Middle East as a base for operations against the Soviet Union and against the liberation movement of the masses throughout the Middle East.

We have to warn the Arab people against those Arab reactionary elements who are ready to betray the movement for national liberation, upon securing the support of Imperialism for their sectional interests against the interests of the masses.

We in this Conference, therefore, appeal to the Arabs and Jews in Palestine to recognise that it is in their mutual interests to join in common struggle against Imperialism.

At the same time the wider problems facing Jewish people all over the world are not the problems of Palestine. Anti-Semitism, a weapon carried to barbaric extremes by fascism, is a weapon used by the ruling class to split and divert the masses of the people away from the struggle for their real interests.

No man or woman today can think of the plight of Jewry without burning memories of

Maidanek and Belsen, without feelings of profound horror at the crimes committed by the fascists against European Jewry, and without expressing their deep sympathy with those who have survived this horror.

It is the duty of all free peoples to succour these victims of fascism. It is their duty to demand the closing of the camps in which some of these victims are still housed, and to aid in their re-establishment in their own countries. We welcome the new status of freedom which Jewry has attained, not only within the Soviet Union, but within the new democracies in Europe, a position which should inspire Jewry throughout the world to intensify its struggle for this democratic solution in all countries. For those who, full of bitter memories of past persecution, do not wish to return, we demand that as an emergency measure, Britain, Australia, Canada, the U.S.A. and other free countries shall provide opportunities for their re-settlement in these countries, so that these victims of fascism may find new hope and new life. No democrat would wish to force immigration on Palestine by imperialist power against the wishes of its people. We believe that the question of immigration into Palestine can only be determined by the people of an independent and democratic Palestine. But we are well aware that throughout history there has been no enmity between Arab and Jew until the imperialists used Zionism to attempt to divide and disrupt the Middle East. And we believe that conscious of the terrible suffering inflicted on European Jewry by Fascism, a free, independent Palestine, in association with the other free countries in the world, would be as ready to offer succour and security to the victims of Fascism as would any other free country.

We therefore express our earnest hope that the forces of the Arab National Movement, and the progressive forces within Palestinian Jewry, recognising their identity of interest, will move rapidly towards their common goal, and, to this end, will seek to create among Arabs and Jews in Palestine those conditions which can ensure not only political agreement, but common action and unity in the struggle for the liberation of their country.

We confidently believe that progressive and democratic forces in other countries will give support to the struggle of the Palestinian people, and in their own countries will combat anti-Semitism and aid Jews to expose the Zionist illusions that have been spread, and thus win them, for the common struggle for freedom and democracy.

This is the way forward for Palestine.

This is the way forward to help European Jewry.

This is the way forward to strengthen the forces fighting for peace and democracy throughout the world.

## GREETINGS TO EMPIRE CONFERENCE

(Extracts from speeches of delegates and fraternal delegates to Empire Communist Conference.)

### The Yoke Of Wall Street

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of U.S.A.*

AS you are aware, American capitalism has emerged from the war enormously enriched and strengthened, but this strength is largely illusory. American capitalism is subject to all the contradictions of the world capitalist system as a whole, and at the present time in the United States there is developing an economic crisis which will not only shake the United States, but the whole capitalist world.

Now these big capitalists in the United States, their new strength, are setting themselves some imposing goals. For one thing, they have decided to crush the trade union movement, which has made enormous progress during the past dozen years. At the present time there are no less than 212 Bills before Congress directed to crushing the trade union movement in almost every conceivable manner, and there are also Bills before the Legislatures of most of the 48 States, but I think we can depend upon the Labor movement of the United States to resist successfully these unprecedented attacks. We have 15 million organised trade unionists. They are now moving towards Labor unity. They are strengthening their practical activities in general, and, as for myself, I am supremely confident that this great movement of workers and their political friends will be able to beat back this reaction and oppression of Wall Street.

But these capitalists in Wall Street have set themselves other goals as well, and one of their goals is to stop the wheels of progress in Europe, to turn them backward; in fact, to force upon the peoples of Europe what they call free enterprise. It is almost sure very foolish in your ears. The peoples of Europe are on the march in their own manner and are turning towards Socialism, and they are not going to be turned aside from that goal by all the gold of Wall Street.

Now to cripple the American Labor Movement, to stop the wheels of progress in Europe, would seem to be a very ambitious goal for the capitalist class of any country, but the great capitalists of the United States have still greater ambitions. They want nothing less than to secure imperialist domination over the whole world. But that, too, is a stupid and reactionary ambition, and it can only bring ill to the peoples of the world, including those in the United States. I think it is a fact, I am sure of this, that the peoples throughout Europe, the peoples throughout the world, who fought so relentlessly to defeat Hitler are not going to put on the yoke of Wall Street.

Very great economic and political struggles are developing in the United States. We can look forward to a very great perspective of struggle, and I want you to have confidence in the American workers as we have great confidence in the workers in the United States. The peoples of the world are marching forward, marching onwards, and in that march the great working class of the United States, you may be sure, will play its part.

### Building A Peaceful Germany

MAX REIMANN

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Germany (Western Zone)*

WE RECEIVED your invitation to your Party Congress with the greatest pleasure. We regarded this invitation as an expression of international solidarity which gives us new courage in our difficult fight. It is the first time after this terrible war which Hitlerite Germany waged against the whole democratic world that we have the opportunity to speak to comrades of another country at such an important Congress.

We know that the whole world still regards the German people with great distrust. The terrible sacrifices which the Allied nations had to make to defeat German fascism justify your distrust. We know well that confidence can only be re-won if the anti-fascist forces in Germany create such conditions that German reaction will never again be in a position to launch a war against Europe and the world.

The first precondition for achieving this is that the material power of German reaction, of German monopoly capitalism, is broken, that their enterprises are confiscated and put into the hands of the people. Secondly, in the whole of Germany a democratic land reform should be carried through in order to break the power of the landowners. The third precondition is the consistent denazification of economy and administration.

We warn the German people against those irresponsible leaders who say: "First repairs, and then reparations," and try to shift responsibility from the German people to the Occupation Powers with the phrase: "Total victory means total responsibility for the victors." The German people has to make reparation in order to win the confidence of the other nations, in order to be able to build a democratic system in Germany herself.

The basis of German democratisation is a united working class and a united Trade Union movement. We Communists do not speak in the name of the old Germany which has caused catastrophe for

Germany and misery to the peoples of the world; we speak in the name of the democratic forces which are emerging from the working class and from the forces of democratic progress. Anti-fascists are the core of these forces, those who have fought illegally against Hitler under a cruel dictatorship, tens of thousands of whom had to sacrifice their lives, tens of thousands of whom suffered in prisons and concentration camps, not to forget those German anti-fascists who fought from 1936 in the International Brigades in Spain. We have in Western Germany a Communist Party with 250,000 members. There is in Germany a united trade union movement with six million members.

The progressive forces in Western Germany have opened the fight for the confiscation of the property of all war criminals and active Nazis.

The Communist Party in the Diet of North Rhine Westphalia has moved a Bill for the confiscation, without compensation, of the mines. We also have moved a referendum for the confiscation of the mines. This has caused a big stir among the miners and the engineers in the Ruhr.

In our country coal is the key for reconstruction. The Ruhr coal, however, must also help to reconstruct the economy of those European countries which were devastated by Hitler's war. The first precondition for that is sufficient food for the German miners. The second precondition is that the necessary technical conditions are created. The third and most important one is that the mines are transferred into the hands of the people with trade unions, the shop stewards, having a decisive influence on production.

Germany cannot be fed without imports. Our aim, however, is to develop our agriculture in such a way that the greater part of our food supplies can be secured from German production.

We hope that the Peace Conference in Moscow will decide upon a final settlement of our reparations obligations. We have only one desire—that the Allied nations agree upon a democratic peace which helps the democratic forces and takes the power from reaction. The aim of the Communist Party is to build in Germany a United Democratic Republic supported by the anti-fascist parties. Such a republic, in which a united working class will have a leading part, will be the most secure guarantee towards the development of a peaceful Germany which never again will be a threat to other nations.

## The Fight Against Franco

ANTONIO MIJE

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Spain*

I AM SPEAKING on behalf of the Party of a country where still exists the bloody dictatorship of Fascism, the last Hitlerite survivor. Thousands

upon thousands of Spanish Communists in the towns and in the mountains are fighting against Franco and for the Republic, are fighting for freedom and democracy. They are fighting for the independence of Spain.

They are fighting in the guerrillas which are dealing uninterrupted and hard blows to the fascists; they are organising the strikes in which hundreds of thousands of workers have participated; they are publishing the clandestine press in various provinces.

Every Communist is a vanguard combatant, a sign-bearer of democracy. Our comrades are examples of national heroes, faithful to the last to the cause of the people and of the Party, like Cristino Garcia; they are models of guerrilla leaders, brave and undaunted, even with their flesh torn, like Ramon Via; they are firm and unyielding before the tortures and death at the hands of Franco's police, like Casto Roza and S. S. Biemna. The Communist Party is a school of patriotism merged with the people, teaching and learning from them.

The basic strategical objective of our Party at the present moment is the overthrow of Franco's regime. In order to achieve this objective we base our policy on the fighting unity of all the republican and anti-Franco forces. The result of this policy is the unity of Communists, Socialists, Republicans, Trade Unionists and anti-Franco Catholics. This policy is gaining ground inside our country as well as among the exiles, and very soon it will become a wide national coalition of all anti-Franco forces.

Today, together with Socialists and Republicans, with Trade Unionists and Basque Catholics, we participate in the Republican Government.

Comrades, in this struggle we have the formidable help and solidarity of the democratic world. But we still need more help at this decisive moment.

We still need more help in order to isolate Franco from the rest of the world. It is imperative that those countries which still maintain diplomatic and commercial relations with Franco's regime should break them. That is, comrades, the best help that world democracy can render to the Spanish people.

We need more solidarity for those who suffer in the prisons of Spain.

We appreciate as a great step forward the decision taken by the British working class when they asked the British Labor Government for the rupture of diplomatic and commercial relations with Franco. But this magnificent decision should not be allowed to be pigeon-holed.

One should not be led to believe that with the withdrawal of the British Ambassador from Madrid all the work has been completed. No.

It is necessary to achieve that the British Government accept an accredited official of the Republican Government. The severance of all com-

## We Shall Be Victors

M. PORPHYROGENIS

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Greece. This was the first time that the Communist Party of Greece has been able to greet a Congress of the British Communist Party*

AFTER THE GREEKS had already liberated their own country, the Greek people welcomed the first British military detachments in October, 1944, with flowers. They greeted them as the representatives of the friendly and allied British people. But official British policy had bitter disappointments in store for the Greek people. Those same troops which the Greeks had welcomed in a frenzy of joy were used to shed Greek blood in an infamous struggle aimed at the suppression of the Greek people.

Ultimately they managed by these means, and by extensive anti-Communist propaganda, to impose on the Greek people a gang of fascist and quislings who embraced their new friends with the same zeal as in the past they had licked the Hitlerite boots. It was a very bitter lesson for our people.

Greek democrats are now massacred by the thousand by official and unofficial fascist gangsters. We count by tens of thousands the tortured, the exiled, and those kept in prison without trial. For many years the Greek people have fought as best they could to liberate themselves from Fascism, but it has again become the ruler and tyrant of Greece, sponsored, organised and supported by British arms.

It would be a lie if I were to pretend that the bitterness the Greek people feel has not influenced their feelings towards Great Britain. But the Greeks have a very deep sense of justice; they have a very rich political experience, and they are able to make a clear distinction between the British people and British foreign policy. We know that the British people can neither approve nor tolerate for long such a policy—a policy which has tragic results not only for Greece, but which is also detrimental to the interests of Britain. The Greek people now wait for the people of Britain to express even more fiercely their opposition to the official British policy pursued in Greece.

A very thick curtain of lies surrounds the Greek drama in order to try and deceive world public opinion, and especially the British people. But the situation in Greece is very clear. The present struggle of the Greek people—a struggle which has already taken the form of an armed fight—does not aim at a Communist dictatorship, as those responsible try to misrepresent it. It is a struggle between Fascism and anti-Fascism. It is a struggle for democracy, waged for exactly the same aims for which we fought in the last anti-

mercial relations with Franco should be brought to a reality in the very near future. And, as a final step, the recognition of the Spanish Republican Government by the British Labor Government should be achieved.

Comrades, as you see, we do not ask for foreign intervention in Spain. No. We feel capable, by our own means and those of our people, of solving the big political and economic problems with which our country is confronted.

All we ask is that Franco should not be helped economically. We ask for the stoppage of goods for Franco. We ask you, too, to refuse the loading and unloading of Franco's ships.

We ask justice.

Death to Franco!

## Greetings From Norway

E. HEIESTAD

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Norway*

WE HAVE EMERGED from the war, which we entered as a small Party, as a mass Party. Out of a population of little over 3,000,000 people we have an adult membership of 33,000 and a youth membership of 16,000.

The Communist Party and the Norwegian Labor Party together form a majority not only in Parliament, but also amongst the people. We have inflicted the first defeat on reaction, and the people's will shall become the country's law.

The eleven Communist M.P.s in the Norwegian Parliament were elected by 170,000 votes, that is one in every seven Norwegians votes for the Communists. We suffered great sacrifices in the war. Thousands of our seamen were killed on the seas. Other thousands have fought with the Allies and have been killed. Still other thousands have suffered in the prisons and concentration camps.

