

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 61.

SEPTEMBER, 1946

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	259	
BONDHOLDERS CAUSE TAX BURDEN	E. W. Campbell	260
VITAL REFERENDUM ISSUES	H. B. Chandley	262
SOVIET PROPOSALS TO BAN ATOM BOMBS	Boris Izakov	263
CHIFLEY'S WAGE-PEGGING FETISH	E. Thornton	264
THE AMERICAN NEGROES' FUTURE	William Z. Foster	265
THE COAL BILL	H. Wells	268
INDIA PLAN A SWINDLE	270
OUTLOOK AFTER BOURNEMOUTH	Harry Pollitt	271
DE-BUNKING SWISS "DEMOCRACY"	Norman Freehill	275
THE ACTIVATING FORCE OF MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY	278
STORY OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY	P. Morgan-Thomas	281
THE PARENT AND THE TEACHER	C. A. Short, B.Sc.	284
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	285
BOOK REVIEW	S. Moston	286
MY DEAD BODY	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	287

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

Theoretical Literature

Many readers are unaware that small quantities of former Anvil stocks of important titles are still available. Among these are the reports to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. given by the leading members of the C.C. Each one of these booklets contains contributions which cannot be obtained from other sources, yet are a vital addition to Marxist theory, e.g., Stalin's statements on the questions of the withering away of the state and on the intelligentsia, and Zhdanov's witty contributions on many questions connected with Party membership. The following titles in this series are still available and may be purchased at our bookshops or wholesale from Current Book Distributors:—

Stalin—Report on the work of the C.C.	6d.
Molotov—Report on the Third Five Year Plan	6d.
Zhdanov—Amendments to the rules of the C.P.S.U.	6d.
Manuilsky—Report of the Delegation of the C.P.S.U. in the Executive Committee of the C.I.	2d.
Resolutions of the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U.	6d.

THE Federal elections have very considerable bearing on the future of the labor movement. A victory for the parties of monopoly capital led by Messrs. Menzies and Fadden would represent a grave setback for the cause of progress. Such a government would ally itself even more firmly to the imperialist, anti-Soviet forces in Britain and the United States and their conspiracies to bring about a new war.

The Menzies-Fadden reaction threatens the use of violent measures against the workers: penal legislation, the prison cell and the policeman's baton in order to halt the onward march of Australian labor. This use of the suppressive organs of the State would accompany a drive by the monopolies against the living standards and democratic liberties of the masses. Victory for the parties of monopoly capital would mean, as in America, the relaxing of price controls, with soaring prices and inflation, a big capitalist's paradise.

Inflation in the U.S.A. is robbing the workers and soldiers of their wartime savings and reducing their living standards. It is likewise ruinous for the middle class, the "small men," whose capital will be swallowed up by the banks and financiers. Such profiteering would accentuate the building muddle and similar problems and prepare the way more rapidly for a new economic catastrophe.

Therefore, the Communist Party must use every ounce of energy to elect, in the first place, the Communist candidates, and to secure the return of the Labor Party candidates where no Communists are standing. The election of Communist candidates has, for the workers, become a more urgent need than ever before. In foreign policy, the Labor Government has based itself on the Anglo-American imperialist bloc which aims at securing world domination for the American and British monopoly capitalists and at smashing the revolutionary movement of the European and Asiatic workers, together with the crushing of the colonial national independence movements and plots for an ultimate anti-Soviet war. Communists must be sent to Parliament to combat this anti-working class foreign policy which can only lead the toilers of the English-speaking countries to a new catastrophe.

The Labor Government has repudiated the platform of the A.L.P. which demands the nationalisation of key monopolies. The Labor Party, according to Chifley, foresees a "golden age" based on new industries to be established by British and American monopolists. As these monopolies have completely failed to produce any sort of "golden age" for the toilers of Britain and America, it may be taken for granted that it is indeed unlikely they will provide one for the Australian masses. What Chifley really means is an expansion of capitalism, a "golden age" of new opportunities for the bourgeoisie to further enrich itself.

EDITORIAL

This statement of Chifley's is reminiscent of the reformists at the time of the pre-depression boom in 1928 when they asserted "Ford had refuted Marx." In 1929, as is known, the great crash had arrived. Mr. Chifley's prediction of a "golden age" by means of the expansion of so-called private enterprise is no more substantial than the pipe-dreams of the Ford-worshipping reformists of 20 years ago.

