

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 72.

AUGUST, 1947

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

AMERICA, AUSTRALIA AND JAPAN	R. Dixon	611
QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	Edvard Kardelj	613
N.S.W. LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE	J. R. Hughes	622
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY IN POLAND	Wladyslaw Gomułka	624
EVATT ATTACKS CIVIL LIBERTIES	Tom Wright	627
THE MOUNTBATTEN AWARD	C. P. of India	629
THE LAST DAYS OF FRANCO	Pasionaria	631
THE NEW DEAL FOR EDUCATION	Dora Crawley, B.A.	636
BOOK REVIEW	J.W.	637
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	638
EVOLUTION FROM TWO ANGLES	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	639

**ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY**

Editor L. L. Sharkey

AMERICA, AUSTRALIA AND JAPAN

R. DIXON

AMERICAN policy in Japan is causing growing alarm in Australia. Ever since the end of the war the U.S. has taken decisions on Japan without consultation with other interested Powers. These decisions follow the same pattern as the policies of American imperialism in Europe, Asia and the Middle East. They aim to establish American domination, to subordinate the whole world to Yankee Imperialism.

The decisions which caused immediate concern in Australia were: MacArthur's announcement that a second Japanese whaling expedition would be despatched to the Antarctic, and the subsequent statement that the Japanese were to be granted the right to assume responsibility for the complete operation of the Phosphate Rock project on Anguar Island, in the Palau Group.

The Australian Government protested to Washington against the whaling expedition on the grounds that (a) it was in the nature of a naval auxiliary expedition, and (b) the Japanese indiscriminately destroyed whales thereby ignoring the international whaling agreement which was designed to preserve the industry.

At the very time the Australian protest was being considered in Washington, General MacArthur, on behalf of the American Government, contemptuously announced the plans for the Japanese whaling expedition.

Concerning the Anguar Island project, the Australian Government pointed out that the Palau group of islands is situated 300 miles north of New Guinea, has great strategic importance for the whole of the South Western Pacific and was the main Japanese base in the South Pacific during World War II. MacArthur's decisions bring the Japanese to within a few hundred miles of the Australian coast and constitute a further threat to Australian security.

MacArthur's decision on the Anguar project, if taken without consultation with Australia or other Powers, caused the Sydney Morning Herald's Washington correspondent to say: "Members of allied Diplomatic Missions said today that the announcement was the culmination of a series of similar incidents by which Supreme Headquarters in Tokyo had made it patently clear that it was not interested in the views of other allies." (S.M.H., 27/6/47.)

The exclusion by America of its allies in the Pacific war from the making of policy in Japan goes hand in hand with U.S. policy to establish its domination in the East, making full use of Japan to this end.

The Potsdam decisions to disarm Japan, destroy its war potential and establish a democratic Japanese state have been set aside.

In a recent statement MacArthur claimed that, under his benign guidance, Japan has become

democratic, has renounced war and that in any case she would be unable to wage war for at least 100 years.

An amazing accomplishment, if it were true. After World War I the European and American nations renounced war under the Kellogg pact, but war came just the same. The renunciation of war by Japan doesn't mean a thing if the forces within Japan which embarked upon imperialist aggression in China and the Pacific remain in power.

Reaction in Japan resides in the feudal-militarist clique which is linked with the great monopolies — the Zaibatsu. Whatever else the war and MacArthur have done they have not destroyed the power of the feudal-militarist-monopolist groups that dominate the economic and political life of Japan.

The old feudal-militarist families are grouped around the Mikado and when Yankee Imperialism, in spite of the demands of Australia, China and Soviet Russia, decided to retain the Mikado instead of treating him as a war criminal, they adopted a policy aimed at retaining the old order in Japan. Thus, feudal land tenure remains, the feudal-militarist landlords and aristocracy rule throughout the countryside. The Communist Party in Japan is forbidden by MacArthur's newspaper censors to advocate the confiscation of the big feudal estates and redistribution of the land to the peasants, which is the first step to breaking the power of feudal-militarist-monarchist reaction in Japan and to laying a sound basis for democracy and peace.

Insofar as the big Japanese monopolies, the Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, Yasuda and other big companies are concerned, they have not been broken up, their industries, and especially the war industries, have barely been touched, and where some redistribution of shares in those concerns have taken place, it is mostly to businessmen representing the big American monopolies.

Thus, the American monopolies are becoming powerfully entrenched in Japanese industry. In accordance with this policy, General MacArthur is basing himself upon the feudal-militarist-monopolist gangs in Japan that enslaved the Japanese people and which were responsible for the wars of imperialist aggression launched by Japan.

In these circumstances it is sheer deception to speak of the democratic reconstruction of Japan. The repression of the labor movement, press censorship, suppression of strikes, provocation, bashings and gaoles for working-class organisations and leaders are subjected to in Japan show that MacArthur is establishing a police state that, in essence, is very little different from what existed before the war.

It is also absurd to say that Japan has lost the power of aggression. While the essential characteristics of Japanese Imperialism remain, as they

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

o, it will remain aggressive and therefore a threat to peace and security. After World War I it was also considered that Germany would be incapable of waging war for a very long time. In the years 1933-39, however, Hitlerism transformed Germany into a military power that constituted the greatest threat in the history of mankind to the peoples of Europe and the world.

It took Hitler six years and yet MacArthur could have us believe that after less than two years of occupation, under his control, Japan will be incapable of waging war for 100 years. It's just as all we don't believe in miracles.

There is much more in the American policy toward Japan than meets the eye. It is part of a general drive to establish American domination throughout the East. In some respects the infamous Japanese imperialist scheme for a Greater East Asia Prosperity Sphere, which in ordinary language meant the complete enslavement of East Asia, has been revived, but under the direction of Yankee imperialism.

In this plan of American Imperialism, Japan occupies a decisive place.

Throughout the rest of East Asia, from China down to Indonesia and even further west to Burma and India, there is a gigantic movement for Democracy and independence.

This revolutionary-democratic movement, which is the mightiest movement that has ever swept through China and South East Asia, appals American Imperialism and cuts right across their plans to establish world domination.

In Japan, therefore, America is basing herself on the most reactionary forces, which MacArthur is doing his best to consolidate at the expense of the democratic movement.

Japan is to be the American sheet-anchor of opposition against the democratic developments in China and South East Asia as well as an advanced base against the Soviet Union.

Japan is the most industrially developed country in part of the capitalist world. They have what the banks call the "industrial know how," and as the resources and economy of Japan are being brought under the sway of the powerful American monopoly, Japan is to become the subordinate agent of American Imperialism in the conquest of markets, sources of raw materials and spheres of influence in East Asia.

Japanese industry will be developed under American direction and with American capital whilst industrial development of the rest of Asia will be hindered.

In this light, and in this light only, that the aims and objects of MacArthur's policy can be understood. Thus, for instance, despite the decision of the United Nations to destroy Japan's industrial potential for the American occupation authorities are now being directed that Japan's industrial potential must be maintained.

Japanese reparations payments are to be very small, as the Yanks claim that Japan is in no

condition to pay reparations to the victims of her aggression. America has decided upon the scale of reparations payments, without consultation with the allies in the war against Japan. We are told that in America, very generously, will make no claim for reparations on Japan, but no mention is made of the fact that the Yanks seized the Japanese gold reserve, and large quantities of silver, platinum, gems, and vast supplies of silk, rubber, tin, and various other raw materials valued at hundreds of millions of dollars.

Moreover, MacArthur has announced, again without agreement with other interested Powers, that trade with Japanese concerns will be resumed from August 15, 1947. Since the occupation of America has dominated and controlled Japanese trade. So much so that 96% of Japanese exports go to the U.S. and 66% of their imports come from the U.S. Whereas before the war a big part of Japan's cotton imports came from India and Egypt, today, under American pressure, Japan obtains raw cotton from the U.S. MacArthur has also insisted that Japanese goods sold to Australia, Britain, New Zealand and some other countries must be sold for not less than American prices for the same goods. As a result, Australian imports of silk, rayon and cotton goods from Japan cost about three times more than if ordinary Japanese prices were charged. Finally, according to latest information, MacArthur is dallying with the idea of insisting upon dollars in payment for Japanese goods after August 15, which will impose severely upon the limited dollar pool, at the disposal of the British nations.

On the other hand, cheap mass-produced Japanese goods are to be unloaded on to the markets of China and South East Asia in a giant bid by American monopoly concerns to oust Britain, Australia and France as competitors on these markets and to bring all of these countries under the economic and political sway of American Imperialism.

On that background the decisions of General MacArthur to despatch a Japanese whaling expedition to the Antarctic, a peering fleet to North Australian waters as is also proposed, and to establish Japanese responsibility for mining phosphates in the Palau Islands, become more menacing.

What is more, the reactionary and aggressive forces in Japan have been very much encouraged by MacArthur's policy. They are even now launching vicious attacks upon the labor movement. They have urged that Japan be permitted a "small" military force, of 100,000 or more. They have demanded the return of the Kurile Islands and Southern Sakhalin from Soviet Russia, and from the U.S. And their latest proposal is that Japanese ex-servicemen should be permitted to "colonise" in New Guinea, Borneo, and other South Western Pacific Islands.

Thus American policy is leading to a revival and strengthening of the reactionary, aggressive and imperialist elements in Japan and constitutes

a grave menace to all the peoples of Asia and the South Western Pacific of U.S. policy have been obvious for many months, but it is only during these last few weeks that the Australian Government has seen fit to protest. Mr. McMahon Ball, Australian, British, New Zealand and Indian representative on the Allied Council in Japan, has

repeatedly expressed doubts on MacArthur's policy, but Dr. Evatt's policy of kow-towing to America has prevented any effective protest being made.

In general it must be said that Dr. Evatt's policy of capitulation to America on policy in Japan can only have the most serious consequences for Australia.

NOTES ON SOME QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EDVARD KARDELJ

(Continued from last issue)

III.

It goes without saying that the state of things which I have just described did not arise only after the war. We all know that there is a vital and necessary link between Munich and the present reactionary policy of certain circles in the large capitalist countries, and that these links are illustrated also by certain characteristic aspects of British and American policies in the course of the Second World War.

Although the Second World War was fundamentally a war of liberation, and an anti-Fascist war, it would, nevertheless, be a mistake not to discern those imperialist elements which determined the quite specific development of this war. This development was influenced by two kinds of antagonisms: on the one hand, there was the antagonism among the capitalist countries in their struggle for the domination of the capitalist world, and on the other, the antagonism between the capitalist world and the truly democratic, socialist and anti-imperialist forces with the Soviet Union at their head. The first of these two antagonisms manifested itself more particularly in the first phase of the war, while the second became increasingly acute as the war was drawing to a close.

In the first phase of the war, Great Britain led a considerable number of its military bases in the world to the United States, and was unable to prevent the economic penetration of the latter into its colonies and Dominions. In the course of the war, the United States obtained a decisive naval superiority over Britain, leaving the latter far behind, as regards sea power. At the same time, the U.S.A. began constructing a whole system of military and naval bases.

Despite all the antagonisms, however, the policies of the imperialist circles of these two countries were identical in one respect: in their relationship to the U.S.S.R. and to the anti-imperialist movements in general.

I shall not here deal in any detail with the policy of the western powers towards the U.S.S.R. during the war, as this policy is but too well-known. I should only like to quote the views of British writers on the subject. Here is what Palme Dutt says, for instance:

"British imperialism pursued a double objective in the war, which was thinly concealed in official expression, but which was patently visible, not only in unofficial expression, but in the practical strategy of the war and in the accompanying Anglo-American diplomatic conferences. On the one hand, the Western imperialists sought, in alliance with the Soviet Union, to ensure the defeat of Hitler. On the other hand, they were concerned that the downfall of Fascism should not lead to the advance of Communist or popular anti-Fascist revolutions in Europe endangering the old social order or to the strengthening of the Soviet Union. They calculated that the weight of the war would not only destroy Hitler, but either equally destroy or fatally weaken the Soviet Union, and that the Anglo-American forces would emerge as the main victors to police Europe and control the world." Palme Dutt then goes on to say:

"All the babblers and sycophants of official expression poured scorn upon the Communist campaign for the second front in the West and jeered at the 'armchair strategists' who dared to intervene on matters of strategy when it was obvious that the military experts alone could judge and knew what was best. Those babblers look foolish enough to-day when it has been revealed in the memoirs of Captain Butcher, the aide de camp of General Eisenhower, that General Eisenhower and his military experts favoured the second front in Europe in the summer of 1942, that the opposition came primarily, not from military, but from political sources, and that the decisive opposition which blocked and delayed the second front came—what could not be stated at the time—from Churchill. When Churchill's decision to ban the second front in 1942 was conveyed to General Eisenhower, General Eisenhower called it 'the blackest day of the war,' and said that the decision prolonged the war."

This decision prolonged the war. General Sir Gifford Martel wrote in his book *Our Armed Forces*:

August, 1947

"The troops in England were ready a year before they were used, and were even becoming stale by 1944. Could we not have been ready sooner if we had settled on our main plan at an earlier date?"

I have quoted the above (we could give a number of similar quotations from different authors) in order to show how the delay in opening the second front was construed by a number of people. Many similar examples could be found in the other fields of war politics. All this, of course, could not change the fact that the Second World War was a war of liberation, but it is obvious that a policy which was open to such an interpretation was hardly apt to promote mutual confidence among the Allies.

When attempting to vindicate such a reactionary policy towards the Soviet Union and the democratic national-liberation movements in occupied Europe, various obscurantists in the western countries were wont to describe the policy as one of defence against "Soviet imperialism," to speak of a clash between two ideologies—western "democracy" and eastern "totalitarianism." In actual fact, however, what we had here was no "defence," and least of all against the Soviet Union, which was threatening no one—except the Hitlerite block; but a purely expansionist tendency of British and American finance capital to entrench themselves in the ruins of occupied Europe. As was only natural, the national-liberation movements and the principled democratic policy of the U.S.S.R. constituted an obstacle to such expansionist tendencies. This explains why there was so much agitation in the course of the war to "wait" that the "right time" should come, that the "signal" should be given, before starting the uprisings for national liberation, etc. This policy was advocated by those leading monopolists who did not view the downfall of the Nazi Government as the aim of the liberation struggle of the democratic forces, but as a stepping-stone towards their domination of the world.

How great was the part played by considerations of a political nature throughout the recent study of its history. These political considerations were certainly one of the essential traits of this war. While the democratic world was waging a just liberation war against the forces of Fascism, reactionary circles were endeavouring to exploit it for their own imperialist aims.

The antagonisms in post-war world politics should also be viewed in this light. Struggling for supremacy and economic positions in the former Axis countries, as well as in other countries, the American and British finance capital circles are linking themselves up more and more with the most reactionary forces in these countries, and are conducting the policy of their country towards the protection of reactionary Fascist elements, the sentencing of war criminals, interference in the domestic affairs of the different countries—towards various anti-democratic actions and anti-Soviet out-

bursts. This explains the continual campaign of reactionary circles in the United States against a policy that is democratic and progressive in the world. This explains the tendency on the part of certain reactionary imperialist circles in Britain to push their country into an imperialist gendarme for the suppression of anti-imperialist and democratic movements and uprisings in different parts of the world, although it is obvious that such a role brings Britain into an increasing measure of dependence upon the United States.