We are, therefore, determined that our people should not suffer again in such ways, that they will stand together and help to defeat reaction and to go forward. We are determined to recreate our country in a new way, towards not only a political but also an economic democracy. But much of what we do will depend on how Britain behaves, on how Britain develops its foreign policy and its home policy. For this reason we are particularly interested in this Congress and in the British Communist Party. The British Commonwealth holds the key position in the world and the British workers are a mighty force.

We hope that you, the British Communist Party, will lead the British people in the right direction; this will guarantee the road to progress, democracy, freedom and Socialism not only for our people and for your people, but for the whole world.

fascist war. It is a continuation of the Greek resistance against the German invaders.

The British Communist Party's assistance in our national struggle for liberation from foreign occupation and internal Fascism is a guarantee that we shall ultimately succeed. For this valuable assistance may I express to you our gratitude and admiration.

The Greek people will do their duty. The fight which is going on in our cities, the fight waged by the Greek democratic army in the mountains of our country, proves it. The Greek people will do their duty because they are conscious of their responsibilities both towards Greece and towards world peace and democracy.

Comrades, we shall be the victors because we have right and the people on our side.

## Democratic Unity In Sweden

W. P. HOLMBERG

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Sweden*

LIKE other Communist Parties, our Party, in the first years of the war, experienced severe attacks from the bourgeoisie, the Social Democrats and trade union leaders. The attacks culminated with one of our Party houses being burned and several of our most prominent comrades murdered. The object of these attacks was declared to be to annihilate the Communist Party, but things went the other way, as they often do.

When war broke out the Party was a very small party with 96,000 votes and three M.P.s. At our Congress in May last year we had a membership of well over 50,000, with 318,000 votes, 18 M.P.s and representatives on every Parliamentary Committee. What is more, we had gained such influence and strength in the trade unions that we have been able to smash the wage stop agreement between the bosses and the trade union leaders. No longer can anyone make policy in Sweden without considering the Communist Party.

Analysing the political situation in our country and outside, our Congress declared that a peaceful development to Socialism, such as that which is taking place in Eastern Europe, was possible also in Sweden, and it was the task of the Party to create the prerequisites for such a development. As such prerequisites we counted the political unity of the working class and the existence of a truly democratic block between the working class and the middle groups in society.

In 1944 the Social Democratic Party tried to counteract the growing influence of the Communist Party by putting forward their post-war programme, promising to raise the living standard of the workers, and carry democracy from the political to the economic field. Much to the distress of the Social Democratic leaders our Party accepted this pro-

gramme as a starting point and, on this basis, unity had been growing ever since.

To solve the second task, Congress put forward and commenced working for a democratic programme of action. The local elections which took place last time were an outstanding proof of the correctness of the line of Congress. The number of votes rose to over 370,000 in Stockholm, and we became the second biggest party there.

## Support The Indonesian Republic

PAUL DE GROOT

*Fraternal Delegate from the Communist Party of Holland.*

I AM glad to be able to report the constant progress of the Communist Party of Holland. At the elections last summer, the first elections after the Liberation, our Party got 530,000 votes, which was 12 per cent of the total votes of the country. In the capital, Amsterdam, our Party became the strongest Party, with 34 per cent of the total votes. In Amsterdam, the membership of our Party has just passed 20,000 members, the biggest Party of the town. In the country as a whole we have 55,000 members.

The situation in our country is much under the influence of the colonial war waged by the Dutch Imperialists against the Indonesians. With the evacuation of British troops from Indonesian soil, they were replaced by Dutch troops, which are a constant danger to the new National Democratic Republic of the Indonesians.

Therefore, our Party devotes much of its activity towards campaigning for an end to the hostilities and the withdrawal of the troops. In September of last year, when the First Division was sent overseas, our Party did not hesitate to call its workers out in a political strike, which resulted in a 24 hour General Strike in the principal centres of the country.

British Imperialism tries to play the role of arbitrator in the Dutch-Indonesian conflict, not only by holding the military supreme command in its hands, but also by means of its diplomacy.

In spite of all aggression, our ally, the Indonesian Republic, grows stronger and stronger. In the past six months, the Indonesian Communist Party has been formed, and its influence is growing rapidly. It holds 35 seats in the Provincial Indonesian Parliament, nearly as many as the Government Socialist Party of Indonesia. Both Parties, Socialists and Communists, are working closely together and stand at the head of a Left Block, which possesses the majority in the Indonesian Parliament. I know that the British comrades are

May, 1947

May, 1947

well acquainted with the events in Indonesia and have even been involved in solidarity action for the Indonesian people. This solidarity remains necessary, as the former Dutch Minister for Foreign Affairs, Van Kleffens, declared in a recent Press Conference, there would not have been a single Dutch soldier in Indonesia if he had not been equipped by Britain.

British and Dutch workers must fight together in the future for democracy at home and in the colonies.

## The Fighting Democracy Of Latin America

ANIBAL ESCALANTE

*Fraternal Delegate from the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba*

THOSE who have been accustomed to think of Latin Americans as backward peoples, frustrated by military cliques and political adventurers, are mistaken. True, there are still Latin-American military cliques and political adventurers in the service of local reaction and foreign imperialism, but a new mass leadership is arising, new in every sense of the word. The young Communist Parties of our continent are this leadership.

In Latin-America, there are today 18 Communist Parties, which together have more than half a million members. There is the powerful Confederation of Latin-American Workers, which unites three and a half million workers. And many of our peoples have attained, through their struggles, a high degree of democratic progress and social advance.

What are the main points in our fighting programme, which is more or less common to all our countries?

1. Fight for complete economic liberation, development of our economy against the pressure of imperialism; fight so that the benefits of the enormously rich resources of our countries shall be for the people and not for the foreign exploiters.

2. Fight for the full consolidation and broadening of democracy, for establishment of democratic rights in those countries such as Salvador, Paraguay, Santo Domingo, which are still suffering under dictatorships.

3. Fight for the betterment of the conditions of life of our workers against the employers, both local and foreign.

4. Fight for the agrarian reform, for the land for the peasants, for abolition of all feudal rights.

5. Fight for complete racial equality; fight discrimination against Negroes and Indians.

6. Fight every attempt to transform Latin-America into a war base for Yankee Imperialism; for peace, for friendship between all peoples.

This is the main outline of our programme, which is varied according to the conditions in each country. To attain these objectives we fight for the widest possible national and democratic unity, in a broad front which stretches from the workers to those sections of the native bourgeoisie who are interested in national progress. The core of this unity is the working class, which is the unwavering leadership in the fight for the needs of our countries.

Who else besides our own reactionaries opposes this struggle? British Imperialism is involved in Latin-America. It has still four thousand million dollars invested in our countries. But British monopoly capitalism is being pushed out of our continent. The main opponent of progress in our countries today is Wall Street, centre of world reaction. When Wall Street talks about Free Enterprise, we know that it means freedom to kill the national industry of our countries. And when Wall Street talks about "Western Democracy," we know that it means, not liberty for our peoples, but reactionary governments, controlled by Washington.

In Cuba, through the struggle of our people and, above all, of our fighting working class, we attained in 1940 a democratic and progressive Constitution. This Constitution gives us the rights of free speech and assembly, freedom of organisation, the right to strike, the guaranteed week of 44 hours with pay for 48 hours, one month's paid holiday a year for all workers, equal pay for equal work, and many other rights.

Our Party, the Popular Socialist Party, which was illegal for 13 years, has now 152,000 members. One-third are Negroes. Forty-four per cent are women. We have a national daily paper, the second largest circulation in the country; and a radio broadcasting station. In the 1942 elections we had 85,000 votes. In the 1944 elections 120,000. In 1946, 200,000.

The Yankee imperialists, alarmed at the growing democratic movements in Latin-America, especially Cuba, are fighting them fiercely. They say that Cuba is a hotbed of Communism. We maintain that we are not creating a hotbed of Communism in Cuba, but that the Cuban people themselves are building a great Communist force which will lead to the salvation of our country, to full national liberation and democracy, towards Socialism. We fight for our country, for our rights, for the interests of our people and the working class.

## Progress In Finland

T. KARVONEN

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Finland*

THERE has been a Communist Party in Finland for 29 years. But during most of that time

May, 1947

the Party has been illegal. Only during the last two years have we had the possibility of working legally for our working class and people. During those illegal years, the membership of our Party was naturally very small. On the average it was some 3,000. But in these last years it has been growing rapidly. Now we count some 40,000 members.

The political situation in Finland after the armistice made it necessary to form a progressive democratic front against the reactionaries and fascists. Together with the Communist Party, the democratic groups from other Parties formed a common organisation, the Democratic Union of Finnish People. In addition to the Communist Party, this organisation consists of the Socialist Party, groups from Social Democratic Party, peasant and intellectual organisations, youth and women's organisations, etc., 200,000 people in all.

The Democratic Union of Finnish People holds 50 out of 200 seats in our Parliament. In the Government, the Union has six seats of a total of 18. The Communist Party itself has 36 seats in Parliament and three in the Government.

Democracy in Finland is on firm ground. The three biggest parties which form the great majority in Parliament have an agreement on developing the political and economic democracy of the country. You know that there are many difficulties, especially economic, but also political, before us. Many of them we have already solved. Just now new economic difficulties are forcing us to face the question of nationalisation.

## Evacuate The Middle East

COMRADES HELOU and BAGDACHE

*The Fraternal Delegates from the Communist Parties of Syria and the Lebanon*

WHEN we received the invitation of the British Communist Party to attend this Congress, and when the papers published this news, there arose a deep interest among workers, peasants, intellectuals and sincere democratic nationalists, notwithstanding their political tendencies. Many requested us to greet you and, at the same time, we received letters from Iraq, Transjordan and other Arab countries under British military occupation, directing us to greet you in the name of all Communists and all democratic parties who are unable to attend this Congress because they are in prison or working under illegal conditions of repression.

Our Party before the war was small; totalling in Syria and Lebanon together only 3,000. Now our parties have 22,000 members equally divided between Syria and Lebanon.

We are the representatives of the first two Arab countries who have achieved the evacuation of all

foreign troops from their land. Neither English, French nor American troops are left in the countries. There is a controversy in explaining this great event, which has an international significance. The truth is that we have achieved this great national victory by virtue of the struggle of the Syrian and Lebanese people and their refusal to accept occupation and repression, and by virtue of the stand of the Soviet Union and the Security Council and the support of public opinion the world over.

The evacuation from Syria and Lebanon has had a great effect on the Arab East. Ever since that date the slogan of evacuation of foreign troops has become the first national slogan of the masses in Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, Transjordan and the whole Middle East.

The question of defending the independence which our countries have achieved and safeguarding it against new foreign occupation and against every imperialist infiltration, whether economic or political, has become a national and democratic question affecting not only Syria and Lebanon, but all Arabs, and the whole question of peace in the Middle East. The imperialist circles in Britain and America, the barons of the City and Wall Street, who are energetically trying to make the Near East a military base, visualise as the principal conditions for executing these schemes, the destruction of the independence of Syria and Lebanon and their re-occupation, either by forming a Near Eastern Block led by Turkish reaction, or by way of Joint Defence Commissions which imperialists have tried without success to force upon the Egyptian people, or by other similar schemes, such as the Greater Syria Plan, which aims at fusion of Syria and Lebanon with the Kingdom of Transjordan, which is under British military occupation.

Our slogan, which springs from the interests of our peoples and the interests of peace, is the defence of independence and the republic, and our forward development in the path of democracy in order to better the living standard of the masses and to refuse to become lackeys to any imperialist block. This means following an independence policy within the United Nations Organisation in co-operation with the Arab peoples struggling for their independence.

In order to fulfil this national policy, we fight with all Republican nationalists without any exception and notwithstanding their political or social tendencies. The Arab National Movement, whose basis has widened among the masses of the people, is not a narrow, feudalist movement, as imperialists and their agents claim, but is a mass movement increasing in strength among all the classes and forcing the ruling classes to rally under the banner of the people and of their slogan—evacuation, independence and democracy.

The campaign of the reactionary imperialists and their agents among the Arabs to disrupt the national movement and turn it from its objective by anti-Communist slogans has completely failed.

May, 1947

525

The Arab National Movement today is characterised by a sense of friendship and hope in the Soviet Union and the progressive movements in the world.

We have confidence that by your efforts and the efforts of British progressives and through the consciousness of the British working class the day will come when Britain will not look on the world through the eyes of Churchill, but through those of the British people, who uphold democracy, fraternity and equality between all peoples.

## People's Democracy In Czechoslovakia

WILHELM NOVI

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*

I am very glad to have the opportunity to greet your magnificent Congress and many of my old British friends. I remember the time, eight years ago, when I came to this country as a political refugee. Today I come as the representative of our mighty Communist Party, which has more than 1,000,000 members, 114 Members of Parliament, 60,000 representatives on municipal councils, nine ministers in the Government, with our beloved leader, the Prime Minister, Gottwald.

I use the opportunity to thank our British comrades and the people of Britain who welcomed us to this country, who not only helped us to live here in safety, but also to work for the liberation of our country. We shall never forget our debt of gratitude to the people of Britain.