Mr. Chifley asks the labor movement to forego nationalisation of the monopolies and the struggle for improved conditions in favor of this fantasy of a capitalist "golden age." Even British and American bourgeois economists, it might be said, expect depression when the present shortage of consumption goods has been met and "saturation" point, estimated by them at a year or two away, has been reached. Communists are needed in Parliament to combat such myths and press for nationalisation of key industries, coal, steel, etc., as the best means of reaching economic stability for the toiling masses.

The Chifley Government steadfastly refuses to countenance wage increases. Communists are needed in Parliament to press for a substantial increase of at least 11 per cent over the present basic wage rate. They are needed to ensure that the 40-hour week becomes the law of the land.

The capitulation of the Labor Governments before the offensive of the capitalists has caused grave discontent in the working-class ranks. The employer-provoked strikes and the failure of the Labor Governments to deal with profiteers and saboteurs has created a situation which tends to alienate middle-class voters.

This situation demands a real fighting election campaign by the Communists, the Trade Unions and the Labor Party alike in order to prevent reaction turning the present difficult situation to its own electoral advantage. Discontented workers can be caught in the toils of Langism, the "Service Party," or even in the Liberal net if the Communists do not appear as an alternative working class leadership. This danger can only be averted by a realization that workers leaving the A.L.P. orbit do not automatically gravitate to the Communist Party. They will be won to the support of Communism if our programme is taken to them. Thousands of new supporters can be won if there is a full mobilisation and maximum activity on the part of our Party's membership. Otherwise, workers disgusted with the Labor Government's failure to solve the major problems facing the country today will be caught up by reactionary demagoguery.

The Communist Party is the Party of the unity of the working class. Despite the fact that there will be contests between Labor Party and Communist Party candidates in a number of electorates, nevertheless the Communists will still work on united front lines during the election period.

taxation and double the amount now being spent on re-establishment, war pensions and repatriation.

However, any suggestion that something be done to release the nation from the grip of the bondholders at once evokes from the bourgeois the holders at once evokes from the bourgeois the panic-stricken cry—"Reputation! That is unthinkable." So it is from the viewpoint of the bourgeois. Marx realised this eighty years ago, when he wrote, "with the rise of national debt making, want of faith in the national debt takes the place of

VITAL REFERENDUM ISSUES

H. B. CHANDLER

VESTED interests will go to any depths to prevent the Commonwealth Parliament obtaining more power at the referendum and especially more power relating to terms and conditions of industrial employment. This fact is clearly shown in the case of the "Liberal"-Country Party which will be forwarded to every elector together with the case presented by the Government for a Yes vote to each of the three questions.

The Opposition bases its case on a repetition of its red-baiting, defence of the Arbitration Court, and an expressed "fear" that if the referendum is carried the Government would be able to deal directly with wages and hours and that the arbitration court would be pushed aside. This is a very weak argument which will be seen through by the thousands of workers who have had such a raw deal at the hands of the arbitration court judges and who have waited so long for the 40-hour week, wage increases and decent working conditions. The red bogey is raised to sidetrack the main issue. Vested interests are opposed to the Commonwealth Government having power to deal with industrial conditions because they gain a great advantage by the delays and decisions of the arbitration court and the big business stranglehold over State legislation through the reactionary Upper Houses that exist in most States of the Commonwealth.

The fact of the matter is that if the referendum is carried the Commonwealth Government will no longer be able to hide behind the constitution as an excuse for not granting the demands of the Unions and the needs of the people so far as working conditions are concerned. It will be a good thing that the Government will be able to discharge all the normal responsibilities of government in respect to fixing the standard hours in industry, to arbitrate on disputes, to fix the basic wage or the principle on which it is assessed, to regulate the maximum weekly hours of labor and to continue the work of the Women's Employment Board in regulating wages and conditions of women in industry.

There are different rates of pay in force in the respective States. There is no common rule in relation to terms of employment. There are 2,500,000 wage earners over 20 years of age in the

blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which may not be forgiven."

Basic wage earners, when they receive their annual income tax assessment; housewives, when they dip into their purse to find the extra halfpenny tax on the family loaf; even workers' children when they part with the halfpenny tax on their weekly bag of sweets, will not be afraid to commit such blasphemy as to curse the bondholders and cry, "Down with the National Debt!"

Commonwealth, of whom 1,250,000 approximately are unionists. No more than one-third are working under Federal awards and one-third under State awards. Thousands of others are not covered by any award. Uniformity of conditions can only be obtained by the Commonwealth Parliament legislating on a national scale, and this can be made possible by carrying the referendum.