This latter consideration is gaining increasing importance in Britain's home politics. The clash of interests between the U.S.A. and Great Britain in all parts of the world is obvious and should not be underrated. The tendency of American finance capital to obtain equal treatment, in the countries of the British Empire, to that enjoyed by British capital, is tantamount to ousting Britain from its own colonies and the countries of its Empire—and this is actually a trend towards the destruction of the British Empire. In Japan and China, war means in the Pacific in general, Britain's voice is heard but feebly. The Americans have gained a firm foothold in the Arab countries and in the Mediterranean—to such an extent, in fact, that they are already saying that the U.S.A. is becoming a "Mediterranean country." And that means that Britain is no longer alone to hold the keys of the Mediterranean lines of communication through the Suez Canal towards the Far East. And the so-called "merging of the British and American Zones" in Germany has opened wide the doors of the British Zone in Germany to the penetration of American finance capital and of the American trusts.

We could cite many more such facts. We should also add the overwhelming military superiority of the U.S.A. over Great Britain—both on the seas and along the world sea routes. By possession of compensation for the fact that it does not the U.S.A. has built a whole extensive system of interlinked military, naval and air force bases in various types in key positions throughout the world. Britain itself was obliged to lease a number of such bases to the United States for a term of years. A system of bases of this type, coupled with economic and political pressure, are obviously far more effective strong points for imperialist expansion than the old style colonial system would be to-day.

All this, of course, is bound to have political consequences too. After the First World War, Nations into an instrument of its policy. Now the situation is completely different. The United States and Britain appear, it is true, to collaborate very closely and on a basis of equality, as in the United Nations Organisation for instance, as in the case of the two plays the decisive, and which the secondary part. And that is the case to-day throughout

August, 1947

615

the international scene. It is obvious, too, that Great Britain's dependence on the United States increases in the measure in which certain reactionary circles impel the former country to adopt an anti-Soviet attitude, and to play the part of a counter-revolutionary gendarme in the international field.

All these facts go to show that the Anglo-American antagonism still exists, that it will develop, and that it will, in connection with a number of other imperialist antagonisms, give rise to all kinds of conflicts among the capitalist countries.

It would, however, be a mistake to overestimate the significance of these antagonisms. Two factors which have to-day an essential bearing on the development of these antagonisms should be borne in mind in this connection: first, the bonds uniting American and British finance capital, and second, the difficult internal contradictions within the British Empire, and within many of the countries under British influence in general.

This has led to the appearance of two trends in British political life. One school of thought holds that Britain's only chance lies in linking its fate to that of the United States; Britain is bound constantly to lose, through this partnership, but will, nevertheless, succeed in saving the Empire. This school of thought has of late—in connection with the agreement regarding United States concessions in the Middle East oil fields—been particularly noticeable in a section of the British press. One would have expected to hear this press express dissatisfaction at the fact that British capital was being squeezed out of the Middle East by American capital. The opposite occurred, however. The press welcomed the action of the United States, in the hope that the U.S.A. would henceforth also be interested in the "pacification" of the Arab world and in saving Britain's positions in that area.

Fully in line with this school of thought are the various plans regarding the future of Anglo-American relations—including the plan for the setting up of an "Anglo-American Federation" or for an "Anglo-American Military Alliance."

Even the most die-hard reactionaries in Britain are showing apprehension at this increasing degree of dependence on the United States. Hence the various plans for a so-called "western block," which is, on the one hand, directed against the U.S.S.R., while on the other it is intended to buttress Britain's independent role as against the United States.

All these and similar "ideas" go to show that the former imperialist methods no longer provide a way out. Many people in England, including people in responsible political positions, and particularly in Parliament, have grasped this. Within the Labor Party itself, the number of those who realise that Britain can hope to play an independent part only if it abandons its present policy and embarks upon a new course, viz., upon one

of peace and friendship with the U.S.S.R., is growing steadily.

Herein lies the crux of the problem, because it would mean a fundamental departure, on the part of Great Britain from the policy it has been pursuing, more or less consistently, subjectively, ever since Munich. This was, fundamentally, the policy which rendered possible Fascist aggression and the Second World War, and the subsequent domination of American monopoly over the capitalist world.

The second school of thought is aware of the fact that the reactionary policy of the Anglo-American "Holy Alliance" against the anti-imperialist and progressive forces in the world, behind which lurks the economic and political expansion of American finance capital, is bound to increase the economic and political dependence of Britain on the U.S.A., and, automatically, still further impair its international position. The clash between these two fundamental trends within British policy will, undoubtedly, assume greater proportions in the future and its outcome will, to a large extent, determine the fate of future co-operation among nations.

It should be pointed out, in this connection, that the aggressive policy of certain of the most reactionary American circles against the world, behind which lurks the economic and political expansion of American finance capital, is bound to increase the economic and political dependence of Britain on the U.S.A., and, automatically, still further impair its international position. The clash between these two fundamental trends within British policy will, undoubtedly, assume greater proportions in the future and its outcome will, to a large extent, determine the fate of future co-operation among nations.

As things now stand, however, the democratic forces and freedom-loving nations of the world are faced with the fact of a consistent anti-democratic and imperialist policy, which is all the more violent as the fissures within the present imperialist system are widening. Experience, therefore, shows once again that capitalist monopoly and political reaction invariably go together.

This became apparent in all the international events which have occurred between the end of the war and the present time. In one of the speeches he delivered last year, Churchill said that the decision on the use of the atom bomb had been taken at Potsdam by President Roosevelt and himself, and that from that moment their views on the future had changed.

And in fact, it was from that moment that the well-known policy of intimidation, which has attended all the efforts made hitherto to build up peace, started. Nor was this policy confined to the atom bomb. We all remember the delay in the recognition of the new Yugoslavia, the ultimatum

to Yugoslavia to withdraw from Trieste, the interference in the internal affairs of Poland; then there was Greece, Albania, the attitude towards Franco Spain, etc. Then came the preparing of the peace treaties with Italy and the other satellite countries. Throughout these preparations, and the results of the Paris Conference, a tendency prevailed on the part of the Western Powers to construct peace regardless of the requirements of justice and the loyalty due to an ally, on a basis detrimental to the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and to other democratic countries, a peace which would place yesterday's aggressors in a state of complete dependence on the Western Powers, and would render them capable possibly to-morrow, once again, of pushing the world into a new cataclysm. Both in Germany and all the occupied countries, yesterday's Fascists and their acolytes are being rehabilitated at an increasing pace and in ever greater numbers, and given positions of decisive importance, while anti-Fascists are being persecuted, or all sorts of obstacles are being put in the way of their struggle against Fascist and imperialist forces. Certain reactionary circles are obviously attempting to use the German Fascists as an imperialist base in Europe. The struggle for Germany is to-day of decisive importance for Europe. That is why the reactionaries deem it necessary to give protection, in all sorts of different ways, to the Fascist and other reactionary elements in Germany. All this has, for over two years already, been accompanied by a frantic press campaign of slanders against the U.S.S.R., against Yugoslavia and other democratic countries and democratic movements. It is thus that the views of our Western Allies, i.e., in certain circles of the Western countries, have "changed"—according to Churchill's words, after Potsdam.

This policy, obviously, boils down to a desire on the part of certain capitalist circles to force their will upon those who do not show due respect towards the "blessings" of imperialism. In other words, they wish to impose a new imperialist "peace" on the world, a "peace" based on world domination by finance capital, instead of a truly democratic peace, based on the freedom and independence of nations, on co-operation among nations and respect for their mutual interests.

Such a policy can no longer, however, be pursued without encountering opposition. This was possible at the time of the Versailles Conference and to a certain extent after the First World War, when the imperialist forces succeeded in blocking the Soviet Union and maintaining it in a state of comparative isolation, and also in keeping the anti-imperialist forces confined within certain limits. Conditions have changed now—the Soviet Union can no longer be isolated. In addition to this, a number of new people's States have arisen, and they have completely wrenched themselves from the sphere of imperialism, while anti-imperialist and democratic movements have conquered such powerful positions in many countries that they

considerably circumscribe the freedom of action of the leading imperialists.

It is clear that the only policy which the democratic forces can follow is a policy of struggle for a just, a democratic peace and co-operation among the nations, based on mutual respect for the just interest of the different countries. According to this conception, the existing antagonisms between the two worlds should not be allowed to constitute an obstacle in the way of the general effort of freedom-loving mankind to secure peaceful co-operation among the nations. Peace and democracy in the world are not endangered by social differences, but by the imperialist economic and political expansion. Two trends, two methods, two schools of thought have thus taken shape in the sphere of present day international politics: on the one hand there is a tendency towards world domination, the tendency towards covert and open expansion, towards imposing one's will on other nations and States, there is the policy of intimidation and outwitting. On the other hand, there is the striving for peaceful co-operation among nations, towards mutual understanding and respect for the just interests of every nation, the striving to achieve the freedom and independence of the dependent and backward colonial peoples. These two different trends are, of course, but a reflection of two different systems, i.e., of the system of imperialism, which is seeking a way out of the general crisis, through a policy of reaction and violence, and of the system of socialism and of people's democracy where capitalism has been overthrown or is rapidly disappearing under the entire activities of the country are directed towards internal construction and the increase of internal welfare. These two different trends in international politics have been apparent in all international relations since the end of the war.

The new Yugoslavia, being a progressive people's State where the roots of capitalism have forever been cut and which has freed itself particularly felt the pressure of international imperialist forces. The negative attitude which a part of our war allies oppose to many of the justified claims of our peoples is, of course, quite easy to comprehend when viewed in this light.

What is here involved, therefore, is neither a "clash between two ideologies," as certain people like to imply, who, either consciously or not, which is perfectly clear and obvious; nor is it that the world is divided into adherents of dialectical materialism and those of idealism, or into the adepts of collectivism and those of individualism, but a clash between imperialism and those of individualism, striving of nations for independence, the striving of freedom-loving mankind for a democratic peace.

What we have today," said Comrade Tito, "are two fronts: the front of democracy and the front of reaction and various pro-

cateurs, and not the front of the West and the front of the East." (Speech delivered in Jesenice, on August 20th, 1946.)

All this goes to show that monopoly capitalism will, in the present phase of its development, seek, more than ever before, to iron out its internal contradictions by increasing political reaction and the struggle against the forces of democracy, progress and socialism.

IV.

What we have just said, however, is but part of the truth. The world is witnessing to-day the unprecedented economic expansion of the finance capital of a single country. It should be pointed out, at the same time, that the foundations of the imperialist system were never so weak as they are to-day, after the Second World War.

Not only did the Second World War fail to bring stabilisation to the capitalist world, but on the contrary, still further deepened and sharpened the general crisis of the system. There can be no doubt but that the near future will see much tension and conflicts, will witness violent economic and political struggles.

The Second World War has, among other things, resulted in a further number of countries throwing off the imperialist yoke. This has considerably undermined imperialist rule in the rest of the world, particularly in the colonies and dependent countries, and led to an increase in the internal contradictions within capitalist economy.

There can be no doubt but that the emergence of people's democracies in certain countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and the beginning of similar processes in other countries—in different forms and at various stages, but with the same trend of development—is the most momentous and significant qualitative change which has occurred in the capitalist world after the Second World War. The significance of this change does not so much lie in the fact that it

modified the relation of forces in the world, the benefit of democracy and socialism, and to the detriment of imperialism, as particularly, in that it reveals certain specific ways of liquidating the rule of capitalist reaction, new forms of development towards socialism. The construction of socialism is no longer an isolated phenomenon confined to the U.S.S.R. It is no longer something which still has to prove its value in practice. The great socialist achievements of the October Revolution have not only stood the test of history, but have already become the substance of the entire genuinely democratic development in the world. There are no longer many governments today which venture openly to defend the capitalist system. On the contrary, capitalist reaction is resorting to all kinds of pseudo-socialist forms and phrases, in order to delude the masses. Even the Fascists liked to hide, and are hiding again today, behind socialist signboards and phrases. This means that it is becoming increasingly difficult for imperialist reaction to wage an open struggle

against socialism. This means, further, that the ideal of socialism, first realised in the Soviet Union, has stood the test of history and emerged triumphant.

On the other hand, of course, all this is evidence of the internal weaknesses of the capitalist system. In the period after the Great October Socialist Revolution, the imperialist system was still sufficiently powerful to make a frontal attack against the revolution in Russia and against the various other revolutionary socialist movements. Today, it is no longer in a position to fill in the crevices within the imperialist system and to stem all the numerous processes which are undermining it. And this relative weakness of the capitalist system enables the struggle for a true people's democracy, and for socialism, to assume the most varied forms.

The genuine democratic forces can now rely on broader reserves, they can make a far more effective use of the increasingly wide and numerous crevices which are appearing within the imperialist system. The Communist Parties in many countries have become a factor capable of having a decisive bearing on the policy of the State. The democratic forces are now in a position more successfully to expose the anti-democratic manoeuvres of the capitalist monopolists.

All these facts acquire their full significance when we bear in mind the part the U.S.S.R. now plays in international relations, a part which in many ways differs from the one it played before the Second World War. The Soviet Union was, from the very first day it came into being, the hope of all freedom-loving people, and an example showing the whole of progressive humanity the way out of the general crisis into which it had been brought by the imperialist system.

At that time, however, the Soviet Union was separated from the rest of the world, by the high wall of capitalist encirclement, and its influence in the field of international relations was far smaller than its strength would have warranted. Today, on the other hand, we may say that the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union no longer exists. We have here in mind, not merely the fact that the Soviet Union is, to a large extent, surrounded by friendly countries, in which capitalism has also been overthrown, or is increasingly losing a foothold, but, above all, two other considerations.

The first is the tremendous influence the Soviet Union now wields in the field of international relations, an influence which the U.S.S.R. achieved in the first place through its victories in the recent war, whereby it demonstrated the strength and the advantages of the Soviet system and of socialism.

The second is the fact that the boundary between the two worlds, between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism, in international relations is no longer the clear-cut frontier-line between the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world, as was the case before the war. We no longer have, today, on the one side, a united

capitalist system and, on the other, a single, encircled socialist country; what we have is, rather, a system of capitalist countries, with the most imperialist forces at their head, on the one hand, and, on the other, a democratic system headed by the Soviet Union. It is obvious why, under such conditions, the isolation of the Soviet Union has become impossible. It has become impossible to take decisions on fundamental questions of international relations without the participation of the Soviet Union, without thereby destroying all possibilities of international co-operation.

And what is particularly important in this connection is the fact that the imperialist chain is bound to break with increasing frequency and rapidity, in view of the existence of such relations of forces, that the possibilities of the victory of a people's democracy, as the starting point of socialist development, will become more varied, and it will become increasingly difficult for the imperialist forces to stifle and curb such processes in different parts of the world.

That is why the emergence of people's democracies in the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, as well as the beginnings of such democracies in certain other countries, are significant, not merely in that they constitute a quantitative change in the relations of forces in the sphere of international politics, but also in that they introduce a new element into the latter, breaking the system of capitalist encirclement of the first country where the construction of socialism has been achieved, and opening up new vistas to the struggle of the democratic, progressive anti-imperialist forces in the world.