We are proud to be able to give you a report on the great successes which our nation achieved under the leadership of our Communist Party. The first step which we carried through after liberation was the nationalisation of the key industries, the banks, the insurance companies. Today we have in the hands of the people 75 per cent of industry, all the banks and all transport. This has created the preconditions for a planned economy.

On the first of January of this year, we began to implement our two years' plan. This plan was drafted by our Party, but now it is in the mind and heart of every Czechoslovak citizen. In January the production plan was fulfilled 100 per cent, and in some important sections of industry more than 100 per cent—for instance, for soft coal by 112 per cent. The figures for February show that in spite of frost and snow the plan will be fulfilled again.

The aim of our two years' plan is definitely to liquidate the consequences of war and occupation, and to secure for ever a firm economic basis of our people's democracy. We may say that Czechoslovakia today is one of the most consolidated countries of Europe.

After fulfilling our two years' plan, we shall start on a new five-year plan. Czechoslovakia,

under the leadership of the Communist Party, has already become a country of a planned economy. Thus we have entered our Czechoslovak Democratic path to Socialism, and thus we are secure against crises and economic catastrophes and against dependence on international monopoly capitalism. It was our Party which united the nation, both in the fight for national liberation, and for reconstruction on the basis of the National Front. Certainly there are sometimes difficulties and differences between the parties which form the National Front, but our policy, in the interest of the people, can be carried through because we can always appeal to the people and the people give us their support.

In the last general election we won 40 per cent of the votes. Now our Party has decided to open the fight for winning the majority of the nation. We are sure that we shall achieve this aim; for the Czechoslovak people understand that the Communist Party is the truest expression of the Czech nation, the best guarantee of their national aspirations, the only force able to secure peace, security and democratic progress.

We won our liberty by our own struggle, by the help of the allied nations, but mainly by the heroic fight of the Soviet Union and the glorious Red Army. Relying on our close friends of the democratic forces in the West, especially here among the working people of Britain, we go confidently forward to our great aim, to Socialism.

*Long live our fraternal Communist Party of Great Britain, and its trusted leader—Harry Pollitt.*

*Long live the friendship between the peoples of Britain and Czechoslovakia.*

## The New Poland

COMRADE BIENKOWSKI, M.P.

*Representative of Polish Workers Party.*

I AM speaking to you, comrades, on behalf of that Party which was the first in Poland to start a relentless fight against the Nazi occupant, a Party which, since the liberation, has taken upon itself the brunt of the burden of the country's reconstruction.

We are proud of our country's achievements. They are great if we consider that after the liberation we found the majority of Polish centres of production either ruined or damaged, and that we have already achieved 75 per cent of our pre-war output, and even exceeded this figure in many important branches of industry.

We owe our results in the first place to the change in Poland's social structure. Poland has entered upon a different road of reform from that of Great Britain. We have solved, in a radical manner, the question of nationalisation of large and medium industrial establishments. We carried out a radical Agrarian reform. We have thus created a basis for a planned economy and, there-

fore, we are in a position to guide our economic development and regulate its pace.

The road chosen by us is different, too, from that of the Soviet Union. The most outstanding characteristic of the structure of modern Poland is the existence, alongside the decisive nationalised sector of industry, of a sector of private enterprise which plays quite a considerable role within the framework of the Economic Plan. Our road, as has been proved by our experience, is the best under Polish conditions. We believe that this road is a specific, peaceful and evolutionary advance towards Socialism in the future.

One of our greatest achievements is the repolonisation and rehabilitation of the Polish Western Territories on the Oder and Western Neisse. These lands, forcibly Germanised throughout the centuries, are once again Polish, and there, five million Polish workers and peasants live and work. We have rebuilt thousands of destroyed or looted enterprises.

The most important of our achievements is the creation of a united front of the working class: close co-operation with the Socialist Party. The division of the working class has always been the source of its weakness and led to the victory of reaction.

The co-operation of the Polish Workers' Party with the Polish Socialist Party has become the cornerstone of our victory. A close collaboration with the Socialist Party is the source of strength of the democratic front in Poland, which, during recent elections, gained the support of the overwhelming majority of the nation.

The victory of Polish democracy in the last elections is another expression of the progress of democracy in Europe. It is a proof that full national unity has been achieved in Poland on the basis of the programme of the Democratic block.

While observing carefully your country's experiences, and those of other countries, we would like to see our own progress considered as a valuable contribution to the fight of the working classes of all countries for a better and more just world. We would wish, however, to see the opinion given on Democratic Poland based on honest and impartial observation. We want close contact and co-operation with all nations, with the nations of the West. We do not wish an "iron curtain" to be dropped between us, as this would suit the reactionary forces only too well.

We stress strongly the necessity for co-operation between nations, not only because Poland needs help, but because we firmly believe that such co-operation is of vital interest to both our countries. We need economic assistance and the support of the Allied nations and we need understanding of our most vital interests.

In this respect, relations between Poland and Great Britain have often not been too happy. We appreciate and think highly of the sympathy shown to Poland by the British working class and the

British people. We have many proofs of this sympathy, but, owing to the activities of forces hostile to Poland, many problems have arisen which prevent a normalisation of relations between our peoples. The removal of these obstacles and the establishment of friendship and co-operation are in our interests, and we also believe, in the interests of Great Britain too.

We wish you every success in your endeavours to achieve unity of the British working class, which will lead to the common goal — Socialism. May this Congress be another important step on the road to this high objective.

## Empire Or Socialism

G. ADHIKARI

*Fraternal Delegate of the Communist Party of India*

INDIA is passing through a mighty anti-imperialist upsurge. Never have we seen such great enthusiasm, such a great upsurge of mass forces. Today, February 22/23, in India in many towns they will be celebrating the anniversary of the great event which took place one year back: The strike of the Indian Navy, which took place in February. Today there will be demonstrations and strikes in Calcutta and Bombay, and I want to draw your attention to this, that with this great naval strike a new period opened in our country. The Indian people have seen and have realised that it is impossible now for imperialism to rule India in the old way. The peasant will have his land, the worker will fight for his rights, and all the people know they will be free.

You are told here that India has become independent. That all that is taking place in India is trouble between Indians. But, in spite of what they say about independence, the British Army exists in India. In student strikes the British Army is brought out to shoot. In peasant strikes the British Army is brought out to shoot. Not only do the British Army remain, but new plans are being made about aeroplane bases and about "open-air asylums." This is the condition of India today, and I say that all the Indian parties, including Congress, must know in their heart of hearts that real independence is not there.

Yet the greatest misfortune is that the leadership of these great mass parties are trying to find out the "peaceful way to independence." They are compromising to find out the way to obtain independence through the plan which the British Government is making. That creates a situation which makes it easier for British imperialism to split and divide our movement.

Today the Indian Communist Party is facing great repression. Our Party, which was founded 15 years ago, began the organisation of workers and peasants, and for the first time put before our country a programme of national democratic revolution, has always faced repression.

We, of the Communist Party, have to organise the anti-imperialist upsurge; we have to win the great majority of people who are today organised under the patriotic parties, the National Congress and the Moslem League. It is the greatest problem for our Party to convince our people that the way to real independence is not through compromise through the British plan, which only creates division amongst us, but through mobilising and uniting the forces of our people for winning independence. Our Party is doing its very best to gain that united front so that we can obtain independence. I greet this Congress which has today very squarely put before the British working class the question of Empire or Socialism. Today more than ever the Indian people have realised that imperialism has to go if we are to live. There is no other alternative.

Exactly the same alternative is placed before the British people today. The empire hangs like a stone round the necks of the British people. Choice before you is Empire or Socialism. And your Party has, in a way, the same difficult task that we have before us in India. You have to win the great majority of the British working class for Socialism, to win the great mass of your own people for the only path forward—that is, Socialism.

You are today passing through a great coal crisis, a manpower shortage. That manpower is there in India, shooting at us, instead of making coal for you. So here is a policy against which you are fighting, and I am sure that the great lead that your Congress is giving today to the British working class will enable you to win the British working class for the fight forward.

## Against Partition Plans

WILLIAM McCULLOUGH

*Fraternal Delegate from the Communist Party of Ireland*

The empire problem is now presented to the people of Britain in the sharpest possible form. During the war the peoples of the oppressed countries built up and greatly strengthened the popular independence movements; and the military defeat of fascism added greatly to this development, with the result that today independence is within the grasp of many Colonial peoples.

Hypocritical concern is being expressed for national minorities of the Colonial countries. Behind this lies the hope of the imperialists that divisions will be created and thus they will be able to maintain their hold on the Colonial people.

Partition is the "solution" being popularised by the imperialists. This was their way in relation to Ireland after the 1914-18 war, when the Irish independence movement had reached its greatest strength.

Partition not only perpetuates antagonisms and division among the people of the partitioned countries, it also puts up smoke screens and obscures

from the people the struggle for progress and Socialism. We, in Ireland, have had partition — we cannot advise its acceptance by the Colonial peoples.

Far be it for me to criticise the foreign policy of the British Government. This can be safely left to the care of the British people. But I should like to pose a question to Mr. Attlee and the Labor Government. Is it in the interests of Labor and the British people to maintain a Tory bridgehead in Northern Ireland?

It is clear that British foreign policy is to continue in friendly association with imperialists of other countries. This is no different to the policy which was pursued by their Tory predecessors, who were so decisively rejected by the British people at the General Election.

And when British Labor Government leaders visit our country, instead of associating with, and assisting, the Trade Union and Labor movement of Ireland, they keep up the same associations as their Tory predecessors.

## Fight For A Democratic Malaya

WU TIEN-WANG

*Fraternal Delegate from the Communist Party of Malaya*

ON behalf of more than 10,000 members of the Communist Party of Malaya and also on behalf of the 5,000,000 oppressed people of Malaya I extend to you the warmest greetings.

After the advent of the British Labor Government, your Party has been the only Party that has continued to struggle relentlessly for the realisation of genuine Socialism. Your Party has also been the only Party in Britain that has upheld the United Nations Charter that proposed the self-determination of all oppressed Colonial peoples.

Today the 3,000,000 people of Malaya are still suffering from colonial rule. Ever since the advent of British rule 100 years ago, the Malayan peoples were forced to lead the lives of colonial slaves. There was not even a shadow of democracy in Malaya. Our Malayan people have never had a single opportunity of experiencing what an election is like. We had no freedom to organise trade unions and all political parties were persecuted. During the entire pre-war period hundreds of our Communist members were banished for life.

After the fall of Singapore, our Party shouldered the entire responsibility of defending the honor and freedom of 5,000,000 people. We organised the 10,000 strong Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army which played a significant role in the liberation struggles.

The Malayan peoples expected that, after the coming to power of the Labor Government, there would be a new era in the relations between the ruling powers and the colonial countries: of the



British Empire. We expected that the Labor Government would unhesitatingly apply the principles of the United Nations Charter, such as self-determination for the colonial peoples.

But after September 5, 1945, the Malayan peoples were made to realise that even the most elementary democratic rights have to be fought for. We are still forced to fight for the legalisation of trade unionism. The Communist Party of Malaya, which has co-operated with the British Allied forces during the entire period of resistance, is now forced to function under semi-legal conditions.

Dear comrades, today the fate of the Malayan peoples is still that of a colony. We still fight for elementary rights, for civil liberties, legalisation of trade unions, legalisation of all political parties. We are relentlessly fighting against the imposition of a reactionary constitution which would relegate the Malayan peoples back to the dark days of 1941.

Before I conclude, I would request that from this Congress you pass resolutions demanding the immediate legalisation of all political parties in Malaya. I would request you also to pass resolutions asking the British Government to recognise civil liberties, to recognise trade unions and also to let the 5,000,000 Malayan peoples have a democratic constitution for a new democratic Malaya.

## Defend Hungarian Democracy

COMRADE HORVATH

*Fraternal Delegate of the Hungarian Communist Party*

TWO years ago a new Hungary was born. We smashed the might of the feudal landlords and of the church princes, whose lands we distributed among six hundred and fifty thousand poor peasants. We nationalised the mines, among the most important ones in Eastern Europe, also a great part of heavy industry. It was our Party which stopped inflation and stabilised our currency. The Hungarian working class threw itself enthusiastically into the task of building up a new country. Our Party has drafted a plan for three years which will raise the standard of living step by step, and prosperity will be added to freedom.

However, the enemies of the people have not looked on idle while progress was being made. A month ago our state defence organisations discovered traces of conspiracy. Former landlords and big capitalists were busy preparing the restoration of fascist-flavored rule. Fascist military formations stationed in the British zone of Austria, under the protection of the British authorities, were to play the chief part in this detestable plot. Hungarian conspirators and ex-fascists hoped for the support of British reactionary forces. They forgot about the democratic forces in England, about the English working class, whose real spirit is manifested by this Congress. The participation in the plot of these Horthy-fascist military formations was, however, not so scandalous as the discovery that the Small-

holders' Party, the biggest Party of the Hungarian Coalition Government, gave shelter and support for the conspirators. The influence of the Smallholders' Party on the peasants was misused for the purposes of restoring the rule of the landlords and big capitalists. Their General Secretary, Bela Kovacs, was one of the leaders of the conspirators.

However, Hungarian democracy is alert and unwavering. A number of generals and a Minister were put under arrest. If some present political leaders stand in the way of justice, we shall appeal to the people and demand new elections.