The widespread unrest in the ranks of the workers is due to insecurity, inadequate pay and bad working conditions. The Commonwealth Parliament must be vested with the necessary authority to overcome these problems. It will then be a matter of the people insisting that it does so courageously and expeditiously. The arguments advanced by Messrs. Menzies, Fadden, Cameron and other protagonists of monopoly interests are false and a complete contradiction of declarations made when they were in power. For instance in 1936 Mr. Menzies said:

"The Government agrees that this question of industrial powers must be dealt with. I am myself in favour of it." (Hansard 29/10/36.)

It is not expected that there will be a great deal of organised opposition to the Social Services questions. This is a clear-cut issue. Since the High Court has invalidated the free medicine scheme, most of the social legislation of the Federal Parliament has been considered to be insecure. This alteration is necessary to validate existing social legislation and enable extended services such as free medical, medicine and dental services and family allowances.

The case against this power has been written by Mr. A. Cameron, M.H.R., and Senators Matner and McLachlan, the only three members in both Houses to vote against the bill. All are Liberal members and all are South Australian. They advance the argument that the High Court did not endanger existing social services, that the new power will impose bureaucratic control, that the Commonwealth will have far-reaching control over the lives of the people, and finally the old parochial reactionary plea that the States will be ousted from their role of providing social services. No doubt electors will choose the progressive role and vote yes for extended Social services.

It must be remembered that it will be necessary for a majority of the States as well as a majority of the electors in each State to vote for the constitutional alterations before they can be carried. As the issue is to be decided at the same time as the federal elections, voters will be given three ballot papers, one for the House of Representatives, one for the Senate and one for the referendum, and on the referendum there will be three questions to be voted upon. This will necessitate the utmost clarity on September 28.

The Australian Communist Party, like the A.L.P., will advocate a Yes vote for each of the referendum questions. The Liberal-Country Party is divided

on the issue. Big business is opposing every question. Some Liberals favour social services and oppose the industrial powers, whilst Country Party protagonists are hesitant upon organised marketing. Generally reaction will be organised for a No vote. But they can be defeated and their red-baiting rejected, providing every effort is made to unite the force of Labor, to campaign vigorously for the referendum, and advantage taken of the opportunity to mobilise the workers, the farmers, and the middle class sections—all who benefit most from the contemplated changes. These changes are progressive and will enable the Commonwealth Parliament to advance towards homes, jobs, and security.

SOVIET PROPOSALS TO BAN ATOM BOMBS

BORIS IZAKOV.

HUMANENESS, clarity and efficacy are the distinguishing features of the Soviet Union's proposals to the Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy.

The invention of a new atomic weapon of enormous destructive power may bring with it boundless misfortune for mankind. In its present form and character this weapon isn't meant to be used at the front line; its radius of action is so wide that it may affect the side using it as well as the enemy. The atomic bomb is calculated mainly for the experience in the Pacific has shown, as the atomic weapon threatens primarily the peaceful population.

The civilised world has barred in war the use of poisonous gas as well as bacteriological means. It is only natural and logical that the same fate should overtake the atomic weapon.

To prohibit the production and use of the atomic weapon is concisely the gist of the Soviet Union's proposals. At the same time they present wide possibilities for the use of atomic energy in peaceful pursuits to further the well being of peoples and the development of science and culture. As Mr. Gromyko, Soviet Representative, stated at the session of the Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy: "There can be no efficacious and effective system of peace unless the discovery of ways and means of using atomic energy is placed at the service of humanity and unless it is utilised only for peaceful pursuits."

The Soviet proposals provide for the conclusion of the International Convention prohibiting production and use of the atomic weapon. According to the draft of this agreement the parties thereto undertake: (1) not to make use of the atomic weapon under any circumstances—(2) to prohibit production and storage of the atomic weapon—(3) to destroy within three months all stores of finished and unfinished atomic weapons.

Proposals submitted by Mr. Gromyko differ in principle from those of the American plan presented to the Commission by Mr. Bernard Baruch. The American plan amounts to the following: That the United States secure the monopoly for manufacture of the atomic weapon for an indefinite period. During this period, which will depend on the development of functions of the international control body, the United States intends to manufacture and store atomic bombs. Thereafter U.S.A. intends gradually in "consecutive stages" to share with the international control organ information on the manufacture of atomic energy and allow it to extend its control over the United States.