After the war, the colonial question has again arisen in a very acute form. Its acuteness has a double aspect. On the one hand, as regards relations between the colonial peoples and the ruling imperialist countries, and on the other, as the object of the political and economic struggle between the leading capitalist monopolies, i.e., the great capitalist countries.

When we used, before, to speak of the centres of anti-imperialist struggle and of wars for national liberation, what we had in view were, in the first place, India and semi-dependent China. Now, in addition to these two countries, centres of this kind have appeared, in various forms and at different stages of development, in Indonesia, Indochina, in the Philippines, Korea, the Arab countries, North Africa, etc., which means that the anti-imperialist movement has embraced practically the entire colonial world. It is not of fundamental importance in this connection whether the colonial rulers will occasionally succeed in temporarily quelling the uprisings for the liberation of the colonial peoples. What is essential is the fact that a conscious and organised movement has embraced the entire colonial world, that the colonial rulers will find it increasingly difficult to maintain the colonies in a state of subjection, and that this will seriously affect political and economic conditions in the home countries and

in the whole of the capitalist world. This powerful growth of the liberation movements in the colonies is to be explained, on the one hand, by the fact that the political consciousness of the broad masses has increased rapidly in the course of the war, and on the other, and particularly, by the considerable growth of industry in the colonies, which has brought the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie on to the political scene, and this has, in its turn, hastened the development of national culture, and of the national intelligentsia. The traditional methods of colonial policy, and the methods of maintaining backward relations and feudal particularism in the colonies, the former being the mainstays of colonial rule, have, under such conditions, become increasingly inadequate. That is why the colonial question is ever more disrupting the foundations of the imperialist system as a whole, while it constitutes a particularly arduous problem for the colonial rulers.

The development of the working class and the labor movements in the colonial and dependent countries has raised the colonial liberation movements on to a higher democratic level, as compared to those of the past. Many of these movements are heading, not merely towards political liberation from foreign imperialism, but also towards the victory of the anti-imperialist forces, the victory of the people's democracy, which would wrench these countries completely from under the influence of imperialism. The colonial rulers are no longer succeeding in achieving a more or less lasting victory over these movements by means of military and police measures. Even if they do succeed in quelling an uprising here and there, the colonial world no longer—under the old forms of colonial rule—offers sufficient security to the finance capital of the home country. That is why imperialist circles must seek to lean more and more on the national bourgeoisie and the other reactionary circles in the colonies and in other dependent countries, making them concessions in return.

It therefore occurs more and more frequently that certain colonial or dependent countries obtain a so-called "independence." Great Britain, in certain cases, resorts to giving formal "independence" to the dependent countries. Such measures are, obviously, accompanied by the corrupting of the ruling classes in the newly established "independent" countries, which enables the great capitalist powers to maintain the country in a state of actual economic and political dependence.

Such methods have become a general trait of present-day imperialist politics. Present-day imperialists are making every endeavour to support anti-democratic regimes in all parts of the world and in all countries imaginable, regimes which the people would long have overthrown, had it not been for support from abroad.

The high degree of concentration attained by finance capital and the tremendous extension of the capitalist monopolies have, it appears, themselves become incompatible with the former methods of

colonial exploitation. For a degree of concentration of finance capital, such as has today been attained by the monopolies in the United States, the former system of the territorial division of colonies has become too narrow. What they need is the world, and not just certain colonies, what they need are free routes across all frontiers — because they are everywhere able to out their capitalist rivals from the markets, and gradually from all economic positions. That is why the United States look upon the British and French colonial systems as impediments and that is why they are coming out in favour of the "independence" of colonial countries. What this amounts to in practice would be to give the present colonial countries under the rule of Great Britain, France, Holland, etc., formal independence, so as to bring them into a state of economic and even political dependence on American finance capital.

For Britain, France and the other countries in possession of colonies, which have, as it is, become highly dependent upon American finance capital, the question is, naturally, different. For them, to maintain the greatest possible measure of political control over the colonies amounts to the question of whether they will, in general, still be able to play some kind of independent role as against the United States, and to the question of preserving at least part of their economic and political position in the world. That is why they are fighting so tenaciously to keep their colonies.

"At the present time the rival interests of British and U.S. imperialism define themselves clearly: the power policy and the dollar policy. Britain, as the weaker productive unit, can rival the United States trade only by legally exclusive measures, to preserve itself a sector (e.g., bilateral pacts, colonial sovereignty, imperial preference). U.S.A. as overwhelmingly the stronger seeks to whittle these away; every barrier removed, every new area gained, for the principle of equality of export, enterprise for all, means a 'liberation'... Thus writes the British journalist Ivor Montagu (*Labour Monthly*, October, 1946).

Hence the paradoxical situation of the American financial magnates and monopoly leaders, who are conquering the capitalist world by means of their dollars and their commodities and carrying out the most extensive expansion, are parading with the "democratic idea" of the "liberation" of colonies, of giving "independence" and "freedom," while Britain, which is fighting for its positions before the onslaughts of the U.S. dollar with the only weapons left to it as an imperialist power, is compelled to play the unpopular part of a genuine slogan of imperialism. It is obvious, therefore, that the U.S. slogan of the "independence" of colonies actually reveals a high degree of capitalist concentration, and, coupled with this, a tendency towards real world domination; concretely — a tendency of the U.S. monopolies to dominate the whole of the capitalist world. The American finance magnates

believe they will succeed where the German imperialists failed.

Alongside these developments in the colonies and dependent countries, there is yet another process in progress — that of the increasing economic enslavement of independent countries, large and small, their transformation into de facto dependent countries. Such a process, of course, does not mean anything fundamentally new in the capitalist world. But this process has now assumed tremendous proportions, and is developing in the main, to the benefit of the finance capital of a single country — of the United States of America. Trade, monopoly unions, loans, investments, obstacles to the development of local industry, various forms of economic pressure, etc. — all these are the means through which American finance capital expands into the different capitalist countries.

That this economic enslavement spells backwardness, poverty, that it retards the development of certain countries — is obvious. The economy of these countries does not serve the people, but the finance capital of foreign countries.

May I be allowed, at this stage, to quote from a typical publicist of U.S. economic expansion, who expresses in very simple terms the essence of the attitude of monopoly circles in the U.S.A. regarding — the independence of a State. He says, for instance:

"The objection might be raised that these short-run policies are conceived exclusively in terms of American economic interests, without due regard for the welfare of foreign economies demanding American goods and services. We willingly submit to such censure. American economic policy should heed legitimate foreign economic demands whenever it is possible to put our own and foreign interests on a common denominator. However, whenever most vital American interests are at stake, such as in this case, American interests must be put first."

In other words, the American imperialists are prepared to acknowledge the independence of other countries so long as this independence is in their interests, but as soon as it comes into conflict with the latter, then it must disappear, or be subordinated to "American interests."

It must be admitted that this Mr. Otto H. Korican expresses in very simple and very open terms the mentality on which the expansion of American finance capital relies.

The political consequences are clear. Where economic interests exist — political interests must also exist. That is why interference in the domestic affairs of the "independent" countries has today become the principal method of imperialist policy.

Speaking, for instance, of American investments in South America, and of the political advantages of joint investments — that is, of joint investments of United States and local South American capital in certain concerns — the *Economist* wrote on June 8th, 1946:

August, 1947

"How to be safe, as well as profitable, has long bothered foreign investors in Latin America . . . United States businessmen have turned to new and less risky forms of investment—the organisation of companies with both United States and local capital and, typically, more native participation in management than has been used in the past. The greatest development of this form has been in Mexico. . . Westinghouse has used the method in Argentine . . . the others in Brazil and Chile. . . Joint investment seems attractive to the Latin Americans. For those with money, it creates new chances to invest with little immediate risk; they can be pretty sure the foreigners expect to make a success of the business.

"The American firms are after business, not dividends. Joint investment to these prudent enterprises is a method of minimising investments while securing a trading or service position in Latin America.

"There are, of course, capitalists who can maintain a political balance, groups and families with a tent in each camp, men of wealth and prestige who will have influence with any government so long as the social structure is intact."

But the method of "joint investments," which is now being mainly applied by U.S. finance capital, has another significant aspect. It enables American finance capital to merge with the finance capital of other countries, and to intertwine the entire economic life of different countries. It is no longer a guest because it has the protection of the local bourgeoisie. In this way, it not only exerts pressure on the domestic policies of the different countries, but also on the foreign policy and on foreign economic connections. Those who have had the opportunity of watching the disciplined manner in which not only the vast majority of South-American, but many other countries as well, voted at recent international conferences for the proposals put forward by the U.S.A. and the manner in which the policy of the latter was frequently carried out through these very States, will have no difficulty in discerning the hand of American finance capital at the back of the attitude of the delegations of these countries.

Although such a policy of "independence" of colonies, and of economic dependence of "independent countries" is proving successful today, from the point of view of big finance capital and of the imperialist system, it nevertheless also affects capitalism very unfavourably in many ways. All these occurrences reflect, it is true, the gigantic concentration of finance capital and its expression on an unprecedented scale, but they, at the same time, reflect the weaknesses of the imperialist order. Open annexation, the bringing of colonies under political rule or political and military pressure were far more reliable weapons of imperialism in the past. These weapons are no longer adequate, although this does not mean, of course, that the imperialists will not make very extensive use of them, if no other means

are available. On the other hand, however, the methods of economic expansion we have just described involve constant interference in the domestic affairs of certain countries on the part of imperialism. It can achieve a certain measure of success, but is bound to expose the national bourgeoisie and the local reactionary forces as agents of foreign imperialism, in the eyes of the people, and isolate them from the masses. Such methods, therefore, contribute to the sharpening of internal contradictions in the different countries. On the one hand, the reactionary forces resort to violence and to the violation of democratic rights, while, on the other, the democratic and anti-imperialist movements embrace increasingly large masses of the people and draw them into the struggle against foreign imperialism, pressure and the local agents of foreign imperialism.

And thus, some of the trends of present-day imperialism contain a typical and ineluctable contradiction; striving for world domination, imperialism creates conditions in the colonies for the growth of resistance against the imperialist system. All this, of course, can only still further sharpen the general crisis of capitalism.

V.

Such are the perspectives facing the capitalist world as it is moving towards a new economic crisis whose consequences are still difficult to foresee, but which will undoubtedly result in even greater and more numerous political crises, in different parts of the world. To believe that the capitalist world will in the near future achieve stability and internal peace, would mean to harbour a great illusion. For the antagonisms of which we have already spoken are bound to lead to new conflicts in all spheres. And so the world which had so eagerly yearned, and still yearns, for peace, is in danger, although it will not have war now, of not acquiring peace either—unless democratic mankind opposes the pernicious activities of the capitalist monopolies. We have "peace" today, but war is raging in Greece, in India, in China, in Indo-China, in the Philippines, in Palestine, in Spain, in Iran, etc., because such are the laws of imperialist expansion. Who can say but that to these centres, new ones will not be added tomorrow, far more important ones which will perturb the imperialist system far more deeply. In short, the capitalist world is faced with a period of unrest and turmoil in which more or less sharp clashes between the imperialist reactionary forces and the democratic, anti-imperialist forces will take place. These forces of democracy will still increase in strength, and it is also obvious that the labor movement, particularly in the European countries, has not yet reached its post-war peak.

It is essential that freedom-loving mankind should grasp the full extent of the peril of the present imperialist system. The democratic forces in the capitalist countries should make no greater mistake than to allow themselves to be deluded by the fact that they still have

formal democratic rights, that their country enjoys formal independence, and forget whence the main danger arises. There is today practically not a single second-rate capitalist country into which foreign monopolies have not penetrated and placed it, to a greater or lesser degree, in an economic, and hence in a political state of dependence upon foreign finance capital. Today this expansion is still, in a certain measure, concealed in phrases about democracy and freedom. Tomorrow, in the measure in which the internal contradictions of capitalism acquire an increasingly acute form, because of the economic and general crisis of capitalism, the monopolies will display an even greater tendency to thrust one country after the other into an ever deeper state of political reaction and towards Fascism.

The main target of these monopolist circles will be the progressive democratic forces in all countries, and more particularly in the countries where these forces are in power. There can be no doubt but that the leading monopolists will, more than ever, endeavour to settle their internal imperialist contradictions by increasing their struggle against the progressive forces. And this for the simple reason that they are impelled to do so by the internal weakness of the imperialist system, which is, in its turn, a result of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism.

This tendency makes itself felt every day in the home affairs of the capitalist countries. If we leave aside such cases as that of Greece, there is practically not one country in which we do not see a more or less sharp struggle between democratic strivings and tendencies towards so-called "strong governments," towards the revival of semi-Fascist and Fascist organisations, towards the grouping and increased activity of extreme reactionary right-wing elements. Behind all this stand the circles of finance capital and of monopoly trusts and cartels, just as, after the first world war, they backed and financed Adolf Hitler. This tendency is all the more active as the contradictions increase in acuity. Obviously, the backward the political consciousness of the masses is in a certain country, the more confusion and lack of activity there is among the masses, the more these masses have been deluded by phrases of the reactionary politicians — the more the ruling capitalist elements like to rant with democratic phrases. It is perfectly clear today that the regime of bourgeois democracy is palatable to imperialism only so long as the masses live in darkness, and while democratic phrases can serve as a cloak for the shameful picture of exploitation and oppression, of the trampling of justice and truth, of parasitism and decay, offered by present day imperialism. When, however, the masses begin to discern the truth, when the level of their political consciousness begins rising, and when they begin to play a conscious part in the political life of their country, then the monopolist propagators of "freedom from fear" begin forgetting their "democratic principles."

When, for instance, at the Paris Peace Conference, last year, the representatives of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia

demanding that Trieste should be given all democratic rights, or at least part of the rights which the British and American ideologues of democracy used to consider were basic elements of democracy in general, then one of the representatives of traditional Western parliamentary government made roughly the following reply:

"We have always been champions of democracy and we do not allow anyone to take precedence of us in this respect, but — in Trieste, conditions are not propitious for the application of democratic principles."

There are, obviously, many territories like Trieste in the world, where, in the opinion of certain imperialist circles, "the requisite conditions for democracy are absent." This explains why the theory of the necessity of a "strong Government" is being advocated with increasing insistence, even in such countries as France. This explains, too, why, in the Western parts of Germany and Austria, denazification has become a derision of the conscience of suffering freedom-loving mankind. This explains why the Fascist Franco is still in power in Spain. This explains why war criminals and quisling elements still enjoy protection, why the reactionary imperialist circles in the U.S.A. and Great Britain are interfering systematically in the domestic affairs of other countries — of course, in the interests of the most reactionary elements in these countries.

For all these reasons, the reactionary forces have made, and are still making, every endeavour to turn the United Nations Organisation and its institutions into a sort of international police organisation — possibly into something reminiscent of the Holy Alliance in the first part of the Nineteenth Century—the task of which would, i.e., be to enforce the order of the imperialist monopolies, and the quelling of democratic and anti-imperialist movements in the world. No effort was spared in order to abolish the right of "veto." It is, however, perfectly obvious what lies at the back of all this. It is, in essence, a tendency to make the United Nations Organisation, by means of the method of outwitting, into the instrument of a bloc or group of States, or even of a single State. The organisation for the collective safeguarding of peace would thus be transformed into an instrument of imperialist expansion, into a weapon for preparing new wars. The very principle of collective security would thereby be discarded, and sacrificed to imperialist aims.