These days we are witnessing the most embittered fight for democracy since liberation. Victory of the people is certain. Firstly, because this fight is led by that Party whose leader, Mathias Rakosi, spent 16 years in the prison of the counter-revolutionists. Secondly, because the Hungarian working class is united. Our co-operation with the Social Democrats is unbreakable. The other reason for the certainty of the victory of the people lies in the solidarity of the free peoples with our fight. By saying this, I do not refer to our neighbors in Eastern Europe only, not even to the invincible Soviet Union, which leads the way to the progress of humanity. We are counting, too, on the democratic forces in England. We are convinced that the working class in England is a solid pillar of real democracy.

## For An Independent Burma

BA THEIN TIN

*(From his speech as representative of the Burmese Communist Party at the Empire Communist Parties' Conference)*

THE Burmese people, though they have been under the yoke of British imperialism for 122 years, have never surrendered their urge for freedom. This is manifested by the constant armed rebellions against the British since the first annexation in 1824. The Burmese people have always been looking for an opportunity to drive the imperialists from Burma.

The Attlee-Aung San Agreement, reached recently in London, militarily, economically and politically fell far short of these aspirations of the entire nation. In fact, this Agreement is one of national humiliation, national disruption and perpetuation of British rule in Burma.

The present situation is therefore characterised by a new upsurge of struggle. In January there was a students' strike, a general strike and the rising of the People's Volunteer Organisation in Tavoy. The whole country is seething with discontent and unrest.

Our task is to reforge the Anti-Fascist Organisation and Communist unity. In Burma we have a ment 300,000 strong, a trade union movement which last year numbered 35,000. Our Party, building Communist, working class and national unity, can achieve an independent Burma.

## THE NEW ARBITRATION BILL

J. R. HUGHES, Political Committee Member

THE new Bill, introduced by the Federal Labor Government, has been heralded by its spokesmen as opening a new chapter in the history of industrial relations in Australia.

The main content of the Bill differs very little from the existing Arbitration Act so far as the principles are concerned.

The Labor Party has always stood for compulsory arbitration. There is a great difference between arbitration and compulsory arbitration in dealing with industrial disputes.

In speaking in Parliament on the introduction of the Bill, Dr. Evatt said that the arbitration laws to date had encouraged and almost made mandatory the Australian system of collective bargaining, through registered organisations. "I assert, confidently, that both the Australian worker, the employer and the Australian community have been far better off with the Court than they could possibly have been without it."

This statement expresses the compulsory aspect of Arbitration which the Labor Party adheres to. Incidentally, Dr. Evatt's remarks concerning the advantages to the community, the worker and the employer which come from the system of compulsory Arbitration are not likely to be shared by the great mass of workers whose hostility to the Court has been marked by industrial disputes which in recent times have been directed against the Court, its delays and treatment of claims almost as much as against the employer.

The working-class attitude favors the system of conciliation or collective bargaining, and is not opposed to the use of arbitrators in the settlement of industrial disputes. However, what has shown itself to be an obstacle to progress and higher living standards has been the system of compulsory arbitration, with its professional arbitrators, appointed by the Crown as part of the State and, as per Dr. Evatt, "... charged with the public duty of securing and maintaining the terms and conditions of employment."

The new Bill retains the Court and in addition appoints a number of Conciliation Commissioners who will add to the army of professional arbitrators having tenure of office until sixty-five years of age and being protected against removal for other than proved misdemeanours, and then only after a vote of both Houses of the Commonwealth Parliament. This further indicates the character of the new Bill in giving added force to the compulsory arbitration machinery which is so beloved of the Labor politicians.

Dr. Evatt, in referring to the Conciliation Commissioners, describes them as "Industrial Administrators." In other words the view is that they will be more than arbitrators on disputes, they will become very powerful units of the State machinery in industrial matters.

The Bill provides some improvements so far as it relates to the machinery of the Arbitration Court. If the Commissioners when appointed use the full power granted it could have the effect of removing the legal formalities and technicalities which so long have been associated with Arbitration and could enable unions' claims to be more expeditiously dealt with.

One of the features in the amendments provides as before that agreements made between unions and employers have to be certified by the Court, but under the amendments the Commissioners can refuse to certify an agreement if they feel that the agreement does not settle the industrial disputes, or if anything contained in the agreement is outside the powers that the Commissioner would have if he were making an award and, probably what is more important, if he feels that such an agreement is not in the public interest.

No worker could hail this new clause as an improvement in Arbitration legislation.

This clause may have added significance in the light of the statements made by Senator McKenna, on behalf of the Government, at the Federal Conference of Unions recently held in Melbourne, in explaining why the Government was opposed to abolishing the Wage-Pegging Laws. Senator McKenna said that due to the labor shortage employers and unions could agree to pay high wages, thus the Government could not accede to and that was why there had to be some authority, such as the Chief Judge, to ensure uniformity.

So, the present policy of uniformity is to be carried forward to the Conciliation Commissioners, who, it is noted, are to meet in conference with the Chief Judge not less frequently than once every six months. Uniformity in itself may not be a bad thing, but uniformity as applied by the Arbitration Court is to ensure uniform low standards.

The Conciliation Commissioners are to be well protected against adverse comment by a very stringent section dealing with contempt; so that to criticise in writing or speech a Conciliation Commissioner can bring a penalty of one hundred pounds. This particular provision is one that could well be amended or eliminated as a person charged with dealing with industrial matters is surely entitled to be spoken about, or indeed criticised in connection with his activities and decisions.

In the existing Arbitration Act some of the sections provide for certain limited interference by the Court in the internal affairs of trade unions. Militant and progressive workers and indeed vast sections of the trade union movement have campaigned to have these powers removed from the Arbitration Act. It has been pointed out that the original purpose of the Arbitration system was to arbitrate on industrial disputes between employers and employees, but in the course of time rights were

May, 1947

granted to the Court which were anti-democratic and unjust. The fact that these limited powers were increasingly used by the Court in interfering with the internal democracy of trade unions has built considerable resentment among trade unionists.

The new Bill deals with this question but does not remove any of the clauses to which objection has been taken. To the contrary, additional provisions are placed in the Bill which will enable the Conciliation Commissioner, against whom lies no appeal, to deal with any question arising out of an organisation as to the rights, status or functions of the members of that organisation or otherwise!

It will be seen from this terminology that officers of a Union could be removed by a Conciliation Commissioner, without any other justification than that it was an order to settle an industrial matter. Funds of unions and indeed all the "human rights" of members of the organisation are imperilled in the hands of the professional arbitrators.

It is not surprising, but certainly contradictory that Dr. Evatt, whose heart bleeds for human rights for people in other lands, has no concern when it comes to the trade unionists of this country.

The removal of this extraordinary power must be demanded; it is a power which if applied to other organisations, such as religious, companies or trusts would raise a howl of protest from the capitalist press; but as it applies to trade unionists it is no doubt considered a very sound principle.

The Arbitration Court has shown an over-keenness to exercise powers which permit them to interfere in the internal affairs of trade unions, but the right of appeal to the High Court, which has been exercised from time to time, has curbed this interference to a considerable extent. Under the new Bill the right of appeal to the High Court is removed.

Whilst agreeing that in connection with strictly industrial questions this move would have much to commend it, none the less efforts should be made to obtain provision in the Bill for a right of appeal to the High Court where the rights of unions or members of unions are involved.

One feature of the Bill is in line with the demands of the trade unionists and that is in relation to the prevention of Counsel, solicitors or paid agents appearing as representatives of any party appearing before the Commissioner. Before the

Court solicitors or Counsel cannot appear if any of the parties object. This is very similar to the present provision which, unfortunately, was not exercised generally by the unions when appearing before the Arbitration Court.

One could refer to a whole number of matters which could have been altered in the Act to make it more workable for the unions who will be required to act under the Arbitration Law. For instance, provision enabling the easy amalgamation of unions, where the unions so desire, to overcome weaknesses existing in the legislation which were experienced by the Ironworkers and other unions when amalgamation between the unions was decided upon; the need to provide for a better form of right of entry of union officials to employers' premises. These are but two of the matters causing the trade unions concern which could have been provided for.

The Government would have been better advised to heed the requests of the A.C.T.U. and Federal Unions, whose proposals have been clearly placed before the Prime Minister and Ministers dealing with this Bill.

The reported statement ("S.M.H." 21/3/47) of Mr. N. J. O. Makin, Australia's ambassador in the U.S.A., emphasises the view held not only by the Labor Party but by the Australian bourgeoisie in connection with the system of compulsory arbitration. Mr. Makin said that "... Australia's industrial position is due to the system of Conciliation and Arbitration which is more satisfactory than in many other parts of the world. It has brought added respect for the law, smooth working in the adjustment of wages and conditions and has minimised friction by way of strikes and lock-outs. Arbitration had proved beneficial to employer and employee alike and therefore had been accepted by both."

Mr. Makin has overlooked the tremendous struggles that have taken place in Australia since the conclusion of the war, to say nothing of the enormous pressure that has been exerted by the working class against the Courts. No doubt therein lies the explanation for many of the provisions of the amended Arbitration Act, which is aimed at binding still more closely the working class of Australia to the system of Arbitration.

## ALL EYES TURN TO PRAGUE

AUDREY BLAKE

AT the present time, the preparations for a new war of aggression are under way in all the capitalist countries. This includes Australia with a war budget of £148 million, a considerable amount of which is being spent on a rocket range. In this situation, every positive action for the maintenance of a stable and lasting peace assumes great importance.

When such action is world-wide, embracing millions of people, its significance is hard to over-estimate.

Such is the character of the World Youth Democratic Youth, to be held in July-August in Czechoslovakia. Millions of young people of every nationality are now in the midst of preparations to

May, 1947

send a total of 50,000 representatives to the Festival, which is one of the most significant international efforts for world friendship and peace ever projected.

The activities during the Festival will cover a wide field — exhibitions on every conceivable subject, lectures and discussions, the best documentary and entertainment films from many countries, dramatic performances by National Theatre Groups, ballet, concerts, puppet shows and a big programme of sporting events. There will be camp-fires, open air and indoor ballroom and folk-dancing and special tours throughout Czechoslovakia.

That the democratic youth of the world should be preparing for such a joyful occasion at this time should cause no surprise. It is a sign of the confidence with which millions of young people in the world today face the future, confidence based on their rapidly growing unity of action through the coordinating and unifying influence of the World Federation.

It is not in any way an indication of a callous attitude to the sufferings of the people in Spain and Greece because of fascist dictatorship. It is not an indication of indifference to the struggles of the colonial peoples for independence. It is not a lack of understanding of youths' responsibilities to their own people in preserving peace and gaining their just demands.

On the contrary, who can doubt that from this Festival will come increased understanding by the youth of the world of the need to unite for action for the things they want and need urgently?

Who can doubt that the youth of America and the British Empire, meeting their contemporaries from those countries around which the monopolists and their press have built an "iron curtain," will learn the truth and come back to tell it to their peoples?

There also can be no doubt that from this Festival a great strengthening of the unity of the youth of the world will take place, that many of the prejudices based on ignorance will be swept away.

Understanding these things all workers will be proud that young Australia will be represented at Prague.

## THE N.S.W. LABOR COUNCIL

J. McPHILLIPS

ONCE a leading centre of militant trade unionism, the N.S.W. (Sydney) Trades and Labor Council is today one of the most backward trade union bodies in the country and, if judged by some of its decisions, almost a reactionary organisation. Whereas this Council at one time functioned as an independent trade union organisation championing the cause of workers on strike, protecting and advancing their immediate class interests, it is now dragged along behind a policy determined in semi-secret conference by a small group and subservient

to the interests of the parliamentarians and the right-wing section of the Labor Party. It has the doubtful distinction of being the only Labor Council in Australia to oppose the A.C.T.U. proposals for action by workers on and after 1st May to enforce a 40-hour week.

The Eureka delegation includes a Brigade which will take part in the reconstruction of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, a Jazz Band and a Sportsman and a Sportswoman. They will all take part in the Festival and then together with all the other delegations will go to rebuild Lidice, till now an example of Nazi brutality and race hatred.

The new Lidice will be a symbol of the peoples' youth, united for international friendship and peace.

The eleven young Reconstruction Volunteers are fired with enthusiasm and determination to be second to none in their labors. They will show that Australian workers really do realise their obligations to the heroic Yugoslavs and Czechoslovaks who fought under such difficult conditions in the common war to defeat fascism.

The group of young musicians from the Eureka Jazz Club, strongest Eureka League Branch in Australia, is famous for its work to develop the best in jazz. They will play Australian songs as well as others, and together with the sports representatives, chosen not only for their sporting prowess but for their sportsmanship, are eagerly looking forward to doing their bit in the Reconstruction of Lidice.

The whole delegation will be led by E.Y.L. Assistant National Secretary, Harry Stein, who has played such an important part in the struggles of Victorian apprentices.

A great campaign for international friendship and peace is now under way — a campaign which will reach its first big peak when the delegation leaves our shores for Europe.

Real understanding and warm-hearted support is needed from the older workers for their youth and its organisation if success is to be achieved, and young workers are to be represented at Prague. The support will be repaid when the delegation returns and is able, by its first-hand accounts to all the workers, to play a big part in rallying the Australian people for united action for peace and progress.