Apparently the U.S.A. means to fix at its own discretion the time when it will permit the international organ "in consecutive stages" to peep into secrets of its "atomic kitchen." Only when the American Government deems control by the international organ "effective" does it promise to cease production of atomic bombs and turn over its stock to the control organ and give it full information on the manufacture of atomic energy.

Each point of this extremely involved plan is a puzzle and fraught with all sorts of complications. Why should the United States Government want to continue manufacturing and storing atomic weapons—after it is prohibited? On what grounds does it claim the right to prolong indefinitely its monopoly for production of atomic energy? Why should all other countries be obliged to bindly trust the intentions of the United States whereas the latter displays clearly expressed mistrust not only towards its partners but also to the international control organ? Perhaps they think in Washington that the sit created over the test of the atomic bomb in the Pacific is especially conducive to arousing trust in the United States?

The fact hasn't been mentioned that the manufacture of atomic bombs in the United States isn't completely in the hands of the Government but that

various stages of it have been leased to private monopolistic firms. One such firm is Dupont Denemours Chemical Company which before the war was connected by a thousand threads with German Farbenindustrie and therefore by no means falls forth trust.

The American Plan has another very great defect. It suggests the departure from fundamental principles of the actions of the Security Council and in particular rejects the principle of unanimity of the Great Powers in the decision of vital questions (right to veto). Commenting on this point of Baruch's proposals, the American Press talks about the necessity for "powers to renounce their sovereignty", presumably . . . in favour of the U.S.A.

Experiences of the past few months have clearly shown that the rule of unanimity of the Great Powers is an irrevocable condition for the preservation of equality of all sides in that organ of United Nations

CHIFLEY'S WAGE-PEGGING FETISH

E. THORNTON.

ONE of the worst aspects of Federal Government policy today is the retention of the rigid wage-pegging controls. It is a common saying in the Trade Union movement that the only person in the country who still has any respect for wage-pegging is Ben Chifley.

Certainly the Prime Minister adopts a stubborn, unrealistic attitude to wage-pegging, and all the arguments put forward by representatives of the trade unions have been ignored by Mr. Chifley who continues to stand flat-footed on this matter. The employers and Arbitration Court Judges are taking full advantage of this attitude by the head of the Federal Government and to the demands of the workers, exasperated by rising prices and falling wages (for there has been a great reduction in the average worker's income since the end of the war, mainly due to abolition of overtime), the employers and the Courts say "We can't give you increased wages because that would be an illegal breach of the wage-pegging regulations."

This is so much eyewash, for the employers are giving increases in wages, have done so in a number of cases; the Courts have also broken the regulations, the most striking example being the decision of the Queensland Industrial Court to grant a 40 hour week to the Queensland shearers, only of course after the shearers had enforced the 40 hour week themselves.

Recently the ironworkers in Whyalla, South Australia, asked the B.H.P. for a wage increase to men employed as holders-up in rivetting squads. The company refused even to discuss the question, on the ground that wage-pegging prevented such an increase. But about the same time the company offered a bonus scheme, which would have provided a wage increase to all workers in the shipyard, and, more glaring still, gave substantial wage increases to non-union staff employees.

on which depends the adoption of most responsible decisions. There can be no deviation from this rule.

The report of a Washington correspondent of Associated Press Agency serves as a curious postscript to the American plan. According to this script to certain Senators stated to him in an interview that Baruch's position is such that the United States will never have to reveal to another country the secrets of the atomic bomb. This ex-country the Baruch's plan apparently reflects the true state of affairs.

The Soviet Union's proposals and the American plan express two different trends in present day international politics. The first reflects an unalterable policy of peace and protection of world security. The American Plan, a product of "atom diplomacy", however, reflects obvious striving for world domination but in our times such striving cannot meet with success.

So there we have the attitude of the B.H.P. clearly defined as holding that wage increases on a time basis for union men were illegal, that incentive payments were not, and that increased time payments for non-union staff men were perfectly legal.

Jack Hughes told me about another example. The Clerks' Union filed a claim for increased wages for the employees of a Trustee Company in Queensland, and after the lapse of some time received a petition from the employees asking that the claim be dropped and stating that all signatories were satisfied with their wages. This of course was very suspicious and therefore an official of the union made an inspection of the wages book of the company and discovered that all the employees in question had received an increase in wages. This was done obviously to counteract the union activity, but what about wage-pegging? It apparently did not apply.