It is the task of the democratic forces to frustrate all such attempts and to wage a tenacious struggle in order to make the United Nations Organisation into a genuine collective custodian of peace. The struggle for true democracy within each capitalist country, and the struggle for a democratic peace and democratic co-operation among nations, are obviously closely bound up.

All these facts, therefore, confront all the democratic, freedom-loving forces of the world with important tasks in the sphere of international politics, tasks upon whose solution, ultimately, hinges the result of the struggle between the forces of

August, 1947

reaction and the forces of progress inside each country. It is, in the first place, essential that democratic forces should co-operate closely, and give one another active support in the struggle for a genuinely democratic peace and co-operation among nations. It is clear where the main danger lies, and freedom-loving mankind must see actively to it that it is not once again driven into a catastrophe by the forces of imperialist reaction and of Fascism. Any attempt to underrate the importance of the factor of international politics, or to confine oneself exclusively to domestic problems, or to withdraw into some sort of "neutralisation" in the field of international politics, is bound to result in the defeat of those who make such an attempt. Just as peace is indivisible, so is the struggle for a genuine democracy.

Through the prism of such conditions in the capitalist world, our masses can perceive even more clearly what they have obtained through the achievements of our national liberation struggle, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia with Comrade Tito at its head. We are not confronted with the prospect of an economic crisis and of serious internal conflicts, nor with that of economic subjugation on the part of any imperialist powers. Before us is the prospect of industrialisation, of elec-

trification and of the advance of agriculture, the prospect of the welfare and the culture of our people attaining ever higher levels. Such prospects can only face truly independent nations which have, for all time, thrown off the yoke of foreign imperialism.

Knowing how to appreciate their own freedom, our peoples are watching with sympathy the liberation struggle of the oppressed people and of the masses which are still laboring under imperialist oppression. At the same time, our peoples favour a policy of peace, of international agreement and of peaceful international co-operation, regardless of the social and economic structure of this or that country.

That is why the foreign policy of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia is the peace-loving policy of peoples who wish to build in peace, but who will always defend their just interests consistently and tenaciously, as well as the true interests of peace and democracy. Together with the Soviet Union and the other truly democratic countries, we fight actively for the establishing of democratic, peaceful relations in the world, because they know that this struggle is no less important than the internal construction of our country.

N.S.W. LABOR PARTY CONFERENCE

J. R. HUGHES

THE Annual General Conference of the Australian Labor Party in New South Wales took place this year in a situation favoring reformism.

The Australian nation emerged victorious from the second world war, escaping the bitter experiences of the invaded European countries. The Australian people relied on the leadership of the Labor Government during the war years and were prepared to continue their support in the post-war period.

Since the end of the war the Labor Party in this State has won two election victories — the Federal elections in which most Labor seats were retained and the State elections in which comparatively greater gains were made.

Another very important factor influencing the pre-conference situation was the election of McGillivray as Premier and his skillful and constructive declarations of policy. The prompt introduction of the 40-hour week was taken by large sections of the people as an indication that his Government not only had a programme of vital reforms, but were prepared to implement it. This constructive election policy won large sections of the working class to support the Labor Party and assisted in its election successes.

Rank and file members of the Labor Party approached the Annual Conference period with high hopes that Labor's policy would at last be implemented; the right wing leadership looked forward to an era of even richer plums of office as Consolidation Commissioners or the like.

These conditions were reflected in the Conference. It was plain that the extreme right wing had

consolidated its position with the right wing leadership of the A.L.P. No bitter struggles took place in connection with policy matters, nor was there any forceful criticism of the leadership of the Party. This in turn led to the lack of any enthusiasm at the Conference and, in fact, the quality of the delegates compared unfavorably with previous years and the conduct of some left much to be desired.

The desire of the right wing leadership to achieve peace within the Party led to what might appear as extremely contradictory decisions, and because of the lack of a militant grouping among delegates the rank and file failed to conduct any real struggle against undemocratic trends and proposals.

Because of the unity between the right wing and the extreme right wing it was possible for Conference to be managed in an extremely clever way. Indicative was the early introduction of the resolution on the socialist objective. The resolution paid lip service to the need for socialisation of industry, diverted attention along the lines of legislative enactment of socialism and drew attention to the constitutional difficulties which it was claimed stood in the way and could be removed only by referendum. The presentation of this "token" resolution succeeded in preventing discussion on the large number of excellent, practical agenda items from Branches and Unions calling for nationalisation of important monopoly industries.

Most of the resolutions from the Branches and Unions on policy matters were good and, like those on nationalisation, expressed the desire of large

August, 1947

sections of the A.L.P. rank and file to see Labor's platform implemented, but most of them were either sidetracked, as in the case of the nationalisation items, or were watered down and presented in composite resolutions from the Agenda Committee.

Such actions by the management of the Conference are of course indicative of the fact that the extreme right wing in the A.L.P. act as the agents of monopoly capital and seek to divert the struggle of the Labor masses into the most ineffective channels.

It was not possible, despite the unity in the camp of the right wing, for them completely to ignore the genuine interest of the workers in such immediate questions as the housing shortage, public health, high prices and similar matters. The decisions of the Conference on these questions were progressive and were in line with the constructive speech delivered by Premier McGillivray to the Conference.

The decisions reached on these matters should be put into operation. The programme is one that every progressive citizen can well support. The solution of the housing problem and other points in the programme are not matters which solely concern the A.L.P. They affect every worker, the middle classes, the farmers and rural workers. Communist and other militant workers should rally to ensure united support and action which is the only guarantee of its implementation. Trade unionists, non-party workers, farmers, professional people, must be shown the need for unity to implement the declarations of the A.L.P. Conference on these vital issues.

The right wing seized the opportunity which Conference presented to continue their attacks against the Communist Party. The extreme right wing went to the lengths of absurdity by proposing that any member of the A.L.P. who supported proposals put forward by any Communist either in a Union or on the Labor Council or elsewhere should be called upon to show cause before the Central Executive of the A.L.P. why they should not be dealt with.

Shortelle, one of the leaders of the extreme right, not only stated that such persons should be excluded from the Labor Party, but declared that any delegate opposing his proposition should be dealt with.

The farcical nature of the proposal was demonstrated by the fact that at meetings of the Labor Council Shogalle, Jackson and other right wing A.L.P. members had supported proposals moved by leading Communists. To date we have not heard of these A.L.P. leaders calling on the Executive to deal with them.

The principal red-baiting propositions, however, were contained in the report on the development of A.L.P. Industrial Groups. It is through these groups that the right wing hopes to secure a large measure of control of the trade unions. The con-

stitution of these Groups provide that they shall select candidates to run for positions in the various trade unions and lays down that any member who opposes the selected candidate or does not work to assist in securing the election of the candidate shall be excluded from the Group.

One clause in the Industrial Group constitution permits the exclusion of A.L.P. members from the Groups where any Group might consider the member as "unsatisfactory." On the other hand it permits the enrolment of non-members of the A.L.P. In other words a person excluded from A.L.P. membership by the A.L.P. Conference can be a member of the Industrial Groups whilst genuine A.L.P. members can be excluded; a Group can exclude an A.L.P. member on the votes of non-members of the Labor Party.

This extraordinary departure from the general constitutional position of the Labor Party found only few opponents at the Conference, but the general feeling displayed an uneasiness nonetheless. It has certainly aroused hostility among more progressive members in the Branches and Unions.

It is however important to keep in mind that these A.L.P. Industrial Groups consist of workers in the various factories — the rank and file workers in industry. The main body of these workers are concerned with the problems of the working class and with a constructive policy for improving the standard of living, working conditions, housing, education and a whole number of other matters. Despite the desire of the right wing to use these Groups for their own ends, it will be possible for Communists to unite with genuine working class members of the Groups around the positive problems in their factory and industry.

The favorable situation referred to earlier will undergo considerable change.

At the Conference Prime Minister Chifley took the opportunity of warning against trade recessions. He spoke of the threat of certain American business interests and of the danger to the "Golden Age" which he had foreseen in Australia, which might lead to unemployment and economic crisis.

Communists know the economic structure of capitalism and the inevitability of recurring economic crises within the general crisis of capitalism. When the crisis develops in Australia the Labor Party will be faced with the problem of meeting the situation.

In the economic crisis of the early 30's, when thousands of workers were on the dole, the Labor Party in office in the State and Federal spheres sought a solution to the crisis, not in the workers' way, but in the capitalist way. They introduced the Premiers' Plan, placing the full burden of the crisis on the workers.

The struggles inside the Labor Party against this reactionary policy gave rise to a tremendous progressive upsurge that brought sweeping changes in leadership in New South Wales.

Just as the recent A.L.P. Conference was a reflection of the general economic and political situation of today, so the A.L.P. conferences of the future will reflect the struggle of the A.L.P.

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY: THE WAY TO THE PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT OF POLAND

WLADYSLAW GOMULKA

[From "Political Affairs," New York, April, 1947. Reprinted from "Glos Ludu" ("People's Voice"), Warsaw, No. 330. Excerpts from an address delivered at a meeting of party activists of the P.P.R. and the P.P.S. in Warsaw, November 29, 1946. The author is the Vice-Premier of Poland and general secretary

of the Polish Workers' Party.]

AN agreement on unity of action and co-operation concluded between the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.) and the Polish Workers' Party (P.P.R.) must be included among political events of great weight and importance.

Under the existing alignment of political forces in Poland unity of action of the workers' parties and a united front of the working class constitute a basic condition for the firm establishment of all the social and political achievements so far attained. On the basis of unity of action of both workers' parties, with close co-operation with other democratic parties, the Polish Workers' Party established the conception of the Polish way of development toward socialism. This conception is significant because it does not include the necessity of a violent, revolutionary political upheaval in the development of Poland and eliminates the necessity of a dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of government in the most difficult period of transition. On the basis of realistic views we have established the possibility of development toward socialism through the system of people's democracy in which the bloc of democratic parties exercises the power of government. This conception, calculating on a peaceful, evolutionary development, would have been difficult to conceive without the presupposition of close co-operation of both our parties and of a worker-peasant alliance.

Some people repeat constantly that the Polish Workers' Party is aiming at the dictatorship of the proletariat and wants to establish socialism in Poland by following the same road as the Soviet Union. It is not necessary to establish that those who make such assertions do so not only because they do not understand Marxism at all, not only because they do not know how to draw conclusions from the differences between historical epochs and concrete historical situations, but because, above all, they want to falsify historical facts and to make it easier for themselves to wage a struggle against our party.

Because this problem has so far not been discussed extensively in public by our party and because of its importance for strengthening the unity of action of both our parties, I consider it advisable

workers for a militant solution to their problems and will again bring the progressive sections into battle against the extreme right wing and the reformist policy of class collaboration.

able to clarify it from the point of view of the party which I represent.

First, I should like to call your attention to three basic differences, easily perceived by all, which mark the paths of development of the Soviet Union and Poland.

The first difference is that the social and political changes in Russia were effected through a violent revolution and in our country in a peaceful way.

The second difference is that the Soviet Union had to go through the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, while in our country there is no such period; and it can be avoided.

The third difference characterising the variation in the ways of development of both countries is that the government in the Soviet Union is in the hands of the Councils of Delegates, or Soviets, which combine the legislative and executive functions and constitute the socialist form of government, whereas in our country the legislative and executive functions are separated and the government is based on a parliamentary democracy.

Nothing would be more false than a belief that these differences originated from the subjective will of individual people in Poland and in the Soviet Union or resulted from the political line of parties functioning in Poland and the Soviet Union. The internal disposition of class forces existing during the Russian Revolution and during the period of the taking over of the government of Poland by the democratic camp decided the differences in the ways of development of Poland and Russia.

Why was it necessary to have a violent revolution in Russia to overthrow the czarist government and to effect social and political changes?

Two causes made the revolution necessary: first, oppression by the czarist government; second, the power of world capitalism, or, to put it differently, the weakness of world democracy.

Lenin said that the power of the czarist government rested on a well-organised and strong class of landlords, on an even better organised and strong class of Russian capitalists teamed with foreign capital, and on a strong state apparatus and ingrained czarist traditions. These were the

three "whales" that could not have been defeated in a peaceful way. It was necessary to defeat them through revolution.

Besides these three internal elements, which gave the czarist government its power to oppress, there was also an external element in the form of the power of capitalist states which supported the czarist government in its struggle with the revolution. Moreover, in 1917 world capital was, in an ideological and governmental sense, much stronger than at the end of the Second World War when the democratic forces were coming to the fore.

All these elements, which in 1917 constituted the strength of the Russian czarist government and could have been broken only by a violent revolution, were in a different position in Poland in 1944. The working class and the toiling masses of Poland did not have to use violent means to overthrow the landlords and big capitalists; for these forces were weak, politically compromised and isolated. That is why it was possible to remove them in a different way.

The weakness of the Polish landlords and capitalists at the moment when the democratic camp was taking over the government was due to the fact that they did not have the state apparatus needed for the struggle with the democratic forces. It is true that, in defence of these classes, various reactionary and fascist groups came forward; but they did not have enough strength to overcome the strength of the democratic camp. The main and basic armed strength of the Polish capitalists, landlords and reaction in general — Anders' army — was outside the country, and unable to do much in defence of their interests.

Therefore the primary cause which permitted the peaceful overthrow of reaction in Poland was the complete shattering of the state apparatus in Poland as a result of the September catastrophe and the utter ill-suitedness of the apparatus of the London delegates in Poland.

At the moment of the liberation of Poland, the power was simply lying on the street. It was picked up by democracy, which proved itself stronger than reaction.

Besides this primary cause there were also others. A very large part of reaction compromised itself in the eyes of the nation as a result of the September disaster of Poland and the anti-Soviet policy of the emigre governments. Many Soviet policy of the emigre governments. Many reactionaries fled from Poland with the Germans or later, in order to organise and prepare their forces abroad for the struggle with the democratic forces inside the country. All this also had an influence in weakening reaction and made possible a peaceful transformation of our social and political conditions.

Another factor which facilitated our taking over power was the inertness of foreign capital in Poland. German capital could not act as a force at all; for, as a result of its defeat, it was eliminated; and the whole nation was inflamed with hatred

toward the Germans. Foreign capital of other origin was actually taken over by the Germans, and that also paralysed its power and prevented it from playing any independent role.

Moreover, all reactionary elements, under the influence of the disaster of Hitlerism and the victories of the Soviet Army, were imbued with fright and incapable of waging an effective struggle against the democratic forces.

Finally, the democratic camp attained power on the wave of the struggle for national liberation. Reaction subordinated the struggle with the occupation forces to its endeavors to gain power in the country. The trend of war developments, however, was not unfolding in accordance with its interests, was not creating favorable perspectives for it to take over power at the moment of the liberation of the country; for everything indicated that Poland would be liberated by the Red Army. Hence, reaction was opposed to armed struggle with Germany. And while reaction's chief watchword was a call to stand ready with arms, the watchword of democracy was an armed struggle with the occupation forces. The stand of reaction on the struggle for national liberation compromised it in the eyes of the Polish nation and in the democratic opinion of the world.