Its decisions show that the Council has deserted the vital class interests of the workers, and in every instance in the past 18 months when a strike has been placed in the hands of its "disputes committee" it has either been diverted into "harmless"

May, 1947

channels or has been forcefully terminated against the best interests of the workers.

This deterioration is caused by the domination of the Council by a comparatively small clique of delegates who use a machine-organised and controlled majority to force through Council decisions calculated to serve their own personal political ambitions and the infamous anti-Communist crusade in which they so consciously participate.

Swagging in the leadership of this clique is the Council's Assistant Secretary, J. Kenny, who flaunts himself before Council like a funny little fat man throwing the full weight of his bulk after everything he says in a vain effort to give his statements emphasis and authority. His "election" to the position of Assistant Secretary provides one of the instances of the anti-democratic practices of this group.

Associated with him in this faction are such people as J. Shortelle (Sugar Workers), R. Jackson (Confectioners), B. O'Malley (Food Preservers), C. Anderson (Plumbers), N. Origglass (Balmain Breakaway Ironworkers), T. Liston (A.W.U.), E. O'Dea and V. Hyland (Shop Assistants). Council's Secretary R. (Bob) King and President L. Austin have either connived at or voted for the anti-working class decisions for which this clique has been responsible and the methods by which these decisions have been "sanctioned."

Commencement of the domination of Council by this right-wing clique dates back to a change in the Council's rules by which the basis of representation was changed and union delegations limited to a maximum of five. This resulted in reducing the representation of the larger unions, and the already existing control of the Council by a combination of the "centre" and the "right" rapidly changed into control by the "right" with the "centre" giving support. Although this controlling faction is invariably able to muster sufficient votes for a majority, the delegates who support them represent a minority of the workers belonging to unions affiliated to the Council. This arises from the basis of representation which enables small affiliates to have representation equal to unions representing big numbers of workers.

But it is not only by its actual decisions that the decline of the N.S.W. Trades and Labor Council is to be measured. The method and manner by which its business is conducted gives equal evidence of its decline.

In a report recently made to the Sydney District Committee of the A.E.U., the delegates representing that Union on the Labor Council drew the attention of the District Committee to "the conduct of business by the Council" and said—

"The present method of conducting Council business is such as to prevent full and proper consideration being given to the merits of matters brought before Council.

"Matters of importance, whether emanating from the Executive or individual unions, are never brought before Council except after an organised

round-up of delegates has been completed. This results in the attendance of a large number of delegates who attend only when their votes are required for a particular purpose.

"Business upon these occasions is conducted in accordance with a pre-arranged plan.

"Time and again by obvious arrangement the 'gas' is applied before the matter before Council has been properly considered and many times before any opposition speakers have been heard."

There is always a particularly heavy attendance upon election nights and delegates who never attended at other times are present upon those occasions for the sole purpose of casting a vote for the "official ticket."

Result is that, as recorded by Cecil Sharpley in the March issue of "Review" in connection with the Melbourne T.H.C., the Disputes Committee of the N.S.W. Trades and Labor Council consists of delegates who have had little or no experience of strikes whilst care is taken to keep out delegates from unions frequently involved in strikes.

Unable to talk in terms other than voting strength, those in control see it that disputes committee meetings include representatives from every right-wing dominated union which may be even only remotely and indirectly affected by the particular strike.

Result is that negotiations with employers and tactics in conducting disputes are determined not by consideration of the best interests of workers but by a desire to settle the strike at any price.

Indicating the results of the control by this rabidly anti-Communist fraternity of right-wing, including the Industrial Groupers, Langites, Catholic Actionists and Trotskyites is a long list of viciously anti-working class decisions made under their leadership.

Crowning this list of infamies is the most recent of them — the expulsion from Council of the class crimes, this political faction mustered a majority vote and expelled the F.E.D.F.A. because members of that union refused to resume work in the Sydney shipyards on terms dictated by the employers, accepted by the Council, but repeatedly rejected by the striking Engine Drivers.

Moving the motion Kenny bleated about discipline, acceptance of majority decision and observance of rules making Council's decisions binding, but did not say why the Council refused to carry out A.C.T.U. decisions against continued affiliation of the Origglass outfit.

Support for the motion came from the Langite O'Neil, whose own union, the A.R.U., was at that very moment threatening a rail stoppage at Easter. O'Neil was returned to this Council as a delegate of support of Franco and active association with Lang.

The Trotskyite Origglass supported the order to the F.E.D.F.A. to resume work, but this same "gentleman" thought it was a great piece of work

May, 1947

on his part to keep men on strike against their own Union for six weeks. But of course the F.E.D.F.A. skivvies never believed in that.

Other decisions of a similar character made on propositions by this clique were listed in the report of the A.E.U. delegates already referred to. These are:—

"1945 Steel Strike—Council made a series of decisions in open opposition to the opinion of the main unions involved and the rank and file workers on strike. These decisions were solely for the purpose of forcing a resumption of work on unfavorable terms and particularly to embarrass the Ironworkers' Union.

"Balmain Ironworkers'—Without consulting the Union concerned and in defiance of an official declaration that there was no Balmain Branch of the Ironworkers' Union, the Labor Council accepted affiliation from the Origglass breakaway group. Since then Council has been informed that the delegates from that group on Council have been expelled from the Ironworkers' Union. The A.C.T.U. Executive decided that the Origglass group was not entitled to affiliation, the Council has adopted that decision, but the Origglass group remain affiliated.

"Secretary's Salary: Without warning and after a big number of delegates had walked out of Council in protest against the last-mentioned decision, Council raised the salary of the Secretary, King, by £5 per week, giving him a weekly salary of £17.

"Assistant Secretary: When F. Kelly resigned from the position of Assistant Secretary to take up business as a publican the then President, J. Kenny, insisted upon filling the position immediately even though the resignation was without notice. He then proceeded to put himself into that position by calling for nominations without notice and ruling out the only two other nominees as they were not present and then declaring himself elected unopposed.

"Tramway Stoppage: Despite the decision of the Tram and Bus Union Executive to continue a 4-hour stoppage into a strike to obtain extra rates for weekend work, and despite opposition of delegates from the unions concerned, the Council directed the men not to strike.

"Waterfront Dispute: Despite opposition from practically every union involved, Council decided to accept proposals of employers representing no gain except proposals of a resumption of work. A.E.U. at all and ordered a resumption of work. A.E.U. and F.E.D.F.A. members have refused to accept this direction.

"40-Hour Week and May Day Stoppage: Adopted by only a narrow majority by Council, the A.C.T.U. proposals to enforce a 40-hour week from 1st May onwards were adopted also by the other four State Branches of the A.C.T.U. Despite this and by obvious arrangement the matter was re-submitted and the only really decisive action so far taken to obtain a general 40-hour week was rejected by Council."

If such decisions began and ended as the comic capers of these anti-Communist humbugs it would not be so bad. But their effect is widespread, goes beyond the Council itself and is a matter of grave concern and urgency to all those who desire to strengthen trade union unity and thus provide the maximum organised strength in support of the class interests of workers.

They have already brought the Council into public disrepute, its authority amongst trade unionists is now lower than it ever was and they have already seriously weakened the strike struggles of the workers in this period.

These struggles will become bigger, will have a greater content and more serious consequences and the effect of such behaviour and decisions will be very much more serious for workers in the near future. These people will become more vicious and desperate in their efforts to stifle the struggles of the workers as this time approaches.

Dimitrov's charge against the Social-Democratic leadership that "They want to show the bourgeoisie that they, better and more skillfully than anyone else, can keep the discontented working masses under control and prevent them falling under the influence of Communism," and his further charge against the reformist leaders in the trade unions adopting a more reactionary policy and more aggression against all opposition in the trade unions as the situation becomes more difficult and complicated for capitalism, most certainly applies to those who are today in control of the N.S.W. Trades and Labor Council. This motley crew find a common interest in their anti-Communist politics. The Trotskyites are in addition paying off the debt they owe Kenny & Co. for the continued affiliation to Council of the Origglass disrupters in defiance of a decision of the A.C.T.U. Executive.

A misguided sense of "party loyalty" causes many delegates to vote for such proposals as mentioned here and either to support or pardon the behaviour of this group of political careerists even though in many instances they are conscious of its incorrectness.

Accepting the ill-founded advice of many of their so-called leaders in and out of Parliament on the "Communist menace," these delegates set virtue in the proposals of this clique because they are directed against the Communists. They see also that the proposals are either made or supported by people who as members of the A.L.P. Executive or Labor Party members of the Legislative Council claim to speak in the name of and with the authority of that party.

Support from such delegates gives this disruptive, ill-behaved group the majority of votes on Council and such support gives weight to a campaign which will ultimately disrupt the Labor Party itself and, worse still, disrupt trade union unity and so leave workers an easy prey to the ravages of disunity.

Communists must continue with renewed vigor their efforts to show these delegates how their party loyalty is misused by this unscrupulous gang, just the same as it was previously used by a similar gang on the Council when that body fought and repudiated the Langties.

The facts in relation to decisions made and the conduct of business by this Council must be made known amongst the rank and file of the various unions.

Authority to propose or vote for such decisions, or endorsement of delegates actions in so doing, was never given by a meeting of the rank and file of any of the unions. This behaviour of these people is confined mainly to the Labor Council meetings and little if anything is known of it by the rank and file.

If reports were given to union members by Labor Council Delegates, delegations from such unions as the A.S.E., E.T.U., Meat Workers and A.R.U. could not continue their existing support for this clique and its policies.

## REPLY TO PROFESSOR RAZIN

J. STALIN

(The following is a translation from a recent letter

from Stalin in the Soviet Journal "Bolshevik")

I HAVE received your letter of January 30 concerning Clausewitz and your short theses on War and Military Arts.

I. You ask: "Have not Lenin's statements evaluating Clausewitz become outdated?"

In my opinion the question is wrongly posed.

From such a posing of the question, it might be thought that Lenin had analysed the military doctrine and military works of Clausewitz, given them a military evaluation and left us a heritage of a series of guiding propositions on leadership.

Such a posing of the question is wrong because such propositions by Lenin on the military doctrine of Clausewitz and his works do not exist.

Lenin differed from Engels in that he did not consider himself an expert in military affairs. It was not only in the past before the October Revolution that he did not consider himself an expert in military affairs, but also after the October Revolution up to the very end of the Civil War. During the Civil War, Lenin gave us, who were then the still young comrades of the Central Committee, the task of "studying military affairs absolutely thoroughly." As for himself, he frankly told us that it was already late for him to study military affairs.

This also explains why, in his comments on Clausewitz and observations on Clausewitz's book, Lenin does not touch upon purely military questions such as questions of military strategy and tactics and their mutual relationship or the mutual connections between the offensive and the retreat, defence and the counter-offensive and so forth.

What was there in Clausewitz, then, that interested Lenin, and why did he praise him?

These policies must be exposed not only in debates on the Labor Council and in the Communist Party press, but in the meetings of unions affiliated to the Council. In this way delegates to the Council will either truthfully reflect the views of and act in accordance with the real desires of the workers they represent, or they will be replaced by delegates who will.

The Communists cannot and do not demand that only Communists or Communist Party supporters be elected to represent unions on such bodies as Trades and Labor Councils, but because we are prepared to do so ourselves we do say that those who are elected should be charged with and honor the obligation of truthfully representing the interests of workers and not those of a disruptive group of careerists.

This is a matter of concern not only for Communists but for all those unionists (and they are the majority) who wish to maintain the Labor Council as an independent, fighting union organisation.

He praised Clausewitz above all because, without being a Marxist, Clausewitz, who in his day enjoyed the authority of an expert in military affairs, confirmed in his works the well-known Marxist propositions that there is a direct connection between war and politics, that politics give birth to war, that war is a continuation of politics by violent means.

Lenin required the support of Clausewitz in this matter in order more to convict Plekhanov, Kautsky and others of Social-Chauvinism, of Social-Imperialism.

He further praised Clausewitz because Clausewitz confirmed in his works the proposition, which is correct from the Marxist point of view, that certain unfavourable conditions, the retreat is a legitimate form of struggle as the offensive. Lenin required the support of Clausewitz here in order once more to convict the "left" Communists who did not recognise the retreat as a legitimate form of struggle.

It follows that Lenin approached the works of Clausewitz not as a military man, but as a politician and was interested in those questions in Clausewitz's work which demonstrate the connection of war with politics.

Thus when critically evaluating the military doctrine of Clausewitz, we, the heirs of Lenin, are not freed by any directions from Lenin which limit our freedom of criticism.

It follows from this that your estimation of Comrade M's article which criticises Clausewitz's military doctrine as "an anti-Leninist sortie" and as a "revision" of Lenin's estimation, is wide of the mark.

2. Should we criticise the essence of Clausewitz's Military Doctrine?

Yes. We should. From the standpoint of the interests of our work and of the military science of our times, we are bound to criticise not only Clausewitz, but also Moltke, Schlieffen, Ludendorff, Keitel and other exponents of the military ideology of Germany. In the last thirty years Germany has twice unleashed bloody war against the world and both times she has been beaten. Is this accidental? Of course not. Does this not mean that not only Germany as a whole, but also her military ideology could not stand the test? Undoubtedly it does. Everybody knows with what respect the military men of the entire world, including even our Russian military men, regarded the military authorities of Germany. Is it necessary to finish with this undeserved respect? It is necessary. Well, for that you must have criticism and particularly from our side.