I could multiply such examples which prove beyond doubt that the wage-pegging regulations are treated with scant respect by the employers. Realising this the Ironworkers' Union has made no bones about its intention to get higher wages in spite of wage-pegging and its activities in this direction have been supported by the Moulders' Union and recently by the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Because of the shortage of foundry labor we have encouraged our members to leave the foundries which pay the lowest wages and go to work in the foundries where wages have been increased. Do we need to be ashamed of this? Of course not!

Our members have a perfect right to sell their labor time to the highest bidder, and after patiently accepting wage-pegging during the war it is understandable that workers should now demand the right

to attempt to catch up with the increases in the cost of living.

But, some may argue, if there is a general rise in wages we will have inflation such as is now occurring in America! Rubbish. American inflation is not the result of wage increases but of the lifting of price control and unscrupulous profiteering.

Others may argue that increases in wages will develop an increased demand for goods which are in short supply and inflation will take place in that manner. The answer to that is that rigid price control will prevent a rise in prices and that secondly goods are not in as short supply as they were a year ago, but wages are lower because of the closing of many war industries and the elimination of overtime in others.

Another argument is to the effect that increased wages will increase the cost of production of consumer goods and therefore increase the cost of living. Many of the basic requirements of the people are hardly affected by wage increases. First, the price of imported goods such as tea and coffee are not affected at all by Australian wages. Then the prices of items such as flour, meat, butter, vegetables, tobacco, beer, etc., are not determined by wages in production to any great degree.

But can anyone tell me that the doubling and trebling of the price of furniture, carpets, crockery

and a score of other home necessities has been caused by increased labor costs? I used to pay 1/6 for two ounces of tobacco. I now pay 3/4- for that due to increased wages or indirect taxation? To the latter, of course.

So one could go on giving such examples which all go to prove that wages have lagged far behind prices, which have risen in spite of pegged wages, and that the worker is poorer today than ever before.

There are plenty of facts to show that wages could be substantially increased without causing an upward trend in prices, especially if price fixing was more rigidly enforced.

The Labor Government is building up for itself a tremendous wave of resentment because of its stubborn attitude to wage-pegging and this will undoubtedly be reflected in the Federal election results.

However there is still time for the Government to change its attitude and allow the adjustments of wages so clearly necessary for the workers. If it maintains its present position there is no alternative but for the trade unions to attempt to nullify the wage-pegging regulations, just as other controls have been made inoperative by other sections of the community.

THE AMERICAN NEGROES' FUTURE

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

(From a speech at the National Board, C.P.U.S.A., March 28, 1946.)

[I]t is a fact we must reckon with that, for the most part, the Negro people have not responded favourably to the slogan of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt, a slogan first put forward by our Party in 1928. Because of this lack of response, which amounts in many cases to vigorous opposition, there are some comrades in our ranks who conclude incorrectly that the slogan of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt is wrong.

Well-defined nations, at certain stages in their development, almost always spontaneously put forth a demand for self-determination and fight to realize it in one form or another. The Negro people in the Black Belt constitute a nation. They possess the basic characteristics of a nation, stated as follows by Stalin:

A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture.

Despite the fact that the Negro people in the Black Belt possess these qualities of nationhood, they nevertheless do not raise the demand for self-determination. Why is this so?

In my judgment, the basic answer to this question is that the Negro people, although a nation, are still a relatively young nation. They have not yet

matured politically to the point where they will conceive of, and fight for, the slogan of self-determination. Nations, like classes, grow and develop; they do not spring full-fledged from the brow of Jove. (Our American working class, for example, with no mass party of its own and with its head full of capitalist ideology, is still far from political maturity.) Nations must pass through a period, more or less extended, of growth and maturation. The Negro people are now in the midst of such national development.

During the past 150 years, from one end of our Hemisphere to the other, more than a score of new nations have come into existence. Some of them, including our own, had great difficulty in acquiring a national consciousness, as well as the various other attributes of nationhood. Indeed, several of them, particularly in Central America, have not yet fully developed a vigorous sense of nationhood, much less won full national independence. In other parts of the world also, including nations and autonomous regions in the Soviet Union, we have in our time seen peoples maturing into national consciousness. In India, too, there are many peoples who do not yet demand self-determination for themselves, but support the general demand for a free India.