No one had greater opportunities and a greater moral right to take over the reins of government after the expulsion of the Germans than those who had thrown all their strength on the scale of struggle for national liberation.

Reaction rested its claims to power on the provisions of the "Sanacja" (Pilsudskiyite) Constitution and on the so-called continuity and legality of governments of Poland. But when the developments of events convinced it that a concrete struggle for the liberation of the country was of greater weight and importance in Poland than a title of legal inheritance of power from "Sanacja," when the P.K.W.N. (Polish Committee of National Liberation) was formed and took into its hands the reins of government in Poland for further organization and direction of the struggle for national liberation, then reaction decided on a desperate, mad and then reaction decided on a desperate, mad and simultaneously criminal step from the viewpoint of involving aimless shedding of the nation's blood. It called the Warsaw uprising at a time when it was known in advance that the Germans would drown it in a sea of blood. But this particular bloodshed was needed by reaction in order to conceal with it its former stand on the struggle for national liberation and to use it later as a pretext to take over the reins of government. However, it was too late. The government was already in the hands of a united democratic camp.

All these circumstances contributed to the creation of a historical opportunity which made it possible to remove reaction from power in a peaceful way and to introduce great social reforms

by the democratic forces without bloodshed, without a revolution and civil war. The Russian masses did not have such a historical opportunity at the moment when they were reaching for power. That is why the revolution to overthrow the czarist government was unavoidable. But in our country it was possible to overthrow reaction in a peaceful way.

Due to the same alignment of class forces which resulted in the October Revolution in Russia, the necessity arose for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to assure the victory of the revolution. In the face of the counter-revolution of the landlords, the capitalists and the right generally in city and village, which was supported by armed intervention on the part of the capitalist states, the Soviet Union had to proceed on the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat was born in a situation of war and horrible hunger, in a situation when the revolution, threatened with defeat, had to crush absolutely the sabotage in supplying foodstuffs for the army, for the working class and for all people who worked in the cities. Revolutionary Russia, fighting against domestic and foreign counter-revolution in order to retain power, simultaneously had to fight the imperialist invaders in order to defend her lands from conquest.

Because the domestic counter-revolution allied itself with foreign interventionists, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a form of state power, was the greatest guarantor of the defence of the country, of the retention of power and of the repulsion of the imperialist invaders.

The problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the situation then existing, amounted to the following: whether the October Revolution would destroy the counter-revolution regardless of the means to be used; or whether, in the case of hesitation, it would itself be strangled and destroyed by the counter-revolution. If there had been no dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, if the October Revolution, after achieving power, had permitted, under the then existing disposition of forces, a parliamentary way of deciding the problems of social reconstruction, it would have been crushed by the landlords and capitalists, who would then have established their own dictatorship and would have exacted a terrible revenge for the attempt to deprive them of their power and fortunes.

We proceed on the basis that, under Polish conditions, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the form of government, can be avoided. We base ourselves on the following considerations:

1. Polish democracy also attained power during a war, but there is a basic difference between our situation and the situation in Russia after the October Revolution.

We took power without applying the force of revolution against reaction. The weakness of re-

action permitted us to apply democratic methods of exercising power.

Our strength lay in this, that we took power under the slogan of liberating our country from German occupation and we were able to realise it.

Reaction was unable to utilise its ideological influence in the greater part of the nation, it was unable to organise the masses for a struggle to overthrow our power; for the masses shared our opinion that the nation's main objective was to fight the Germans, to liberate the country. In this struggle the power of democracy and of the government created by it was strengthened.

The dictatorship of the working class, the class which was and is at the head of the democratic camp, was unnecessary; for the resistance of reaction did not overflow into a wide wave of counter-revolution. Reaction was unable to organise such resistance.

2. In taking over power in July, 1944, we had the certainty of victory over Germany. The working class in Russia, on attaining power in 1917, found itself faced with the catastrophe of war and with the threat of the rape of its country by world imperialism with which domestic reaction was allied.

3. When taking over power, we were confronted only with a boycott by world reaction, which at first did not recognise our democratic government in reborn Poland. However, the struggle in our case was limited to suppressing the activities of the diversionary groups of Polish reaction. This was due to the growth of strength of world democracy as a result of the defeat of fascism during the war. This strength is far greater than it was at the moment of the overthrow of Russian czarism. World reaction cannot organise more extensive assistance to Polish reaction; for the disposition of political forces in its own countries does not permit it to do so.

We are witnessing the growth of democratic strength in the French nation after the Second World War. We also see the development in England, where the nation declared itself against reaction in the elections, giving the majority of the votes to the Labor Party and expressing in this way its democratic tendencies. Similarly in other countries, in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Italy, the strength of the democratic forces is everywhere growing.

This power of world democracy is strengthening our democracy, for it is not permitting world reaction to extend such help to Polish reaction as the landlords and capitalists in czarist Russia received during the first years of the socialist revolution.

We should remember that the working class in Russia, when it took power, was confronted with armed intervention by fourteen capitalist states which wanted to strangle the October Revolution.

4. When taking over power we were also confronted with great economic difficulties, which we still feel to this day. But our difficulties, our

shortages of supplies are so much smaller and we can overcome them so much easier, among other things because the Soviet Union is extending help to us, while revolutionary Russia had to rely exclusively on herself. On the one hand the capitalist states tried to separate her with a barbed-wire fence of isolation from the rest of the world, while the internal counter-revolution organised sabotage and brought the terrible disaster of hunger upon the workers and upon the cities in general.

5. There is furthermore the fact that the Soviet Union was able to erect a powerful industry only at the cost of tremendous hardships imposed on society and that, in close connection with the industrialisation of the country, she was faced with the problem of the collectivisation of agriculture.

We, however, find ourselves in a far better situation. Independently of the possibilities of receiving foreign credits for the reconstruction and development of our industry, we can effect that purpose with lesser hardship on our people. This is made possible by the fact that the actual productive potential of our industry, proportionate to our population, is far greater than the productive potential of Russia before the realisation of its Five-Year Plans. Similarly, there is not the slightest need for us to follow the Soviet pattern of agricultural economy. We have rejected collectivisation, since in Polish conditions it would be harmful in the economic and political sense.

This position of ours results from the character of the social and political system of Poland. Our democracy and the social system which we are building and establishing have no historical precedent. And our experiences till now show that the results are good.

Ours is not a country with a typical capitalist system; for our basic branches of industrial production, the banks and transportation have been nationalised.

Ours is not a country with a socialist system; for the non-socialised sector of production occupies a very important place in our national economy. We have recognised the necessity and usefulness of

individual initiative and non-socialised forms of production in a definite segment of industrial production; we have rejected completely the collectivisation of agriculture. We have, however, created conditions permitting us to regulate the non-socialised segment of industrial production in accordance with the needs of the entire national economy.

Our type of democracy is not similar to the traditional democracies existing in other countries, even in those which are governed by a parliamentary socialist majority.

Our people's democracy differs, or rather is distinguished from, the democracies existing in the West by such facts as that our democracy needed only a very short period of time to expropriate the landlords and to nationalise big and middle-size industry, while the western democracies are approaching social reforms very timidly. Therefore, under the democratic systems of the western countries, the actual rulers are the big capitalists and bankers, or at least they have the deciding role in governing the country, while under our democratic system this is impossible.

Our democracy is also not similar to Soviet democracy, just as our social system is not similar to the Soviet system.

In the Soviet Union, which has solved the problem of class antagonism, there exists only one party — the Communist Party — while in our country several democratic parties operate legally.

Polish democracy is exercising power through a multi-party parliamentary system. The Polish National Council serves today as a temporary form of that system; tomorrow the form will be the Parliament, chosen in general elections. Soviet democracy realises national power through Soviets, and its parliamentary system is based on principles different from ours.

Our democracy has many elements of socialist democracy and also many elements of liberal-bourgeois democracy, just as our economic system has many features of socialist and capitalist economy. Our type of democracy and our social system we have designated "People's Democracy."

EVATT ATTACKS CIVIL LIBERTIES

TOM WRIGHT

DR. EVATT, Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, and an ex-Judge of the High Court, has sneaked through Parliament the Approved Defence Projects Act. This legislation attacks civil liberties as viciously as did Bruce's 1926 amendments to the Crimes Act.

This infamous betrayal of the labor movement was perpetrated unostentatiously on June 3 and 6. On June 3 the bill was introduced by its author, Dr. Evatt, who made a twenty-six minutes speech. No one else spoke. The debate on the second reading commenced at 3.13 a.m. in the closing hours of the session. All of the proceedings including

the committee stage occupied one and three-quarter hours and the betrayal was accomplished. There was no division, the legislation being agreed to on the voices.

According to statements attributed to Mrs. Doris Blackburn, only twelve members were awake at the time. Only one member of the Labor Party spoke to the measure, Dr. Evatt, its perpetrator. There was one voice in defence of civil liberties, Mrs. Blackburn's. The only other speakers were Menzies, Cameron, Corser, White and Holt of the Opposition who gave their wholehearted blessing to this iniquitous measure.

It is necessary to ask how one Labor Party Minister, supported by five open enemies of the labor movement, could get away with this flagrant attack on the democratic rights of the Australian people.

First it is clear that the Bill was never properly discussed in the Caucus, that its terms were never read or explained by its author. Secondly, Ward, Frazer and Beazley, to mention three who are usually alert in defence of civil liberties, were absent from the House at the time of its enactment. However, Dr. Evatt has landed the Government with legislation which becomes its responsibility.

This new edition of the Crimes Act is termed "an Act to provide for the protection of Approved Defence Projects and for other purposes." Section 3 defines an approved defence project as "Any work or undertaking for the testing of long range weapons which is approved by the Minister of State for Defence as an immediate defence project and including any other work or undertaking, being carried out either within or outside Australia, for the defence of Australia or any territory of the Commonwealth, which is so approved as an immediate defence project."

Section 4 provides that "Any person who without reasonable cause or excuse by boycott or threat of boycott of any persons, property, work or undertaking, prevents, hinders, or obstructs or endeavours to prevent, hinder or obstruct the carrying out of an approved defence project . . . or by speech or writing advocates or encourages the prevention, hindrance or obstruction of the carrying out of an approved defence project . . . shall be guilty of an offence." The maximum penalty is one year's gaol or a £5,000 fine. (On June 20 the rocket range was gazetted as an approved defence project.)

The excuse, or avowed reason, given by Dr. Evatt for his repressive legislation is the pamphlet, "Rocket Range Threatens Australia," by Alf Watt, Secretary of the Communist Party in S.A., from which he quoted to show that trade unions might oppose the rocket range project. The hypocrisy of this excuse will be apparent when it is recognised that prior to this legislation, the Australian Communist Party had made it perfectly clear that it would not support any proposal to "boycott" the rocket range but would persist with its criticisms of Dr. Evatt's foreign policy, which involves Australia in the war plans of American imperialism, and that it would support the humanitarian appeals on behalf of the tribal aborigines, threatened by the rocket range. There can be no doubt, for example, that another pamphlet, "The Rocket Range, Aborigines and War," containing a speech by Dr. Duguid is an indictment of the rocket range policy as outspoken as Alf Watt's and equally distasteful to the chief arbiter of Australia's foreign policy in the Labor Caucus.

When comparing the new act, particularly Section 4, with the 1926 Crimes Act amendments, sponsored by Sir John Latham, who afterwards

became a Judge of the High Court, one is struck with the similarity in terms. However, Dr. Evatt, who as a judge condemned the corresponding sections of the Crimes Act, could not very well use this Act for his own purposes, although it contains all and more than he requires.

It is also to be noted that, as a Judge, the Attorney-General had questioned the validity of the Crimes Act. The new Act seeks its constitutional basis in the specific 'defence' powers vested in the Commonwealth Government.

An examination of the new Act reveals that it is an offence for any person, in speech or writing, to state what may be held to prevent, hinder or obstruct a Government project or even to state that any person should have this right. In effect any person can be imprisoned or fined for criticising the Government.

Already there has been some exposure of this attack on civil liberties and a number of protests. The Rev. W. Bottomly of Melbourne has called it "the greatest blow to freedom dealt by any Federal Parliament since federation." Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick of the Council for Civil Liberties has forecast that if Dr. Evatt attempts to enforce the Act many men and women will get up and denounce the Government projects and dare him to prosecute. Demands for repeal of this legislation are being made in the trade unions.

Mr. A. E. Monk, Secretary of the Australasian Council of Trade Unions, reported to the Melbourne Trades Hall Council that he had discussed the matter with Dr. Evatt pointing out its menace to trade unions pursuing their normal industrial activity.

It is dangerous for the labor movement to assume that the Government will not dare to use the Act in its broad interpretation. There is a sinister aspect in the persistence with this legislation around the question of red baiting in parliament a clear exposition of the rocket range, despite the game of shuttlecock between the Attorney-General and the Opposition over the timely purpose of an alleged plan for a Communist Party monopoly of trade with Indonesia. Is Dr. Evatt so much enmeshed with American warmongers that internal war preparations like the U.S. Labor Bill must have their counterpart in Australia? Certainly Dr. Evatt did not get authority or support for his Act from any section of the labor movement he is supposed to represent.

Past experience has also shown that repressive legislation, introduced for a specific purpose, is often used at a later date for quite other purposes. One outstanding example of this was the use of the dictation test in an attempt to exclude the New Zealander, Gerald Griffin, and the Czechoslovak, Egon Kisch, from entering Australia in 1934 to attend a conference in connection with the International Peace Campaign. The dictation test was introduced specifically to exclude only persons from Asiatic countries.

Spokesmen of the Labor Government have already announced the Government's intention to repeal the objectionable sections of the Crimes

Act. The labor movement and all democrats must demand the repeal also of Dr. Evatt's Defence Projects Act.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA ON THE MOUNTBATTEN AWARD

DELHI, June 20, 1947.

1. The Mountbatten Award does not give India real independence but is the culmination of a double-faced Imperial policy which, while making concessions to the national demand to transfer power, sets in motion disruptive and reactionary forces to disrupt the popular upsurge, obstruct the realisation of real independence, throttle the growth of democracy and destroy the unity and integrity of India.

2. British Imperial Aims.

The growing mass upsurge of the various sections of the Indian people, the States' people's struggles in State after State, the gigantic wave of working-class strikes, peasant actions, the brave anti-imperialist demonstrations of students and the militant mood of the armed forces brought the imperialists face to face with the unprecedented strength of the national liberation movement.

In addition, British imperialism emerged greatly weakened politically and economically out of World War II. Its main imperialist rival, the United States, vastly strengthened in the war, threatened to sweep it out of its traditional imperial bases. At home, the British Labor movement would not back the reconquest of India. All over the world, democratic opinion, immensely strengthened with the defeat of fascism, demanded Indian independence.