Am I on the side of the victors over Germany? So far as Clausewitz in particular is concerned, he is, of course, outdated as a military authority. Clausewitz was in fact a representative of the manufacturing period of war. But now we are in the machine period of war. Undoubtedly the machine period calls for new military theoreticians. It is ridiculous to take lessons now from Clausewitz.

It is impossible to move forward and to advance science without subjecting outdated propositions and the judgment of well-known authorities to critical analysis. This applies not only to authorities in military affairs, but also to classics of Marxism.

Engels once said that General Barclay de Tolle was the only Russian Commander of the period of 1812 who merited attention. Engels, of course, was mistaken, for Kutusov as a Commander stood indisputably head and shoulders above Barclay de Tolle. But even in our time you can still find people who will support this mistaken opinion of Engels a haute voix. In our criticism we must not be guided by individual propositions and opinions of the classics, but by that famous direction once given by Lenin:

"We do not at all regard the theory of Marx as something complete and inviolable; we are convinced, on the contrary, that it has laid the cornerstones of that science which Socialists must further advance in all directions if they do not wish to lag behind life. We think that it is particularly necessary for Russian Socialists independently to analyse the theory of Marx, for this theory provides only general guiding propositions which must be applied differently in England from France, in France from Germany, in Germany from Russia, according to the particular circumstances."

Such an approach is even more obligatory for us in relation to military authorities.

3. As for your short theses on "War and Military Art," I can only make some general remarks about their schematic character. In the thesis there is too much philosophy and abstract propositions. The terminology of Clausewitz concerning grammar and the logic of war rates on the ear. The question of a Party approach to military science is too primitively posed. The dithyrambs in honour of Stalin grate on the ears and simply make one uncomfortable to read them. There is no section on the counter-offensive (not to be confused with the counter-attack). I am speaking of a counter-offensive after a successful enemy offensive, which however has not produced decisive results, and in the course of which the defence gathers its forces, passes to the counter-offensive and inflicts a decisive defeat on the enemy. I think that a well organised counter-offensive is a very interesting form of offensive. As an historian you should interest yourself in this matter. The old Parthians knew already of such a counter-offensive when they drew the Roman General Crassus and his troops deep into their country and then struck with a counter-offensive and destroyed them. Our genius, General Kutusov also knew of this very well when he destroyed Napoleon and his army with the help of a well prepared counter-offensive.

THE ATTACK ON SECULAR EDUCATION

"PEDAGOGUE"

AS the power and influence of the Soviet Union grows stronger and wider every day, and in all countries Communism is attracting more of the best people to its ranks, the die-hard Imperialists employ every weapon they control against progress, and, as ever, summon Religion as the handmaid of Reaction. Reactionaries of every type rant about the decay of moral values in schools and homes, and to confuse the minds of the unenlightened, attribute this behaviour, delinquency, crime, industrial unrest, war to secular education.

Annual speech days produced such a fanfare of these vapourings in Victoria in 1946, that it is opportune to inquire from what quarters the demands for religious education are coming and why.

Secular Education in Victoria has always been based on popular demand, based on the recognition that religious education tends to be inefficient and divides the people. When Victoria separated from New South Wales in 1851, education was under the two board system, church schools being grouped under the Denominational Schools Board and secular schools under the Board of National Education.

Mr. H. C. E. Childers, the first inspector of denominational schools, in his first report in 1851 stated that he found that "religious jealousies prevented united action in securing a good school-house and a capable teacher." The people were disgusted with the sectarian rivalries and why.

ensuing agitation resulted in the Common School Act of 1862, by which all schools receiving a Government Grant were brought under the one board. Church schools still continued, however, and were opposed to popular education, with the result that in 1866 100,000 children of school age were not at school.

That the people were determined to end the prostitution of education to religion was evidenced by the slogan that swept the colony in 1872: "Compulsory, free and secular education." "The Age" fought a great campaign along with the people, the result being the return of the Liberals in overwhelming numbers and the introduction of the Education Bill in 1872 in accordance with the people's mandate. Section 21 of the new act reads: "In every State School secular education only shall be given. No teacher shall give any instruction other than secular in any State school building," a clause which Sir John Latham described in 1944 as "the bulwark of religious freedom."

This Act remained inviolate until the Dunstan Ministry put through the Education (Patriotic Ceremonies) Bill in 1940, making it compulsory for every child to make a declaration beginning, "I love God," a contradiction of all the Education Acts from 1872 to 1928. Too little notice was taken of this. This amending Act must be repealed, as an unjustifiable encroachment on the civil liberties of the people and a violation of the individual conscience. Under this clause, children of Jehovah's Witnesses were excluded from State Schools in 1940 for refusal to take part in "patriotic" ceremonies, at their parents' orders, although, ironically enough, they were also asked to repeat "and cheerfully obey my parents."

The first steady and persistent attack on the Secular Clause came in the first quarter of the century, Protestant Churchmen striving to introduce "undenominational" scripture lessons into the curriculum. This open agitation included a demand for a referendum to secure alteration of the Education Act. In defence of the secular clause of the Act, a League was formed of legal and business men and members of the intelligentsia, including Mr. (now Sir) John Latham, Henry Giles Turner and Mr. Hingston. Strong opposition to the change came on the one hand from the Catholic Church which then had few schools, and feared indoctrination of its flock, and on the other from the Labor Party, which jealously one of its members (the late Hon. D. Smith M.L.A.) who, while opposed to the change, supported the idea of a referendum. The people again spoke with no uncertain voice in the 1920 elections, which the sponsors of a referendum on Secular Education were so completely routed that the topic has never been revived.

However, the churches secured one concession, by regulation from the Education Department, that churchmen or their accredited deputies could

conduct religious instruction in the schools during the first or last half hour of the morning or afternoon session, on the technicality that the schools were not then in session. The churches have never availed themselves fully of this privilege, the instructors being frequently absent of late, and the quality of instructors has been of a level that has made teachers (some of whom remain in the room in the interests of their own discipline) revolt at it being deemed "religious."

From 1940 a new attack began on the Secular clause, a "snide" attack, in which secret approaches were made and pressure brought to bear on political parties and individual politicians. The attacks came from Church leaders, Head Masters of registered schools, and "Liberal Politicians," and the object was two-fold, to get state grants for Church Schools, and to secure religious teaching in State Schools.

Church Schools, which are class schools even more than denominational schools, and cater for the bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie, have flourished of late years in Victoria. Today, they are confronted with demands for extra expenditure for modern education, and with the demands of parents faced with the rising cost of living and high taxation for reduced fees. Moreover that same industrial unrest, so lamented by many churchmen, has entered their strongholds. To attract brilliant men for Leaving and Matriculation Classes the Public Schools must offer salaries higher than the State Department; naturally other male teachers then seek to improve their salaries by collective agreements. Women teachers in registered schools have secured a Wages Board and an award ranging from £234-£324 per year, a marked advance on their former miserly wages—and so the registered schools must secure State Grants if they are to survive.

Mr. Darling, of Geelong Grammar School, made the position clear in the report given in "The Age" 18/4/44, of his address at the Religion and Life Conference at Warrnambool.

"The present divorce occasioned by the word 'Secular' in the Education Act made it impossible either for the State to subsidise Church Schools or to supply adequate religious teaching of its own. Mr. Darling suggested first the subsidising on a 50% basis of church schools, including the Roman Catholic system. That included the contention that individual churches had the right to educate their children as they thought right."

Reaction also plans that education shall become subservient to the creed of the ruling class by the medium of religious teaching. Mr. Darling put this clearly also.

"The second factor was the removal of the word 'secular' from the Act, which would enable the daily opening of State Schools with prayer and worship. Religious instruction should be conducted in school time by school

teachers who were already in the system. Training in the religious side of the work should be part of the future training of teachers. The call to teaching as a Christian vocation should be made clearly to Christian boys and girls."

The Catholic Church, which has a vast educational system today, now favours the removal of the Secular clause both because it advocates Obscurantism as a means of preventing the growth of Scientific Marxism, and because the introduction of religion into State Schools would provide the argument that Catholic children are therefore excluded from them, and the State must provide for their education.

An early attempt was made to secure the support of State School teachers for introduction of religious teaching when a resolution from the Head Teachers' Branch came before the 1943 Conference for debate. "That there be an amendment to the Act to provide for a fuller measure of religious teaching in the curriculum." "The Herald" (Murdoch press) ran columns in support of this resolution, but the teachers threw it out.

The two churches most concerned with this attempt to remove the secular clause are the two most sectarian, the Anglican and the Catholic. In 1944 the Council of Churches took a deputation to Premier Dunstan, requesting:

1. That the word secular be removed from the Education Act.
2. That legal provision be made to allow accredited representatives of religious denominations to give religious instruction on the basis of an agreed syllabus twice a week during school hours to children when parents are willing.
3. That ministers of religion when authorised by the recognised authority of their denomination have the right to give instruction to children of their own denomination.

(This clause would open the door to sectarian differences in every State School. It is also educationally unsound in that it groups children of all ages into one denominational class.)

The smooth Mr. Dunstan showed favourable inclinations to the deputations, purring: "In a Christian land, surely we are all Christians."

At this stage a second Education Act Defence League was formed by progressive teachers, including Communists, Churchmen, Rationalists and Scientists, to maintain the "secular" clause and to oppose attempts to have it removed. A second deputation of legal men, clergy, journalists, scientists, rationalists, saw the Premier to stress that the removal of the clause would be a retrogressive step. Various clergy became alert to the reasons for Catholic support for the change, with the result that several Ministers' Fraternals sent letters of protest to the Premier, who decided to do nothing.

At the end of 1945 the Labor Party was returned, and the position was more secure. Still

avoiding open attack, the reactionary forces make covert sorties against first one point in the line, then another, so that the League has to be constantly vigilant. It has called several public meetings, has enrolled adherents on a subscription fee of 1/-, and maintains a continuous series of press replies to letters opposing secular education. This year it has exposed two attempts of the Anglican Church to alter the status quo by (1) the introduction into Secondary Schools of a number of teachers trained and paid by the Church to conduct daily lessons on religion, an attractive offer which the present Minister flatly turned down when it was made to him by a deputation, (2) an amendment of the Act by a clause defining "secular" as non-sectarian, so that the churches could introduce an agreed syllabus into schools. After radio debates with the Anglican protagonists of this idea they retreated to their camp, agreeing that as so far the church had made little use of its privilege of half hour per week, it must give its attention to that work before it seeks to advance.

The greatest danger is that through back-stairs influence the League may be confronted with a "fait accompli." Secrecy and unconstitutionality accompanied the introduction into the Education Course at Melbourne University of a new subject, "Method of Religious Teaching," an arbitrary act of the Vice-Chancellor. Through correspondence with the League the matter was ventilated and it seems likely that the course will not be repeated next year.

The Catholic Church continues a more open assault. After the New Education Conference the secretary of the Assisian's Guild (Catholic Teachers) attacked its support of secular education and its materialistic philosophy. Throughout the conference these teachers had questioned lecturers about secular education and had pursued the Polish delegate with queries designed to suggest that the Soviet was oppressing Poland. Once again the supporters of religious teaching are identified with the dispensers of anti-Soviet propaganda and advocates of World War II.

Dr. Mannix recently opposed Commonwealth Grants for education, which all progressive teaching organisations desire as the means of providing equal educational opportunity to every Australian girl and boy. Dr. Mannix talks of double taxation of Catholics, ignoring the fact that the neutral State Schools are open to his adherents, and that he is really advocating increased taxation of the majority for his minority.

In 1947 the Education Act Defence League, which is not an anti-religious body, as the presence of clergymen on its committee confirms, will go over to the offensive. In the interests of efficient education of the children, of tolerance, of national unity, it will not only defend the secular clause, but strive to have religious teaching completely removed from State Schools. By pamphlets and public meetings it will expose the unethical nature

of so-called "religious teaching," its bias to anti-Semitism, most pronounced in Easter lessons about the crucifixion, and its general reactionary nature. It will seek to cause the people of Victoria to demand that Section 21 be interpreted as intended in 1872.

Communists have a part to play in this struggle. By withdrawing their children from religious instruction, under the conscience clause, they can assist in demonstrating that religious instruction is not desired. They must expose the reactionary aims of religious zealots. How significant it was that Mr. A. J. Law, Principal of the Teachers' College, preaching in the Anglican Cathedral, should in the same address plead for scripture readings in school books, and condemn the Transport Strike, while Rev. W. Bottomley, chairman

## SIR JAMES JEANS

J.W.

THE late Sir James Jeans wrote a number of popular books to explain modern physics and astronomy to the layman. However, as all his writings are so heavily coloured by his philosophy, the ordinary reader is more likely to be confused than enlightened.

There are many other scientific writers with a literary style at least as pleasing and entertaining as that of Jeans. Yet Jeans is probably more widely known and more widely quoted than any other. In particular, he and Eddington have been quoted with satisfaction from more pulpits than all the rest of the modern scientists put together.

Prof. J. B. S. Haldane is another eminent scientist who has written widely on scientific subjects for the layman. His earlier books enjoyed a considerable amount of popularity. Later he became a Marxist and books like his *Marxist Philosophy and the Sciences* are hardly mentioned in respectable society.

Why did Jeans enjoy the esteem of the bourgeois world?