The Negro people in the United States are developing their nationhood under extremely difficult conditions. Nevertheless, they are developing it. Coming to the United States, dating back almost 300 years, from all parts of Africa, they found themselves enchained by chattel slavery. This made it impossible for them, until the Civil War, to develop all the characteristics of a nation. But, even under slavery, they did develop certain national characteristics such as a common homeland, a common speech and a common psychological make-up flowing from their traditions of oppression. It was only with the abolition of slavery in 1865 that the Negro people had an opportunity to develop the higher qualities of nationhood. Since then their progress toward nationhood has been phenomenal. They have in varying degrees registered tremendous strides in science, in politics, in agriculture, in labor unions, in the armed forces, in educational pursuits, in general culture, in sports, in all walks of life. They have now developed a strong proletariat and a well-marked, even though weak, bourgeoisie. This national progress is all the more remarkable in view of the brief time in which it has occurred and the extremely difficult conditions under which it has taken place. Let us not forget that there are still many thousands of American Negroes who were actually born chattel slaves.

The Negro people are rapidly developing their nationhood under conditions of repression hardly equalled in any other country in the world. In the North, as a national minority, they have to face widespread discrimination in every phase of social life, and in the South, where the great bulk of them live, they suffer under the weight of the infamous Jim Crow and semi-feudal system. Not long ago several Indian comrades asserted to me that the Negroes in the South were in an even worse condition of oppression and discrimination than the Untouchables of India. Despite all these difficulties, however, the progress being made by the Negro people has been one of the most striking features of American life during the past 80 years.

There are three special features that raise ideological difficulties to the acceptance of the slogan of self-determination by the young Negro nation. The bourgeoisie seized upon these to mask their fierce national repression. The first of these ideological difficulties is the race question. Ever since Negro slaves were brought to this country, the exploiters have attempted to justify their oppression upon the grounds that the Negroes are biologically an inferior race. This is the theory of white supremacy and Negro inferiority. It has been the ideological basis, not only for slavery, but for the entire system of discriminations against Negroes. In consequence, Negroes naturally fight fiercely against this whole concept of racial inferiority and the segregationism that accompanies it. This makes them highly suspicious of any proposals, even slogans of national

self-determination, that would seem to set them apart from the bulk of the white population. Pre-occupation with this burning question of racial discrimination tends to obscure the more basic conception of their status as a nation.

A second ideological barrier to the development of national consciousness among the Negro people has to do with the general question of American democratic traditions. Negroes rightly feel themselves to be American in the fullest sense of the word. And, despite all the discrimination that is directed against them as a people, they are also proud of American democratic traditions and their contributions to establishing them. Consequently, here with this strong spirit of Americanism the young Negro people do not readily develop the conception of being themselves a nation, even though they are an oppressed nation within the broad American nation.

A third obstacle to the development of full national consciousness among the Negroes as a people arises from the fact, situated literally in the bosom of the strongest and largest capitalist nation in the world, it is difficult for them, a relatively small and the most impoverished section of the American people, to conceive of themselves as taking a stand as a nation within this great American nation, and as demanding the right of self-determination. Such an assertion of nationhood on their part would be an act demanding very high national consciousness.

The foregoing are some of the major reasons why the young Negro nation has not yet reached the point of political maturity where it fully understands itself to be a nation and where it demands the right of self-determination. But that the Negro people are on the way to achieving such consciousness of nationhood is made obvious by observing their general orientation as a people.

Where are the Negro people going? What are they doing to solve the problem of repression? What is the route they are taking in their forward march? These are some of the major questions to which we must find answers. And we can find them, not in wishful thinking as to what the Negroes should or should not do, but in studying what the Negroes are actually thinking and doing about these matters. In applying the principles of Marxism to this complex problem we must be careful to avoid schematism; we must, as Lenin often counselled, listen carefully to the voice of the people. We must use our theory, not as a dogma, but as a guide to action.

In order to establish just what the orientation of the Negro people is, it may be helpful first to point out some of the goals toward which they are NOT heading. First, they are not looking, as a people, for the solution of their problems by inter-marriage and absorption into the general white majority of the nation, as appears to be taking place in some Latin-American countries. At the same time, they fight against the white supremacy barriers to the right of inter-marriage. Second, they

are not planning to emigrate from the United States to Africa, as Garvey (and various other exodus proponents since Civil War times) would have had them do. Third, they are not dispersing their national organizations and giving up their struggles and simply relying upon the goodwill and generosity of the American bourgeoisie to provide them with economic, political, and social equality, as Browder recommends they do. And, fourth, they are not looking forward to a time when, in the South, they have a Negro Republic. Where, then, are they heading as a people, and what is their orientation? Under the pressure of their difficult situation, the Negro people are developing along a triple-phased course.