Hemmed in from all sides, the Imperialist rulers have been forced to enter into negotiations with Indian leadership, talk of agreeing to Indian independence while they seek new forms of indirect rule. This has been the central aim of British policy ever since the Cabinet Mission Plan and the Mountbatten Plan is the latest variant, despite obvious differences. The sole purpose is to disrupt the people, strengthen reaction, get into alliance with it and thus make Indian independence formal.

(a) Control through Partition. The British policy of divide and rule, exploiting Hindu-Muslim differences, produced an unprecedented civil war. It has now culminated in the final act of partition of the country into two hostile States which they plan to control by entering into new alliances with reactionary forces in the different partitioned areas.

The British imperialist aim is to influence the reactionary leadership of the League to keep Pakistan a British Dominion, to allow British capital to have almost undisputed sway over the undeveloped Muslim majority areas, to utilize the North-west as a strategic base and as a base for the domination of India as a whole.

British Big Business, by entering into partnership with Indian Big Business, aims to continue to dominate the economy of India. By its agreements with Indian capital it expects to preserve intact its capital and retain and extend its control over vital industries in India. It hopes to use its Indian partner as its tool to influence the military and foreign policy of the Indian Union, despite its republican form. It expects to achieve this aim, through reliance on the great influence of Indian Big Business over the extreme Right on the Congress leadership.

The Communist Party warns the Indian people that there are the new methods of control over India that British imperialism aims to employ in order to preserve its domination of India.

(b) Utilisation of Princely Puppets. In the Imperial Plan for controlling the India of the future their traditional puppets, the Indian Princes, occupy a position of supreme importance.

The Plan, by granting the Princes the option to stay away from the Indian Union, gives them a weapon to drive a hard bargain with the forces of Indian nationalism, retain their feudal privileges as far as possible and act as a brake on the democratic movement of the entire people. Thus imperialist strategy is one of putting checks and balances in the new State against the national leadership and attempting to circumscribe freedom and democracy to the utmost possible extent.

It is the selfish British imperial effort to place their fifth column inside all the organs of the Indian States of the future so that they can influence its foreign policy in the interests of their British masters.

But at the same time British imperialism encourages in a subtle manner some of the big Princes to remain "independent," in case they cannot get favorable terms from the Congress and League, so that such "independent" States can be used as its outposts on Indian soil.

The Communist Party is firmly of the opinion that the struggle against Princely autocracy is at once the struggle against British manoeuvres to limit and control Indian independence and democracy and for their full realisation.

(c) Perpetuation of colonial social order. In the background of its constitutional manoeuvres imperialism is carrying forward the struggle to save the colonial social order for existing vested interests so that in alliance with them it may retain control not only over Indian economy, but also the Indian State. Hence, through the links of Indian vested interests with the popular ministries and the steel-frame of the Indian bureaucracy, it seeks to

influence the economic and administrative policy of the provincial ministries and the Central Governments so that these governments resist radical economic measures. The results of these efforts, if successful, will lead to intensification of the economic crisis and further deterioration in the conditions of the people.

With the same end in view, the bureaucracy seeks desperately to drive a wedge between the national movement, whose leaders are at the head of the government, and the rising working-class and peasant movements. This they strive to do through use of unprecedented mass terror against workers and peasants — who constitute the main social force among our people in the vanguard of the fight against the British-created social order and for a rapid transition to a new, democratic social order.

The strategy of British imperialism is to prevent a united national revolt by exploiting all the weaknesses in our national and social life and disrupting the unity of national forces. It is a strategy to forge a new alliance with Princes, landlords and Indian Big Business to be able to control through them Indian States of the future as also Indian economy and thus manoeuvre the transition from direct to indirect rule.

3. Disruptive Procedure.

The procedure outlined by the Mountbatten Plan is as disruptive as the Plan itself and calculated to ensure its fulfilment through a series of British awards.

The Boundaries Commission and other Commissions dealing with financial and other aspects of division are only intended to worsen Hindu-Muslim-Sikh relations so that the British arbiters can give their awards intensifying the communal conflict still further.

4. The very fact that British imperialism does not hope any longer to rule India directly is recognition of the undisputed strength of the Indian freedom movement. Its desperate manoeuvres reveal not its strength but its utter weakness, which has forced it to make important concessions to the urgent demands of the national liberation movement, e.g.

(a) Transfer of power to Congress and League Governments on Dominion Status basis by August 15.

(b) Assurance, though equivocal, that Britain shall not seek to establish independent relationship with the Princes.

(c) Constituent Assemblies, despite their limitations, are free to declare for independence and make their own Constitutions.

The Communist Party is of the opinion that new opportunities for national advance have been won. The two popular Governments and the Constituent Assemblies are the strategic weapons in the hands of the national leadership. It is the task of the national movement to ensure that they are used for the rapid realisation of national aims.

The concessions have not been voluntarily given by the British Government but extracted through the continuous pressure of the Congress leadership for transfer of power and the rising tide of popular struggles of the workers, peasants, students and States' people which grew despite British-provoked civil war, despite all efforts to check and suppress them, and which showed the new spirit of the people. The British Government agreed to these concessions because there was no way out for it and hence its desperate last step of partition.

The path forward is beset with difficulties. Sharp alternatives face the national movement and our entire people.

Either imperialist manoeuvres succeed, exploiting all the fissures in our national movement, thus making Indian independence formal, or, national forces unitedly ensure that the Constituent Assemblies draft Constitutions on the basis of independence of the country and the popular Governments firmly resist imperialist pressure to extort economic and military concessions.

Either the Princes are appeased and the British fifth column is retained inside our country, or, with the support of the entire country and the popular Governments, the States' people are actively aided to win their own liberation and bring one-third of our land under the banner of independent India.

Either the anti-national and anti-democratic activities of the vested interests are checked and the task of nation-building is begun to ensure food, cloth, jobs, and a living wage, prospect of a new life to workers, peasants and the common people, by the joint efforts of the popular Governments and popular organisations, or Indian economy gets mortgaged to British Big Business and the Indian people pass through bitter suffering.

Either partitioned India grows into two hostile States with reaction strengthened within each or the progressives intervene and carry forward the struggle for reunion by demanding a complete break with British imperialism by their own States and friendly relations between them in mutual interest.

The Communist Party has consistently warned against the dangers of imperialist manoeuvres if the national movement fails to forge a united front.

It warned against partition. It suggested recognition of the right of national self-determination and the immediate implementation of fundamental democratic measures to undermine communal separatism and to preserve and strengthen Indian unity on the basis of the unity and equality of every nationality.

The Communist Party warned against the intrigues of vested interests with the popular Ministries. It demanded that the Ministries break the resistance of vested interests and meet the needs of the people.

It warned against our political parties getting entangled in the imperialist Plan and demanded a sharp break with it.

National unification behind the popular Governments for the realisation of complete independ-

ence demands that people's vigilance be roused against the compromisers in the national leaderships, people's indignation against the vested interests, and national conscience against communal provocateurs.

In the present transitional period the unification of national forces against reaction in each State is the only guarantee against imperialist manoeuvres.

The Communist Party is fully confident that imperialist intrigues can be decisively defeated. The allies of imperialism have a very narrow social basis.

THE LAST DAYS OF FRANCO

PASIONARIA

(Report at the Spanish Communist Party Congress, held in Paris, March, 1947.)

WE are holding this Congress during the last days of the Franco regime, which has brought pain to physical and moral ruin, while the democratic forces of Spain are organising themselves for the last stage of the struggle for the re-establishment of the Republic. Franco tried to turn back the wheel of History, but History marches implacably forward.

Established by Hitler and Mussolini, Franco's regime has always been at the service of foreign interests, and its fortunes were naturally influenced by the victory of the Allies. There is one milestone in history which marks the inevitability of Franco's downfall — Stalingrad. This victory was a blow for Fascism, including Franco's brand of Fascism, and a signal of hope for the forces of progress.

The Franco regime is crumbling. The workers' organisations are building themselves up again in clandestinity; there are strikes and demonstrations protesting against hunger; the peasants are showing resistance to the Franco regime, dozens of illegal newspapers are being published. National feeling is reappearing in Catalonia, Euzkadi and Galicia. The parties of the Right, who were originally part of Franco's bloc, are now pursuing an active policy independent of Franco. Representatives of the Chambers of Industry and Commerce for the whole of Spain have openly expressed the opposition of the financiers and business men to the Franco regime, according to an article published in the New York Post, pointing out the necessity for a change in the present regime and greater freedom for commerce and industry to allow it to fulfil its mission of national reconstruction. Certain elements of the Church are also showing disagreement with Franco's regime. In the army, too, Franco is losing authority, and many military leaders are seeking ways of ending the present regime.

What is happening in Spain is no surprise to us, for Fascism everywhere is government by terror and criminal oppression, giving rise to corruption and national degeneration; Franco's Fascism is

no exception. In his hands, Spain is brought to ruin. On the one hand, there is the terrible poverty of the people and on the other, fabulous fortunes made by the new rich, the Falangist class.

While the workers' wages have more or less stayed at the level of 1936, the cost of living has risen generally by 472 per cent and the cost of foodstuffs by 534 per cent.

The extreme hardships suffered by the ordinary people stand out in sharp contrast with the enormous profits declared by big business, whose principal shareholders are the Falange chiefs. Typical example is the Aznar shipping company, of which Nicolas Franco, the Caudillo's brother, is one of the main shareholders: profits for 1945 — 72,200,000 pesetas. Since 1937, this company has distributed dividends to the value of five and a half times its capital. These rates of profit, which are general throughout Spain, are not an indication of real prosperity, but of inflation, which will lead inevitably to an economic crisis on a scale without precedent in the history of Spain. Signs of it are already occurring, in the lack of markets and foreign currency. The production of steel has declined alarmingly; the production of coke from gas is now only 35 per cent of that of 1935; phosphates, essential to agriculture, 71 per cent of the 1935 level; lead, 71 per cent; copper, 40 per cent; sulphur, 20 per cent. The decline in sulphates and copper is particularly important because it has repercussions on agriculture and the production of the necessities of life.

One of the forms of struggle against the regime is sabotage of production. The workers do not want to produce for Franco. The peasants are resisting the Falangist decrees because the land is not theirs, and the products of it not for their consumption. The following details appear in the financial review of the Bank of Vizcaya: "In comparison with 1935, production of coal in 1944 has decreased in the following proportions: Anthracite, 1 per cent; bituminous, 29 per cent; lignite, 43 per cent."

As for agriculture, the decrease in the area sown reaches phenomenal proportions. In 1935, for instance, the total area sown with wheat was 11,250,000 acres; in 1945 total area had decreased to 8,750,000 acres. Similar decreases are shown in the case of oats, maize, beans, potatoes, beetroot and onions.

There is a perfectly simple explanation for these decreases: the peasants are not sowing because they are reduced once more by the Franco regime to the state of servitude which the Republic had abolished. Remember on the other hand, the great contribution made to the war effort by the peasants of Valencia, Castilla, Andalucia and Extremadura, when these regimes were the granaries of Loyalist Spain. In those days a Republican Minister, Vicente Uribe, a member of the Communist Party, brought new democratic life to the fields of Spain, and awakened patriotic feelings which were in danger of being suffocated through bureaucratic delays and corrupt interests. In those days our peasants gave their sweat and energy to the land, and their sons and their blood to the defence of the Republic and liberty.

Let those who dream of reactionary solutions for our country, and think that anything will do to satisfy our people, remember these things. Let them not forget that Spain once knew freedom, and that a people who have been free will never be content to live in slavery.

Doubtless many people will wonder how it is that after defeat of Hitler and with such a situation existing in Spain, Franco can still maintain power. We have said before, and we say it again, Spain is not a purely national problem, but a problem of an international character. Proof of this lies in the determined efforts on the part of reactionary circles to prevent a democratic solution of the Spanish question. Today, as in 1936, Spain is a crucial point in world politics.

Franco is shamelessly surrendering Spanish sovereignty to imperialist groups in exchange for their support of his regime. In the struggle between the rival imperialist groups of Great Britain and America, Spain is a pawn of immense importance. It is vital for England to maintain and consolidate her influence in Spain, because this ensures the defence of her Empire routes and hinders American efforts to oust her from the world markets. Moreover, Spain thus becomes a bridge-head for commercial and political penetration into Europe and Africa, while at the same time it keeps open the doors to Latin-American markets.

For the Americans, the conquest of economic and political influence in Spain means the power to stand across the trade routes of France, England and Italy; to penetrate into Morocco; to ensure lines of communication to the petrol of the East; to create new American bases in the Mediterranean; to open American routes to the European market and to add new links to the long chain of strategic

points acquired by the U.S.A. throughout the world, both during and after the war. And it is quite on the cards that one day Truman may appear as the saviour of poor little Franco, as he did recently with reactionary Greece.

For this policy international imperialism needs a reactionary Spain, ready to lend itself to these aggressive, anti-democratic intentions. This amply explains why, two years after the victory of the democracies, Franco can still remain in power.

There is no secret about the open, bare-faced intervention of foreign agents in their attempts to re-establish the monarchy as a substitute for Franco. There are certain imperialist groups interested in the continuation of a fascist or a semi-fascist regime in Spain as an instrument against all democratic countries; and when certain people, perhaps quite sincerely, that if the Communists were not in the Republican government it would receive greater support from Britain and U.S.A. they are judging the policy of the dominant groups in those countries too naively. The British imperialists and American reactionaries have no desire to see the Republic re-established in Spain, even if it were a moderate republic. They want to keep Spain in a position of weakness and instability; with Franco or without, with a king or a regency; no matter, but certainly without democracy, without freedom, without sovereignty.

In spite of all this, we know that the efforts of these reactionary groups will fail. Everywhere, including those countries where imperialist circles have great influence, the weight of the democratic forces and all peace-loving people is greater than that of the groups who dream of new aggressive ventures and of imposing new regimes of tyranny and oppression on the people.

We are optimistic because we know that the working-class and the democratic forces of every country are on our side; that the great Soviet Union is also on our side defending the cause of the Spanish Republic against its enemies in the international conferences. Further proof of this solidarity is the action of the French Government in closing the frontier, and the attitude of those governments which have broken relations with Franco, those which have never established relations, and those which have established relations with the Republican government. The decision taken by the U.N.O. is an encouraging sign; and although it is still not what the Spanish people deserve, it is an enormous importance, because for the first time in a conference of such scope, Franco's regime has been recognised as fascist, thus recognising implicitly the justice of the Republican cause. This decision is the first step in more far-reaching decisions which will lead to the final liquidation of Franco.

We are optimistic because of the increasing acts of solidarity expressed in the decisions of the Trade Unions; the creation in Britain of the Parliamentary

Committee for Aid to Republican Spain; the action of the workers of Metro-Vickers, of the workers of Chile, of Cuba, of Holland, and of Norway, the great demonstrations of solidarity organised by the democratic peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and Palestine. The peoples of Latin-America, too, who are fighting against imperialism, are continuing to help us because they know that only a free, democratic Spain can open new horizons of liberty for America, and establish firm bonds of fraternal relations between Spain and the countries of America.

But above all, we are optimistic because we know the fight our people are waging and we know that they hate Franco's bloody regime.