In class society those philosophies which support the existing order are the ones most favoured by the supporters of the ruling class.

Thus during last century the most publicised popular philosophies were those like Herbert Spencer's, which distorted the scientific knowledge of evolution and transformed Darwin's conception of the 'survival of the fittest' into a philosophical system which justified unscrupulous, cut-throat competition.

Now it is the age of monopoly capitalism, of capitalism in decay, which tends to fascism. The philosophy of fascism involves blind faith in a 'leader' and mystical conceptions of 'blood' and 'race'. The belief in human reason, in man's ability to know, understand and use the laws of nature and society, is discouraged. Whereas rationalism and materialism were the philosophies which

of the Education Act Defence League, should support the strike and expose its origin in poor wages and conditions. Communists must make it clear that it is not lack of religion that causes misbehaviour in schools, but crowded class rooms, and lack of teaching facilities; that delinquency and crime spring from the same roots as industrial unrest and war, the deficiencies of the capitalist system. India and Palestine provide terrible examples of the use of religion to divide communities; the removal of the secular clause would achieve a similar result.

We must ensure that secular education and progress have the support of every Communist, and that they are maintained by the eternal vigilance which is the price of religious liberty.

assisted the French bourgeoisie to overthrow the authority of the feudal aristocracy, now materialism has become the philosophy of the working class. Anything which can be used to draw workers and intellectuals away from the revolutionary working-class movement is used by those who support the ruling class.

The philosophy of Sir James Jeans is so used, just as the Victorian philosophers drew false conclusions from the biological science of the day, so did Jeans draw false conclusions from modern physical science.

Jeans' influence spreads far beyond the readers of his books. Because of the growth of scientific knowledge, pure religious faith has lost much of its former appeal. Idealists of all sorts like now to refer to some scientific 'authority' to support their arguments. Hence the sayings of Jeans are quoted far and wide.

Lenin found it necessary to write a long book, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, to combat the influence of the 'scientific', idealistic sceptical philosophers Mach, Avenarius and others of his day. A study of that book would also expose Jeans' philosophy, which is basically similar.

In this short article I can deal only briefly with one or two aspects of Jeans' philosophy.

Jeans professed to derive his conclusions from modern scientific knowledge. To those not versed in science or philosophy, therefore, his theories would seem to possess a high degree of authority. Yet his reasoning from known scientific facts to his speculations on the nature of God and man is completely illogical.

Our modern knowledge of nature and society has been possible only because of the basic assumption that all natural and social phenomena are subject to definite laws. There is no outside, supernatural meddling with those laws, says the scientist.

Were it not so, were events subject to interference by some outside power, it would be impossible to discover any underlying, consistent scientific law. Yet scientists have been able to discover more and more laws governing the behaviour of natural processes and have proved the truth of those laws by accurately predicting what will happen under particular circumstances.

In the same way social scientists can predict the course of development of society under particular historical conditions. Marxists were able to predict the coming depression in 1929, for example.

It is because Marxists have grasped the underlying laws of the development of society that they are able to hasten and make less violent the collapse of capitalism. Were it not for their knowledge of the laws of society, Marxists would be as helpless as Utopian dreamers in attempting to change the world. On the other hand, if man's destiny were guided by some external Power, not subject to natural laws, but capable of creating events in history in order to punish offending nations or to demonstrate his power, it would be useless to attempt a scientific study of the world and the way to change it.

Yet Jeans, by distorting the findings of modern science, introduces a mystical and sceptical conception of the world.

How does he do this?

Here is an example. An important statement of modern physics is Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty. The use of the term 'Principle of Uncertainty' could quite easily confuse the layman into thinking that the scientists had now discovered that when we get down to the basic particles of matter definite laws no longer apply, but that the behaviour of electrons is determined by chance or by the action of some mysterious power. And so the Principle of Uncertainty has been seized upon with delight by all those who believe in the existence of some supernatural power and desire a weapon to attack the materialists.

Their arguments are fortified by scientists like Jeans and Eddington who also use this Principle to justify their idealistic philosophy. Thus Jeans says: 'Heisenberg now makes it appear that nature abhors accuracy and precision above all things. Also, that 'the future may not be so unalterably determined by the past as we used to think; in part at least it may rest on the knees of whatever Gods there be'.

If electrons and atoms were not accurate and precise, atomic research would be a chancy affair. But the success of the atomic bomb shows that scientists have been able to find out very accurately how atoms and electrons behave. As everyone knows, the bomb was made on the basis of a theoretical understanding of the laws of behaviour of atoms and required extremely accurate and precise calculations. That these laws did hold,

with no uncertainty, was proved by the atomic bomb.

The Principle of Uncertainty does not in fact contradict the basic scientific assumption of natural law. In brief, it states that it is not possible for an observer to determine exactly both the position and speed of an electron. To draw the philosophical conclusions that Jeans does is completely unscientific.

The belief in a mysterious, supernatural force is the main theme of Jeans' philosophy. The very title of his most famous book, *The Mysterious Universe*, suggests it. In his presidential address to the British Association in 1934 he talked of 'a mysterious world outside ourselves to which our minds can never penetrate'.

He attempts also to show that men, or at least their thoughts, have something akin to the 'Great Architect of the Universe' himself. He suggests that because we find that natural phenomena can be described in mathematical terms—which he asserts are the result of 'pure thought'—then the Being that made the Universe must think mathematically. If man by purely abstract thinking, says Jeans, derives a system of mathematics which is the same system that God used in designing the Universe then man must be akin to God. And so, he says, 'from the intrinsic evidence of his creation, the Great Architect of the Universe now begins to appear as a pure mathematician'. Dr. L. Susan Stebbing comments: 'In short, a Being well fitted to become the President of the Royal Society—a colleague of Jeans himself'.

There is nothing remarkable in the fact that nature obeys mathematical laws when we consider that these laws were themselves derived from a study of nature, and are tested by an examination of nature. But Jeans ignores the materialistic interpretation for his idealistic speculation.

And where does all this lead? Whatever Jeans intended, it does in fact lead to a faith in 'authority' rather than to belief in human reason. It leads to a mysticism which supports reactionary policies. The mysticism of the Nazi's belief in 'blood and leadership' is assisted by philosophical idealism such as that of Jeans.

Let us think that this is far-fetched and that Jeans' ideas are quite harmless and legitimate speculations, let me quote a typical passage which shows how support is given by the philosophising scientists to reactionary ideas.

'In place of the older materialism there is now coming into prominence a new idealism. The interesting fact about this change of atmosphere is that leading scientists are putting forward spiritual interpretations of Nature (e.g. Jeans, Einstein, Eddington).

'The optimistic faith of scientists and philosophers that reason would at last triumph has given way either to despair or to a recognition of the severe limitations of science. The remarkable

feature of the surrender of this naive belief in the future of science is that it has been made by the scientists themselves. It has come to light that the laws which were supposed to reign throughout the physical world do not reign at all in the sub-microscopic phase of that world. The foundations of the physical world do not obey what is known as physical law. The electron has a particle-aspect and a wave-aspect, and there can be no way of thinking these two aspects together. This refers to Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty. The modern atomic theory even more than the theory of Relativity is a shock to the old ways of thinking. Of course, it is a shock which science has administered to itself.

"What has happened in science has happened at the same time in all other spheres wherein human reason seeks to penetrate to the secrets of existence, so that the man who is intellectually sensitive is forced to make two admissions—often with sorrow. 'Science is incompetent to reach the secret of existence. Philosophy is incompetent to reach the secret of existence'.

"This is the point reached by modern thought. What is to be the next step? There are two possible answers. The first, 'Therefore there is no way of reaching the secret of existence.' The second

is to admit that Reason has discovered her limitations. Knowledge her boundaries, and both must be supplemented or superseded by a Revelation. This revelation is known only to Faith."

(Rev. A. C. Watson, in 'Christ and Tomorrow,') The writer then proceeds to give the following 'illustrative quotation' from Sir Michael Sadler. "The young are eager and hungry for faith, for work, for a leader whom they can trust and follow without question. They are not interested in what at one time I would have gone to the stake for—I mean liberty of thought. Give them the possibility of ardour of achievement, and they would not give a hang about the freedom of the press. Once the young have found their leader and accepted his purpose, there will be a revolution."

The 'revolution' that Sir Michael Sadler talks about is not a revolution, it is a fascist counter-revolution. We see, then, from the passages quoted, how a justification for a faith in a leader—a 'fuhrer'—can follow directly from the confused writings of Jeans and his like.

Because it leads along false paths and away from the scientific revolutionary movement is the reason why Jeans's philosophy is so much admired by those who wish to retain the existing order at all costs.

ies" and national oppression and, not least, the need or inevitability of war.

It is true that the West did make substantial contributions to civilisation. But that was in the past. These claims of superiority are applied to the present-day world, i.e. in the era of imperialist decline. They are utterly false because the very essence of imperialism is, politically, intense exploitation and warring and, culturally, negativism, pornography, irrationalism and universal corruption. A social system that drenches the earth periodically with its saturnalias of blood has no longer a right to exist—let alone call itself 'superior'!

Hence the arrant hypocrisy. Oppression always cloaks itself in respectable garb. Marx observed that 'the greater the development of antagonism between the growing forces of production and the extant social order, the more does the ideology of the ruling class become permeated with hypocrisy. In addition, the more effectively life reveals the mendacious character of this ideology, the more does the language used by the dominant class become sublime and virtuous.'

The historic contribution of the West to mankind was the capitalist mode of production, which represented an enormous economic, scientific and cultural advance over the earlier feudal society. The bourgeois-democratic revolution provided the basis for mankind's eventual emancipation from classes and class oppression. But, among other shortcomings, capitalist democracy is a democracy enjoyed almost exclusively by the rich. Fascism is the ultimate in horror, but capitalism also caused some of the most terrible sufferings of the masses both at home (children as young as six and even four years working in the mills and mines), and abroad ('the white peoples are known mainly for their crimes'). Let the apologist for Western culture explain democracy, freedom, human dignity, etc., in a society dominated by economic insecurity, slums, poor education and hopelessly inadequate health services for the overwhelming majority of the population! What 'respect for the human personality' was there during the depression when hundreds of thousands of independent, free-spirited Australians were thrown on the dole? Furthermore, in this century in the West, and as occasion suited the ruling class, capitalist democracy quickly descended into what Lenin called the "bloody morass" of militarism, ruthless censorship, and the savage deprivation of the most elementary rights of the toilers.

Some of the myths and hypocrisies of Western capitalist society are fairly easily exposed, e.g., the commercialisation of sport, commercialisation of Mother's Day, the corruption in bourgeois art, and so on. Others present a more difficult problem. Take the legend, fortified by thousands of books, that Scotland Yard guards the public against crime. It does, but only to a limited degree; in any case, the capitalists must have some means, or agency, to protect them and their property from the depredations of burglars and forgers. But the real func-

tion of Scotland Yard (also the notorious FBI in USA, the Royal North-West Mounted Police of Canada, and in Australia, Dr. Ewart's Commonwealth Investigation Bureau) is, as an arm of the capitalist state apparatus for the organisation of espionage and provocation against the Labor Movement, Scotland Yard with its legendary 'great detectives' and "trained investigators" has always been one of the chief weapons employed by Britain's imperialists against their own workers, the colonial peoples and, far from least, against the Soviet Union.

The patriotism of the bourgeoisie is another legend. Bourgeois patriotism had some reality in that earlier period in history when the bourgeoisie were creating the great modern nations. But history is already full of examples of bourgeois treason, in the West no less than in the East (e.g., the French capitalists uniting with the invading Prussians against the Paris Commune; Britain's millionaires rearming Hitlerite Germany; the tender solicitude shown by the Australian capitalist class and their press for those individuals charged with aiding Japan during the war).

Two other proofs may be adduced—

1. Military theory. The first "principle of war" for centuries was known as the "Maintenance of the Objective." This meant simply that when Country A went to war with Country B, the objective of victory over B was to be maintained at all costs; every consideration—supplies, alliances, training of troops, costs, etc.—had to be subordinated to that one single aim. Sound doctrine, without doubt. But since the October Revolution, this first principle has been dropped from military text-books in Western countries. Why? Because if imperialist Country A (England) is at war with imperialist Country B (Germany) the objective of victory might have to be modified in the course of the struggle. Victory might turn out to be not at all desirable, or not too desirable. In fact, victory might endanger the victor! Hence, the Munichism after Hitler's accession to power; hence the "switch-the-war" plots in the early part of the war; hence the current moves to restore the military power of Germany and Japan. And hence the concern of the Truman and Atlees for the monarchist-fascist regime of Greece.

2. Treason as a Virtue. Another proof is the contrasting treatment by the Soviet Union and Britain of their respective "fifth columns." The Soviet suppressed the Trotskyites, a number of those wreckers and spies being executed. In Britain, one of the traitors, Grand Admiral Sir Barry Domville, was interned for a short period, but he continued to collect his £1200 pension!

What price patriotism? Here are two strikingly opposed civilisations. To this day Trotsky and his fellow-gangsters are "vindicated" in capitalist newspapers and in rightwing labor journals.

The American imperialists are also adept in donning the mask of culture, religion, honor and democracy. President Wilson set the fashion in

## Questions & Answers

conducted by  
L.H. GOULD

What is this much-talked-of "Western" culture? Is there anything in history, ethics or philosophy to substantiate the claim of superiority of the West over the East?—E. F. Walden.