First, the negro people, along with their white allies, are fighting militantly and resolutely for economic, political and social equality, and first-class citizenship, and not without very substantial successes. They are seeking to integrate themselves on a basis of equality into every American institution and into all fields of endeavour. The measure of their efforts in this direction is indicated, among other developments, by such movements as those against lynching, against the poll tax, and for full rights in the armed forces, for fair employment practices, etc.

Second, in order to carry through successfully these struggles for equal rights, the Negro people are energetically organizing themselves, and more and more on a national Negro basis. The N.A.A.C.P., the National Urban League, the National Negro Congress, the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America and other organizations have greatly increased in numbers and influence during the past decade or two, while in the sphere of trade union organization the Negro workers have made most striking progress.

Third, along with this organized fight for equality, the Negro people are also gradually developing their natural culture and national consciousness. Specifically Negro culture is showing great vitality, so much so that it has already profoundly affected American culture in general. As for the development of their national consciousness, one of its most striking manifestations is the extent to which Negroes nowadays have lessened their talk of "race" consciousness and increased their tendency to consider themselves as "the Negro people." They have also developed a marked community of feeling with the colonial peoples of the world who are now fighting for national liberation.

All this signifies that the Negro people are on the path that leads to national struggle, organization, and consciousness. It is the way that leads to the eventual adoption of the slogan of self-determination, with corresponding practical demands for economic and political freedom. Today, both in the North and the South, the Negro people have put forward immediate demands appropriate to those of an oppressed national minority, seeking equality within the given state. But they will eventually advance

economic and political demands that will raise their programme for the South to the higher level of national liberation.

With their process of increasing struggle, improving organization, and developing national consciousness, the Negro people at this time are orientating in the general direction of statehood in the Black Belt within the general confines of the U.S. There are no separatist tendencies among them. Rather than toward a Negro Republic in the South, they are much more definitely moving toward relationships roughly analogous in certain respects to those of the French-Canadian people toward the rest of the Canadian people. This is what the living practice of the Negro people teaches us now, and these lessons must not be ignored or misunderstood.

The Communist Party deservedly has a high prestige among the Negro people. This is because our Party, ever since its formation, has fought resolutely beside the harassed Negro masses. We have relentlessly struggled against the outrageous lynchings, against the Jim Crow system, and against anti-Negro discrimination and white chauvinism in all fields. We have also fought tirelessly for all the demands of the Negro people, and for the unity of the Negro masses and the white progressive forces. Our Party can rightfully claim much of the credit for the political progress made in recent years by the Negro people.

A weakness in our Party's work, however, has been the inept way we have handled the question of self-determination in the Black Belt of the South. Our adoption of the slogan of self-determination in 1928 marked a big step forward in our Negro work; but, unfortunately (save for the Browder revisionist period, when we dropped the slogan altogether), we have quite generally interpreted it in a Leftist manner. This has tended to make it unacceptable to the Negro people. Among the major improvements necessary in our presentation of the slogan of self-determination are the following:

(a) We must not brush aside the question of race, as we have done too often in the past. On the contrary, we must fully evaluate the role racial prejudice plays in the oppression of the Negro people and show its relation to the larger, more basic political question of the national oppression of the Negro people.

(b) We must attune our advocacy of the slogan of self-determination more closely to the general stage of national development which the young Negro nation has attained. We must pay closer attention to the incipient national moods, ideas, and movements now developing among this oppressed people, and adopt as a major task the awakening of the Negro people's consciousness of nationhood. We must pay particular attention to solving the land hunger of the Negro people. We must not present the slogan of self-determin-

ation to the Negro people in a manner that assumes that they are a nation fully matured politically.

(c) We must not, either by direct advocacy or by implication, create the impression that self-determination in the Southern Black Belt would necessarily lead to the creation of a Negro Republic. Instead, we must show that self-determination is but one. This is all the more necessary because the Negro people are in no sense orientating themselves at present toward the setting up of a separate Republic. We must study more carefully the whole

THE COAL BILL

H. WELLS.

THE Coal Industry Bill brought down in the Federal Parliament, following discussions between the Federal Government and the N.S.W. Government, will not solve the problems of the coal industry, but it should ensure better conditions in the pits, some reasonable amenities at the mines and in the coalfields towns and a greater output of coal.

The measure is not nationalisation of the coal industry — it is very far from that. It could more correctly be described as a Bill to provide the coal owners of New South Wales (who have been declared by several learned Judges to be extremely short-sighted, anarchistically competitive and wantonly wasteful) with advice, money, and general assistance to rehabilitate their industry, re-equip their mines with new and up-to-date machinery and to provide (in spite of themselves) a sure, ready market for all the coal they can produce.