I call on the workers of all countries, on all peoples and democracies, to increase their acts of solidarity with the cause of the Republican Spain, to defend the cause of the Republic as their own; to prevent the supply of raw materials to Franco; to insist that their governments break relations with Franco and recognise the government of the Spanish Republic.

When the question of the regime which is to succeed Franco comes up for discussion, the Communist Party declares without any hesitation that the only regime which can succeed Franco is a democratic Republic, and the Communist Party will devote all its energies and strength to the establishment of the Republic.

Franco's propaganda has concentrated on the bogey of the Communist danger, continually presenting the conservative forces with the dilemma of "Fascism or Communism." In its manifesto of September, 1942, the Communist Party completely exploded this line of Franco propaganda, exposing the falsity of this dilemma, and pointing out the democratic solution to the situation: the re-establishment of the Republic.

In answer to the anxiety of the forces which can become allies of the working class in its fight against Franco, the Communist Party today ratifies the policy which it has consistently maintained and defended, and declares: "Abiding by the programme laid down at our Congress at Toulouse in 1945, the Communist Party considers that the regime which is to succeed Franco must be a Republic. As an independent party of the proletariat, the Communist Party pledges itself to fight for the Republic, within the democratic standards established, together with all the national democratic forces, both in the functions of the State, and in the work of reconstruction of Spain in restoring the national economy which has been ruined by Franco.

"We consider that one of the essential premises for the development of democracy is the introduction of a profound agrarian reform, together with the solution of the national problem, including that of Morocco; and the Communist

Party will fight for the solution of the problem of the ownership of the land, and the question of nationalities and colonial peoples, in accordance with fundamental democratic principles and the interests of the working class, the people and the Republic.

"The Communist Party considers that the bourgeois character of the democratic Republic for which it is fighting does not exclude, but rather presupposes, the active participation of the working class in the administration of the country and the consolidation of democratic institutions. The Communist Party will fight for the due representation of the working class in all state organisms, since only in that way will it be possible to create solid and lasting institutions in our country.

"It is also false that the Communist Party wants to force a civil war. The war is already on; it never stopped. Franco himself said so in his speech at Burgos on October 1, 1946, when he declared: 'We thought that with our crusade we had achieved peace, and nevertheless, as you know, we have had ten years of war.'

"We are just the people most interested in avoiding bloodshed, because it is always we who make the greatest contribution to the sacrifice. We want peace, justice and the re-establishment of normal democratic order; we want to live and work in conditions of legality, because in that way we can develop our organisations with greater facility, and prove the falsity of our enemies' accusations, and make our programme known throughout the country."

The Republican parties need not see a rival in the Communist Party, but rather an ally in the long period of democratic development which will open after the downfall of Franco. We Communists do not agree with those who say that the Republican parties have no part in the Spain of tomorrow. On the contrary, we believe that they have an important part to play, and we shall support and defend collaboration with all Republican parties and individuals who are sincere in their desire to fight for a true progressive democracy in our country.

It has been said that the obstacle to the solution of the Spanish question is the position between intransigence and compromise, and the Communist Party is blamed for obstructing the solution. This is a lie, designed to justify a defeatist viewpoint.

I repeat, the Communist Party is more interested than anybody else in finding the true solution corresponding to the wishes and needs of the people, because ours is the party which is fighting hardest and shedding most blood in seeking a true solution.

To those who claim that the monarchy is a solution, may we point out that our people has never taken up arms for the monarchy as a form of government, yet they fought heroically for three years for the Republic; and the flower of Spanish youth has died in Franco's prisons after being

subjected to terrible tortures and still remained faithful to their democratic ideals. To forget all this, to forget all that has happened since 1936, would be an act of treachery towards all those who died for the Republic.

The Communist Party insists that the people should decide, that they should be consulted. But in order for the people to decide, the conditions for freedom of decision must first be created; the Communist Party declared in December, 1945, and repeats today, that it is willing to accept the decision of the people once Franco and Falange have been thrown out.

In the fight of the Spanish people against Franco, the Communist Party is in the vanguard. When others were demoralised by defeat, the Communist Party declared that the defeat of the Spanish people was a cruel, bloody defeat, but that it was only a temporary defeat, that the fight had not ended. What is more, the Communists began to organise the fight against Franco in each region, province and village. They organised in secret, and those who were in danger of their lives took to the mountains and initiated the guerrilla movement which has now become so strong. From the very first the Communist Party was the soul of the popular resistance, the organiser of the fight.

A conspiracy of silence is maintained around the heroic fighting that is going on in Spain, but the Communist Party lives among the peasant guerrilla fighters and the men fighting in the mountains of Andalucía, Aragón, Asturias, etc. The fighting now extends not only to the mountains, but also the plains, villages and towns, on such a scale that Franco can no longer hide the existence of these fighters; and the leaders of these guerrilla bands are such men as Cristino García, Ramon Via, and many others whom we are proud to claim as ours, not because all those who fight are Communists, but because all those who fight think, as the Communists think, that only the hard road of struggle and sacrifice will lead to victory over Franco. The increase in guerrilla activities is clearly shown by the fact that in 1945 the average number of guerrilla incidents was 29 per month; in 1946, 37 per month; and for the first months of 1947, 40 per month.

The struggle of the guerrillas has taken on a more political, more offensive character; their blows are directed at the regime and those who serve it, so that the people seeing their interests defended by the guerrilla fighters, do not hesitate to give them their support in the fight for liberation.

The Communist Party is in the forefront of the fight against Franco, in the guerrilla fighting, in the organisation of trade unions, and in publishing dozens of newspapers. The activity of our Party is no secret; the whole of Spain knows about it. It is not surprising, therefore, that our Party is increasing, and that the workers and peasants see in it their party, a national party fighting in the in-

terests of the people. Even in the prisons, the Communists have organised hunger strikes in solidarity with the prisoners of Alcalá de Henares and Carabanchel; and by their firmness in the face of torture, have proved that no terror can shake the resistance of those who fight for the cause of freedom and liberty.

We repeat again and again the need for unity in order to achieve the liberation of our people; and above all, the unity of the parties of the working class with the parties of the Republic.

This necessity became clear in the days of the war. Unity was necessary then in order to carry on the war and to win peace; it is necessary now in order to strike the last decisive blow at Franco's regime. The attitude of the Communist Party remains one of condemnation of Franco, and willingness to join in common action with all other anti-Franco forces who sincerely desire the downfall of Franco and are prepared to respect the will of the people. The Communist Party declares: neither intransigence towards non-Republican anti-Franco forces, nor liquidationism. We must finish with Franco, but not merely in order to substitute any kind of regime.

Collaboration, for a certain period, in accordance with a definite policy, with forces whose aims differ widely from our own, does not mean that we are renouncing our revolutionary principles. We are prepared to go forward with all who want to fight Franco, because we want to put an end to the suffering of our people and to prevent the complete ruin of Spain.

The Communist Party has given thousands of its best members to the fight, and if all the Republican groups had thrown their forces into the fight with the same energy, the question of the Spanish regime would be in a very different position today. Unfortunately, many sections of the Republican camp lack confidence in their own strength and in the fighting power of the people. This attitude is false and dangerous. Victory lies within the reach of the Republicans but to attain it we must remain united, in a solid Republican front against the intrigues and manoeuvres of those who are opposed to the establishment of a democratic regime in Spain.

The dangers of capitulation have not completely disappeared, and the only way to defeat these intrigues is to maintain unity among the anti-Franco forces.

There is now a Republican government, recently formed under the premiership of a Socialist, and in which the Communist Party is participating, but it is paradoxical that although there is collaboration at government level, there is as yet no Republican front supporting the government, on which it can rely to carry out its policy. It is vital that all disunity in the Republican camp should be stamped out, and so deprive those so-called democratic

groups in certain countries of their only pretext for refusing to help Republican Spain.

To those who say that there is already the Alliance of Democratic Forces, we reply that that is not enough. It does not represent all the anti-Franco forces in Spain, and so far has not played the leading role in the fight against Franco; all our past experience shows the need for a more solid, wider organisation than the Alliance; an organisation directly responsible to the government and leading the fight in Spain for the re-establishment of the Republic.

This question came up for discussion under the Giral Government, and we supported it as we considered it correct and necessary. The Council of Resistance should include the forces of the Alliance, plus the Republican parties, the guerrilla groups, the intellectuals, the resistance movements of Catalonia, Euzkadi and Galicia, the Youth organisations and all other groups carrying out any form of anti-Franco activity. Their activity should be co-ordinated with those of the Spanish Republicans outside Spain, and should therefore be in close contact with the government which will give it all the economic and political help it may need.

We consider that no form of struggle should be rejected if it will help in the fight against Franco; we are not opposed to the Government's negotiating with anti-Franco forces of the Right. What we do oppose are the defeatist compromises initiated by those who serve not the Spanish people, but interests foreign to Spain.

The Government will be strengthened in its dealings with non-Republican forces if the fight in the interior of Spain continues to develop and increase. The recent wave of strikes is evidence of the Spanish people's will to fight. In the course of 1946, the number of strikes and protests against insufficient food reached 160, according to information we have received, which is still incomplete. We show the possibilities of mobilising the workers in defence of their rights, even under a police regime such as Franco's.

We Communists have a clear sense of our responsibility as the Party of the proletariat, as the vanguard of all the democratic forces of our country. Therefore, we cannot allow personal feelings to influence our policy and activity. Our policy is inspired only by the defence of the interests of the people and the fight for the Republic; and this decided our participation in the present government.

Certain individuals urged us to refuse to take part in the government and to protest against the formation of a government by Llopis; but this course would only serve to injure the cause we fight for. We participated in the Giral Government and we now participate in the Llopis Government; not because this government is completely

satisfactory to us, but because so long as Llopis remains faithful to Republican principles we shall support his government as officially representing the Republic. We Communists are not indifferent to individuals, but our policy is one of principles, and we abide by the programme we are fighting for. Let there be no mistake about this; the Communist Party has never refused to work with anybody except Franco. It is absolutely false that the Communists and Socialists should behave as enemies towards each other. In the past we have collaborated with Largo Caballero, with Prieto in a government headed by Negrin, and now we are collaborating with Llopis.

The experience of October, 1934, the electoral victory of the Popular Front, and our common participation in the war have proved the value of unity between the Socialists and Communists; today that unity is just as necessary to bring about Franco's downfall. For our part, we shall work unceasingly to strengthen and improve relations with the Socialists.

Finally, a few words in answer to those who criticise our participation in the government. The Communist Party does not satisfy itself with merely shouting "Long live the Republic." We follow up that cry with action. If within the government itself tendencies appear which are dangerous to the Republic and democracy, we take the steps necessary in each case.

As to those who are so concerned about our integrity, I would remind them that the Communist Party has never made participation in the government the be-all and end-all of its policy. We participate in the government when we consider it necessary in the defence of the interests of the working class and the people.

Another point: the Ministers and deputies belong to the Party, and the power to resign these posts belongs to the Party and not to the individuals. A Communist Minister, moreover, gives his salary to the Party, and it is the Party that decides how much he is to be paid. In this way, our Party does not become divided into two groups of militants: the privileged ones enjoying government securities, and the rest of our membership. For a Communist, a political position is a new responsibility and not a way of making a living.

Therefore, when we have to choose a comrade for a government post we discuss the matter with a view to choosing the man who is best for the job. The comrades hold their jobs at the disposition of the Party, but they also know that the Party with all its authority stands behind them. These methods serve to form our members in a true sense of responsibility, and that is the best guarantee of the loyalty and sincerity of our deputies and Ministers in carrying out the trust they are charged with.

THE NEW DEAL FOR EDUCATION

DORA CRAWLEY, B.A., Dip. Ed.

THE Conference held in the Sydney Town Hall last Easter, 5th and 6th April, showed clearly that the people of N.S.W. were not only intensely interested in Education, but that they definitely supported the New Deal for Education. It was the Teachers' Federation, the Parents and Citizens' Federation and the Federation of Infants' School Clubs which decided to call a State Conference, and this conference turned out to be one of the largest ever held in Australia. It consisted of 844 delegates from 790 organisations in city and country, actually representing over a million people, and was organised by a committee representative of eighteen organisations. These organisations were—N.S.W. Teachers' Federation, Federation of P. & C. Associations, Federation of Infants and Nursery School Clubs, Country Women's Association, N.S.W. Labor Council, Primary Producers Association, Aust. Journalists' Association, People's Council for Culture, Returned Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, N.S.W. State Union of Students, National Youth Association, Parks and Playgrounds Movement of N.S.W., British Medical Association, New Education Fellowship, School (Oslo) Lunch Advisory Committee, United Associations of Women, National Council of Women, Federal and State Public and Essential Services Council.

This was the broad and representative nature of the conference. It was the unity between country and city, amongst workers, middle class and intellectuals that so enraged the capitalist Press. The evening of the first Conference day the "Sun" was out with its story of "President's Call to the Communists". This attempt to brand the Conference as the brain-child of the Communists only, and thus discredit and disrupt it, had been made by the Press even prior to Easter in the form of articles and letters. But the failure of this attempt was glaringly apparent in the wonderful unity of the delegates and in the smoothness of the whole proceedings.

Even Mr. H. B. Turner, Liberal M.L.A., included in his remarks the fact that he was impressed by the unanimity of the speakers at the Conference. What will the press have gained when the 844 delegates report to their organisations, and the truth of Mr. Lewis' statement is contrasted with the distortion in the "Sun"?

However, the important point is that the Conference did display remarkable unity and now the job is to maintain and build on this unity. The work is far from finished, the Conference was only the beginning; it made plans for the New Deal, these plans, these decisions must be well publicised and around them the same progressive forces, which mean all those sincerely interested in the children

of the nation, must be drawn to see that the decisions are implemented.

And these proposals the Conference made. In the first place the Teachers' Federation laid down five principles on which it proposed to base its activities for a New Deal for Education. These were:—

1. Government responsibility for education at all stages;
2. Maintenance of the principles underlying public education as laid down by the Parkes Public Instruction Act;
3. Commonwealth aid for Education;
4. The doubling of the State education vote;
5. A New Deal for Education is dependent upon unity of action of the nations for peace.

These principles were the essence of the conference resolutions dealing with the basic principle and needs, international understanding, education in the countryside. However, the organisational resolution must be read in full, as it is the keynote of what form the future activity around the New Deal is to take:

1. That the New Deal for Education Conference Committee be appointed, together with additional representatives from other central organisations, to conduct the New Deal for Education Campaign throughout New South Wales and to make every endeavour to assist to build similar movements in other States for the purpose of developing a Commonwealth-wide campaign. This Committee to be known as "The New Deal for Education Committee".
2. That the delegates to the Conference report back to the organisations they represent and endeavour to induce those associations to take an active part in the campaign.
3. That delegates undertake to organise New Deal Committees in the localities and workplaces and wherever possible local and district New Deal Committees be representative of all local organisations.
4. That delegates do everything possible to form Parents and Citizens' Associations or Infants' School Clubs at every school throughout the State, and that such associations be urged to affiliate with the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations or Federation of Infants' School Clubs.
5. That the incoming New Deal for Education Committee —
 - a. Forward resolutions carried at Conference to the Prime Minister and Premier for implementation.
 - b. Approach organisations, including political parties, to give full support to resolutions carried at this Conference, together with all other organisations it is possible for the New

Deal Committees to contact.