The direct refutation of these hypocritical claims is that the West produced imperialist oppression and imperialism war—including two world wars and some 80 smaller military conflicts since 1914! It was Western civilisation that spawned Hitler, Petain, Franco, Mussolini, Laval and Mosley. The fifth column and Nazi gas chambers, wholesale massacres of Jews and other peoples, and the current preparations for atomic and bacteriological warfare are the most recent expressions of the "Western way of life."

Hitler was a Westerner. If it be argued that he wasn't quite so Western, so gentlemanly, so refined, so sportsmanlike as the Anglo-Saxon, the reply is that Hitler learned most of his terrorist technique from Anglo-American imperialism, e.g., the oppression of colonial peoples, or the Ludlow Massacre in USA when the authorities shot and burned alive striking miners, their wives and children. Hitlerism was "accepted" by the West in all the "best

circles." In Australia (which is also, of course, of the West) UAP premier of NSW Stevens accepted a medal from the Nazis; NSW Police Commissioner Mackay went to Nazi Germany to "study" police methods there. There are of course differences between the East and West in tradition, mores, culture, but they are unessential differences; and differences exist between any two Western, or two Eastern countries, and between sections of any single country. In the fundamentals of social outlook and practice, however, there is no difference between the MacArthurs, Trumans, Menzies, Francos, Mussolins and Churchills.

Today, politically, the "East" is decidedly very far ahead of the "West." This is not because of any inherent superiority of Eastern peoples; there is no such thing. It is because the peoples of Eastern Europe (Russians, Czechs, Poles, etc.) have advanced far beyond the social order of the West. In the East, the exploitation of man by man has completely ended, or is ending; and there, culturally, society rejects categorically the old conceptions (so beloved of the master class in the West) of inequality of the sexes, the master-servant relation or any form of servitude or dependence, race "theor-

modern times with his call "to make the world safe for democracy." He kept intoning this plea even while scheming to make USA the first imperialist power on earth, and to strangle the new Soviet Republic. General MacArthur seldom omits the Deity in his pronouncements; the billionaire Andrew Mellon "always made it a practice of taking God into partnership with him"! The editorials in the Australian yellow press provide daily examples of the capacity of the parasites to use "sublime and virtuous" language.

Here are a few short figures about American capitalist ("moral, cultured, democratic") civilisation. They are supplied by its own officials and statisticians. In studying them one realises the heavy tasks confronting the American Communists, trade unions and other progressive forces. Five to six million persons live by crime; one in every 11 is "lainted to some degree" with syphilis; one out of 16 will visit as a patient a mental institution in the course of his life; one out of every five books is "designedly pornographic." This is official capitalist society today which, according to Truman, is to act as guardian of "free" peoples in all parts of the world!

To summarise, Western (bourgeois) culture and morality are as moribund and repulsive as the society they reflect. All values become perverted in a society where money-making is the highest aim. And more and more is Western culture characterised by

irrationalism, by rejection of science (except for war), by the repudiation of those very cultural achievements associated with the emergence and development of capitalism. When a scientist, a really great scientist, like Sir James Jeans can say in all seriousness: "nature abhors accuracy and precision above all things," we are given a fitting commentary on imperialism in extreme decline (recall Lenin's branding of the Jeans' and Eddingtons of his day as "scientific salesmen of theology"). All the talk about democracy, ideals, "the things we hold dear," freedom, etc., only cloak the black magic, gloom and negativism of a society hurrying to its doom.

The proletarians, while part of that society, are also its gravediggers. In fighting for their own future, they must skillfully and resolutely combat the lies and shams, whether in the guise of a "new" philosophy or the regular outpourings of the publicists of the capitalist class.

[References: All Marxist works deal in one way or another with this subject. The most available perhaps are the *Manifesto of the Communist Party and Lenin's Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade*. For a clear, if unwitting, description of the corruption, treason, double-dealing, hypocrisy and bureaucratism of capitalist society the reader is referred to such works as the *War Memoirs of Lloyd George*.]

## BOOK REVIEW

History of the Civil War in the U.S.S.R.  
Vol. 2. The Great Proletarian  
Revolution.

JULIE LATTER.

[It is almost a decade since a Commission of the C.P.S.U. commenced the preparation of the full history of the Civil War, and at least six years since Volume I was received in Australia. The compilation of this present volume was completed in 1941 and was published in Russian early in the following year. But for the Hitlerite attack in June, 1941, we should doubtless have had the translation soon afterwards.

The authors and editors include many world-famous figures such as Gorky, Molotov, Voroshilov, Kirov, Zhdanov and Stalin.

The period is the same as that covered by John Reed's *Ten Days That Shook The World*, a book which was eagerly devoured by English-speaking people at a time when no other history of the early days of the October Revolution was available. That book had, however, many shortcomings, due both to lack of adequate documentation and factual information, and to the absence of a Marxist

approach and interpretation. Consequently, Reed's book was confusing and hard to read.

Volume II of *The History of the Civil War* supplies what was lacking in our conception of the struggle. The narrative is freshly and vividly written and the personality of Lenin emerges three-dimensionally from the text. The value of the book to active Communists, however, lies in the political lessons which are drawn from the events of 1917, and the clarification of the political strategy underlying the course formulated by Lenin and the Bolshevik Party.

A detailed account is given of the work of preparing for the armed insurrection, of convincing the Party that the crisis had matured, of exposing Kerensky, and the Mensheviks still within the recently-formed Soviets, the participation of the Bolsheviks in the Pre-Parliament and the subsequent boycott after a short declaration aimed at destroying the illusion that a peaceful development of the

Revolution was possible, concentration of the Bolshevik groups in the factories and barracks to facilitate choice of the correct time at which to start the insurrection.

The correction of mistakes was stressed by Lenin: "It is not dangerous for the fighting Party of the advanced class to make mistakes; it is dangerous, however, to persist in error, to refuse out of false pride to admit and correct mistakes."

While Lenin emphasised the fact that the political fate of the people would be decided primarily by the victory of the revolution in Petrograd and in Moscow, the Bolshevik Party never assumed that the rest of the country would automatically follow Petrograd and Moscow. Mobilisation took place all over the country and methods of work to win the masses to the Bolshevik struggle had to be adapted to local conditions.

Even before the uprising, the followers of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev played a treacherous role and attempted to sabotage the Revolution by an allegedly "democratic" resolution to postpone a decision until the arrival of Bolshevik delegates to the Congress. When this was defeated, they completed their treachery by handing a statement of their disagreements with the Central Committee to the Menshevik press, thus informing the enemy that an insurrection was contemplated. The Bolsheviks continued their preparations undeterred by this betrayal.

Lenin showed himself as the great master of revolutionary strategy and tactics. He formulated rules for the conduct of the armed insurrection. "You must concentrate a great superiority of forces at the decisive point, at the decisive moment, otherwise the enemy, who has the advantage of being better prepared and organised, will destroy the insurgents."

"Once the insurrection has begun, you must act with the greatest determination and take the offensive without fail. Defence means death to a great insurrection."

No sooner had the Bolsheviks seized power than they were beset by all the problems of building the infant Socialist state. "The food situation in revolutionary Petrograd was extremely grave. All

the work of keeping the capital supplied with food was conducted under the direct guidance of Lenin and Stalin."

The concluding chapter states:

"Not a single revolution in human history had destroyed the obstacles standing in the path of the new society as thoroughly and relentlessly as the October Revolution swept away the obstacles standing in the path of the new Socialist society. And this gigantic task of releasing the land from its feudal fetters was accomplished in the first few weeks of the proletarian dictatorship. The bourgeois state machine was demolished; bureaucracy was shattered to its foundations. The peoples swept away the ancient caste barriers, abolished landlord rule—feudal landownership, and reduced the obsolete feudal institutions to ashes.

"But the revolution did not confine itself to breaking up the old. While destroying, the people also built on a vast scale, and with creative energy. Out of the flames of the revolutionary conflagration an entirely new state administration arose. In the place of the old and disintegrated army, the foundations of a new workers' and peasants' army were laid. New organs for the management of the country's economy were created.

"Thus, the foundations of the Socialist society began to be laid in the very first days of the existence of the Soviet Republic."

The book has a detailed chronology of the events of the period it covers, a full list of references and sources quoted in every chapter, and a comprehensive index of names and a list of newspapers quoted. It is profusely illustrated with many full-page reproductions of drawings and paintings by Soviet artists, as well as numerous smaller productions and photographs of Soviet leaders. Outstanding among these is a perfect facsimile of the resolution passed by the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party on October 10th, 1917, on armed insurrection, drafted by Lenin himself.

Beautifully produced by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, the book can be obtained from Current Book Distributors or progressive bookshops (price 15/-).

## CAN YOU ALTER CAT NATURE?

PROFESSOR J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

AFTER a lecture which I recently gave on the question, "Are we losing our morality?" someone asked me, "Can one change human nature?"

I don't know the answer, because I don't know what "human nature" means. But if you put the question in the more concrete form: "Can one change the sort of things which people want to do?" the answer is undoubtedly Yes.

In one type of society competition is a strong motive, though it may be competition for money,

the esteem of one's fellows, or the prospect of escaping hell-fire.

In others, co-operation is an equally strong motive. People want to work with and for others, and are not interested in excelling them. Probably the ideal is a blend of the two, where everyone tries to be useful, but is quite pleased if he is more useful than his neighbor.

When a scientist is asked a question of this kind, he often gets a great deal of information from anti-



mals. One can experiment on them, and they are less likely to do what is expected of them to please mummy or teacher, and therefore one gets a clearer answer.

The cat is a good subject for experiments of this kind, since it is harder to train than a dog, and less susceptible to reward or punishment.

In the experiment which I am going to describe, Zing Yang-kuo, of Hangchow University, tried to get an answer to the question, "Is it part of the nature of cats to kill mice and rats?"

He worked on fifty-nine kittens, divided into three groups.

Each member of group A lived with a rat or mouse from the age of a week upward, except that until it was weaned at about a fortnight it was put with its mother at night.

Group B was kept in solitary confinement in cages after weaning, except for the tests described later. Neither Group A nor Group B was allowed to see a mother kill a mouse or rat.

Group C lived with their mothers throughout the experiment. And every four days they saw their mother kill an animal which might be a white rat, an ordinary mouse, or a small dancing mouse. The mother was not allowed to eat it, and each mother cat killed only one kind of animal.

From the age of a week onward, the following experiment was done on each kitten every fourth day. It was put in a cage with a white rat for half an hour, then with a large mouse, and finally with a small dancing mouse. The experiments went on till the kitten either killed one or more animals, or reached the age of four months.

The results were absolutely conclusive. Only three of the 18 kittens of group A ever killed an animal.

In no case did they kill an animal of the kind with which they had been brought up. On the contrary, they treated such animals with friendship.

Nine out of 20 kittens in Group B killed an animal. They were more likely to kill a mouse than a rat, and a small mouse than a large one. If they had killed a large one, they usually killed the smaller ones also. But less than half of them ever killed one.

Finally, eighteen out of the twenty-one kittens in group C were killers. In almost every case the animal first killed was one of the kind which they had seen their mothers kill.

Diet had no effect. Half the kittens in each group were given meat, the others were not. The meat eaters were no more likely to kill, but if they did so they were likely to eat their victims.

Nor did it make any difference whether a kitten had just been fed, or had gone without food for

12 hours before the test. In the absence of previous experience, hunger does not make a kitten violent.

The experiment went on. The pacifist kittens of Groups A and B were given another two months during which they could see other cats killing mice or rats.

Nine out of the eleven kittens of Group B fell for this propaganda, but only one of the 15 kittens in Group A, which had lived with a mouse or rat.

I have no doubt that there were innate differences between these kittens as well.

If Mr. Kuo had bred from the three pacifist kittens of Group C and gone on selecting those which did not kill even when they saw their mothers doing so, he could probably have produced a race of cats which never killed mice or rats.

Similarly, he could have bred a very fierce breed from the killer kittens of group A. Whether such a result would need ten generations or several thousand I do not know. But ten generations are quite enough to separate out groups of rats with very different abilities as regards finding their way through mazes.

Nevertheless it is quite clear that the education of these kittens counted for a great deal more than any inborn differences which may have existed between them.

The evidence of anthropology is very strong that the same is true for men.

And, of course, with human beings, precept as well as example counts. Though I don't think it counts for as much as some people think. The example of parents who behave decently is worth any amount of "pi-jaw" from parents who do not. However, that is only my personal opinion, and is not based on any statistics.

My attention was called to Kuo's work by Cohen's "Human Nature, War and Society,"<sup>1</sup> a book with which I disagree, because, after an excellent start, it never deals seriously with the fundamental question: "What types of social structure lead to war?"

Mr. Cohen may well believe that the Marxist answer to this question is incorrect, but he is not likely to win Marxists over to his views if he ignores it.

Nevertheless, the history of Kuo's kittens is only one of his arguments to show that war is not an unavoidable evil rooted in human nature.

The next step in the argument, if we want to do something practical, is to show that the basic causes of wars, even of those fought in the name of superior religions or superior races, are mainly economic, and then to do our utmost to abolish the economic causes of war.

<sup>1</sup> Watts and Co., 1946.

(World Copyright Reserved.)