6. That all organisations represented at the Conference approach the Prime Minister, the Premier, Federal and State members of Parliament and candidates in Parliamentary elections by a) letters, b) telegrams, c) deputations, and d) public meetings, to gain support for the resolutions carried by this Conference, with specific reference to the request that the Commonwealth Government

spend £100,000,000 on education in Australia, and the New South Wales State Government increase its educational expenditure to £17,000,000.

THUS WE HAVE THE JOB AHEAD OF US CLEARLY OUTLINED, AND WITH THESE MATERIAL GAINS WON THEN MUCH CAN BE DONE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION ITSELF.



BOOK REVIEW

LENIN : SELECTED WORKS
(Two-volume Edition)

J. W.



ANYONE who reads the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union must be struck by the way in which the Party leaders had a constant grasp of the situation at any moment. They had "their eye on the ball". As compared to bourgeois politicians who, generally, after long deliberations, produce a solution to a problem which they hope will settle it once and for all, Communists realise that there are no "permanent" solutions, that everything depends on the "conditions, time, and place", and that courses of action must be shaped and altered in accordance with changing conditions.

The History of the C.P.S.U. makes clear, too just how much the Communist Party and the working-class movement owes to Lenin. In particular it emphasises the importance of Lenin's works. What is to be Done, One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward, and Two Tactics of Social-Democracy.

In these books Lenin discussed the necessary fundamental requirements of a working-class party which is honestly striving for socialism, and the correct basis on which the work of the Party should be built.

In reading these books, or any other of Lenin's works, one is struck by the same feeling that here is someone who has a complete grasp of the essential aspects of the problem with which he is dealing.

Shaw's summing-up of Marx could equally well be applied to Lenin. "There is not a word of fear, nor appeal to chance, nor to providence, nor vain remonstrance with nature . . . nor any other familiar sign of the piddiness which seizes men when they climb to heights which command a view of the past, present and future of human society. Marx keeps his head like a god. He has discovered the law of social development and knows what must come. The thread of history is in his hand."

The First Volume of Lenin's Selected Works contains, with most of the more important of his writings up to the 1917 revolution, the four books I have mentioned. (The main exception is Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, published as a separ-

ate volume.) Besides his longer works, there are a number of shorter articles on various subjects.

This is a theoretical text-book of the first importance. And when I use the word "theoretical" I mean, not abstract theorising, but the systematised knowledge gained from practical activity and from careful study and analysis of objective, concrete facts. There is not a chapter in the book in which Lenin does not refer to some actual happening and draw a logical and intensely practical conclusion therefrom.

That is why Lenin, while basing his studies on the fundamental scientific laws first enunciated by Marx and Engels, was able to elaborate those laws and to show how they operated under the changing conditions of monopoly capitalism.

In the "Right of Nations to Self-Determination", for example, the question, "What is self-determination of nations?" is answered, not by an abstract discussion on general principles of "freedom", but by an acute examination of the conditions of oppressed peoples.

"What is meant by the terms?" asks Lenin. "Shall we seek for an answer in legal definitions deduced from all sorts of "general concepts" of law? Or should we seek an answer in the historical and economic study of the national movements?"

The theory of the national and colonial question, of which the basic ideas were stated by Marx and Engels, was developed for the period of Imperialism by Lenin and further elaborated by Stalin. On the basis of this theory, the Indian Marxist, Adhikari, was able to analyse in a specific and concrete manner the present day problem of Indian independence, and to propose a realistic solution. (See Indian National and Hindu-Muslim Unity, by G. Adhikari.)

I use this illustration purposely in order to show how pertinent are Lenin's works to the study of present-day problems. Although he wrote of historical events and developments of his day, the conclusions he drew form part of the permanent

basis of Marxist theory, without which an understanding of the world movements of today is impossible.

Permit me to refer briefly to one other book included in this volume. It is the classic work *Imperialism*. I recall some discussions I had with a banking friend on the subject of Marxism. I could not persuade him that the subject was worth studying. Finally I lent him a copy of *Imperialism*. He read it and returned enthusiastically. "This man knows what he is talking about," he said. He had learnt that Lenin knew far more about the basic operations of finance capital than he himself, whose business it was to study banking and finance. Perhaps a trivial incident, but one which indicates

how clearly Lenin could grasp and explain the essential features of any subject.

The volume contains, in addition to Lenin's works, a few short speeches and articles by Stalin. One sentence from these is particularly appropriate here. "Only Lenin could write of the most intricate and cold things so simply and clearly, so concisely and boldly that every sentence did not so much speak as ring like a rifle shot."

The volume, which has recently been published in English by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, is the first of two which comprise the *Selected Works*. It is exceptional value for the 8/6 for which it sells.

Questions & Answers

conducted by
L.H. GOULD

Would you elaborate on the distinction between imperialism as a "policy" of capitalism and imperialism as a "stage" of capitalism? . . . How does Lenin's characterisation apply to the U.S.A. imperialists today?
—Mrs. Summers.

World events in recent decades have fully revealed the essential features of imperialism—the domination of the financial oligarchs, the resort to extreme reaction, military aggression to seize the territories of other States, and so on. (For a fuller description of imperialism, see this column, April, 1947.)

To say that imperialism is a "policy" of the capitalists is to say that they "elected" or "preferred" to become imperialists; that they made their "choice" out of a number of alternative policies; that instead of "choosing" the path of violent annexation of other people's territories the capitalists of any country could just as well have embarked upon peaceful good-neighbourly relations with all the rival capitalist powers!

In characterising imperialism as a stage of capitalism, Lenin at once pointed to the elemental nature of the further development of capitalism from its free competitive stage; in other words, capitalism advanced to its highest stage (monopoly capitalism, or finance-capitalism, or imperialism) because of objective necessity, because of the laws of capitalist development which operate independently of the will of the capitalists.

The distinction is of decisive importance to the Labor Movement. If Kautsky and the other "theoreticians" of the Second International were correct in defining imperialism as a "policy," then all sorts of possibilities existed — imperialist wars were not inevitable, the various imperialisms could

merge peacefully into a super-imperialism which, in turn, would pass on easily and peacefully to Socialism. If this were true, the need to struggle for Socialism was ended, in fact struggle for Socialism would even become, according to Kautsky, "anti-Marxist"! Lenin waged fierce polemics against Kautsky's definition of imperialism, branding it as "bourgeois reformism" and a "slurring over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism, instead of an exposure of their depth."

Here is the relevant passage from Lenin:—

"Imperialism is a striving for annexations—this is what the political part of Kautsky's definition amounts to. It is correct, but very incomplete, for, politically, imperialism is generally a striving towards violence and reaction. We are interested here, however, in the economic definition. The errors in the definition of Kautsky are clearly evident. The characteristic feature of imperialism is not industrial capital, but finance capital. It is not an accident that in France, it was precisely the extraordinarily rapid development of finance capital and the weakening of industrial capital, that, from 1880 onwards, gave rise to a sharpening of annexationist (colonial) policy.

"The characteristic feature of imperialism is precisely the fact that it strives to annex not only agrarian but even the most industrialised regions (the German appetite for Belgium; the French appetite for Lorraine), first, because the fact that the world is already partitioned makes it necessary, in the event of a re-partition, to stretch out one's hand to any kind of territory, and second, because an essential feature of imperialism is the rivalry between a number of great powers in striving for hegemony, i.e., for the seizure of territory, not so

much for their own direct advantage as to weaken the adversary and undermine his hegemony (for Germany, Belgium is chiefly necessary as a base against England; for England, Bagdad as a base against Germany, etc.)."

This was written in 1916, in the midst of the imperialist world war. Vast changes have occurred since then. Thirty years ago a number of imperialist States dominated the world, and were engaged in a bloody war to strengthen colonial slavery by a more "equitable" division of the colonies and more "team work" in their exploitation, and to strengthen the oppression of national minorities inside the "great" nations, and to strengthen and prolong the system of wage slavery. Today the world is divided up, on one side, into an enormously weakened imperialism, and on the other, a system of advanced democratic States headed by the Soviet Union. Many of the great imperialist States have disappeared from the earth. But Lenin's brilliantly-correct analysis of imperialism still applies, almost word-for-word, to U.S.A. imperialism of today.

We may note the leading ideas in the statement:—

1. Imperialism is in general "a striving towards violence and reaction." This is confirmed by a thousand acts of violence by the U.S.A. imperialists, already perpetrated or planned (anti-Labor legislation; suppression of democratic bodies in western Germany, Korea, and the Philippines; their role in Greece and Turkey; the mounting stock of atom bombs, and so on).

2. "The characteristic feature of imperialism . . . is finance-capital" . . . The Morgans, du Ponts, etc., are by far the most powerful group of finance-capitalists in the history of capitalism. No one can dispute for a moment the fact that these oligarchs possess preponderating power to decide the fate of their country internally and its relations abroad.

3. "Extreme extension of annexationist (colonial) policy." U.S.A. imperialists regard themselves as the "logical" successors to control of the colonial empires, now rapidly slipping from the hands of their weakened rivals — the imperialists of Britain, France, Holland, etc.

4. "It strives to annex not only agrarian countries but even the most industrialised regions." U.S.A. imperialism is reaching out to annex, under varying labels and pretexts, the whole of the remaining capitalist world, including the colonies, including the British dominions, including Britain itself! Hitler set the example earlier, beginning with his conquest of Austria and Czechoslovakia. In essentials, Truman's policy differs not at all from Hitler's.

5. "Striving for hegemony . . . to weaken the adversary." This is the "American century." American imperialism feels it must drive with the utmost speed towards organising, controlling, regimenting the capitalist countries ("leading" them) in the many tasks of preserving capitalist exploitation and, in particular, the task of weakening and destroying the main adversary, the ever-growing forces of democracy and Socialism.

MacArthur's decisions on the Japanese whaling fleets and the Anguar phosphate mines appear to have awakened some glimmer of consciousness of U.S.A. imperialist designs among A.L.P. leaders, for example, Mr. Chifley's statement at the recent N.S.W. A.L.P. conference. But upon the united forces of Australian Labor-democracy will devolve the historic responsibility of combating the horrors now being prepared for us and the free peoples everywhere by the war-mad imperialists of U.S.A. and their agents and Fifth Columns in every capitalist country.

(References: Lenin, *Imperialism*; L. Sharkey, *July Communist Review*.)

EVOLUTION FROM TWO ANGLES

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

I HAVE just returned from the United States where I was one of five British biologists invited by Princeton University to a three-day discussion on evolution, palaeontology and genetics, which was a part of the celebration of the University's bi-centenary.

The object was to bring together men who were studying evolution from two different angles. The palaeontologists study the changes which have taken place in time, for example, the differences between the bones and teeth of modern horses, asses, and zebras, and their ancestors in the glacial period before the great ice ages.

The geneticists study the nature of the differences between different closely-related animals and plants, for example between fish in Mexican rivers

which clearly belong to different species, and rarely hybridise in nature, but yet are near enough to give fertile hybrids in captivity, so that one can see how the differences between the species are determined.

One might compare it with a conference in which historians were brought together with students of contemporary economics and politics. But the comparison is not quite fair, because we know a good deal about the economics of even two thousand years ago; for example, the prices of corn, copper, and slaves in terms of gold in ancient Rome.

And we certainly do not know, though we can often guess, what were the selective advantages or disadvantages of a particular detail of tooth shape in horses or elephants ten million years ago.

Nevertheless such meetings are now more worth while than they were twenty years ago, for several reasons. The palaeontologists have ample records of some species.

They can say how much the teeth varied in a population of extinct horses all buried in the same quicksand, and whether the change in tooth form found in horses buried a million years later could have been due to selection of the variations in a particular direction. Darwin believed that they could, though he had practically no knowledge of variation in extinct animals.

The evidence which we can now bring from the study of variation in fossils strongly supports Darwin's theory, though, of course, a very great deal more evidence is needed, just as we need more evidence to support or counter the Marxist explanation of change in prehistoric human societies.

The conference began with a review of the methods which have been used to date various rocks. By far the best evidence is from the amounts of lead formed by the transformation of the elements in radio-active minerals. The main difficulty is that radio-active rocks are generally igneous, formed by volcanoes or in the molten depths of the earth, while fossils are mostly found in sedimentary rocks, laid down by water. So only a few fossils are really accurately dated.

However, we know that the age of great reptiles came to an end, and mammals became the dominant land animals, about seventy million years ago; whereas the earliest vertebrate fossils, of primitive jawless armoured fish, were formed a little over four hundred million years before our time.

And some other dates, such as that at which our ancestors came out of the water, are also pretty well known. One striking conclusion was the very uneven rate of development in different groups.

Some shellfish have remained practically unaltered for four hundred million years, down to details of the attachment of the muscles for closing and opening the shells, and pulling in parts which project outside them. In the same time the vertebrates have evolved from jawless fish to men, hoofed animals, carnivores, birds, and all the huge range of vertebrate forms. Even such a relatively advanced animal as the opossum has stayed put for seventy million years. There is no inevitable law of progress.

One cannot help thinking of the law of the uneven development of capitalism. But as there are many more families of animals than capitalist States, the evidence is even more impressive. Darwin called his great book *The Origin of the Species*. But it is now clear that we have to explain two rather different processes.

The first is a change in a whole population, such as the increase in the length of the molar

teeth of ancestral horses, which enabled them to chew grass, a process which would have worn down their short-toothed tree-browsing ancestors' teeth in a year or so. The other is the division of one ancestral species into two or more, such as wild horses, wild asses, and various kinds of zebra, which are quite distinct.

Probably a majority of the conference thought that a species never, or very rarely, splits up in the same habitat.

Horses and zebras evolved from a common ancestor in different countries. Although there may be a good deal of variation in colour and structure between members of a species living together, this rarely seems to reach the stage of splitting a species in two.

On the other hand, quite a small geographical barrier, such as a valley between two mountain ranges, may cause a species to split into two new ones which after some thousands of years are unable to cross with one another.

The Californian botanists are studying a number of plant species in the making, because in this part of the United States there are many fertile areas separated by desert since the ice ages, and big differences have arisen in the last 20,000 years; whereas except for a few mountain plants this had not happened elsewhere in the United States within the same time.

On the other hand, the industrial areas of Europe offer the most striking examples of changes in populations in response to changed environments, notably the development of hereditary black varieties of moths in the black countries of England and Germany. The geneticists stressed the belief that evolution could be explained in terms of known causes, and without any supernatural intervention. They also pointed out that evolution was the result of struggle, not merely a "struggle for life between individuals, but a struggle between opposing processes, such as mutation, which tends to make a species variable, and selection which reduces variability." In fact some of them are good dialectical materialists without knowing it.

Thanks to the war, British and American people understand one another less than they did ten years ago. These misunderstandings may be disastrous to the world. A few hundred meetings where workers in different occupations met their opposite numbers would do much to bridge the gap.

Now that the C.I.O. and the A.F.L. are coming together, fraternal relations between British and American unions should become easier, and I very much hope that other workers will get together, as scientific workers are beginning to do.

(General News Service, World Copyright Reserved)