In return for all this and with a surety to the owners of a regular profit, the Government hopes to gain sufficient coal to overcome the great lag in Australian industry and in fact in its whole economy, caused by the coal shortage.

The mineworkers on the other hand can gain much better working conditions, better machinery which can mean less arduous, gut-tearing toil, better treatment of dust, which will be tremendous gain, better ventilation, some reasonable amenities at the pits and in the coalfields towns.

The Joint Control Board can also make a real contribution to the coalfields people by providing for the establishing of other industries in the coalfields, thereby making possible alternate employment and the possibility of parents holding their families together, and better homes in which to house themselves.

The coalmining industry is one of the industries in Australia in which change from "wildcat" methods to even capitalist "modernity" and "efficiency" can benefit the worker. No one, Government, mining unions, or the Labor Movement, should be carried away with high-sounding speeches to believe that the present legislation means anything more or less than this.

question of bi-national and multi-national states, as they exist in various parts of the world.

(d) We must more concretely connect the question of Socialism with the fight of the Negro people against racial and national oppression. We must show them that while their present fight for their economic, political, and social equality, and their eventual struggle for national self-determination, are indispensable for their welfare and freedom, it will only be under Socialism that they, together with the white toiling masses, will finally achieve full liberty, equality, and prosperity.

For the mining unions, interested as they are in altering the rotten set-up that has existed in the pits and is so much a problem in winning even normal trade union discipline and clarity, in preventing the utter collapse of the industry on which all their members and dependents have to rely for their future and in the winning of some real advance in the health of their members, the present legislation is a real and great gain.

Especially is this so because the Miners' Federation had to fight so hard and take such measures as to actually force the Governments to go even this distance.

The present measure is a step in the direction in which the mining unions wish to go — they have fought hard for this gain, they must fight just as hard to ensure that they make the most of the provisions in the Bill and to ensure that in its administration the Joint Coal Board goes at least to the full extent promised by the Government leaders in their speeches in the parliamentary debate.

The Governments and the Labor Movement must assist the Miners' Federation to ensure that the New South Wales coalowners do not "suck the Bill dry" and then in a few years — three to five — throw it away. Without doubt, and despite their phoney opposition to the Bill, this will be in their minds. If there is evidence of this, we must ensure that the Joint Coal Board take steps to acquire the mines and remove these profit-sucking gentry, so that the industry may return in use to Australia and its people the 20 millions of pounds which the Government leaders consider will be necessary to reorganise it.

Now to some features of the Bill itself.

The Bill provides for the establishment of a Coal Authority to be known as the Joint Coal Board, with extensive powers.

Its main powers relate to:

- (a) To ensure that coal is produced in the State in such quantities and with such regularity as will meet requirements throughout Australia and in trade with other countries.
- (b) To ensure that the coal resources of the State are conserved, developed, worked

and used to the best advantage in the public interests.

- (c) To ensure that coal produced in the State is distributed and used in such manner, quantities, classes and grades and at such prices as are calculated best to serve the public interest and secure the economic use of coal and the maintenance of essential services and industrial activities.

- (d) To promote the welfare of workers engaged in the coal industry in the State.

In order to carry out its declared functions, the Joint Coal Board is provided with extensive power to require any mine manager or owners, or any employee, to put into effect any decision made by the Board. In other words, the owners are to be requested to accept such advice as will make it possible for their pits to produce sufficient coal for the abovementioned purposes.

They are to be requested to spend public money to improve the machinery and equipment of their collieries, to increase output of coal. They are to be requested to allow the Joint Coal Board to distribute their coal and to supply classes of coal most needed for particular undertakings.

If they do not accept the request made to them by the Board, and the advice tendered to improve their industry, then some pressure may be brought to bear on them, or, alternatively, the Board may acquire their mines by paying just compensation. But which coal owner will not be prepared to accept such advice and money and distribution of their coal, when they are to be guaranteed a much better profit than they have made for the past fifteen years?

There is nothing to provide that the owners shall not do such things as they have done towards the men in the industry during the past years, and without doubt, while they may co-operate and accept advice from the Board until such time as they have reorganised their pits, their history would lead me to believe that their attitude will change very considerably both towards the Board and towards their employees immediately this has been achieved.

It is significant that Part 4 of the Bill was deleted at the request of Mr. Menzies when the Bill was discussed in the Federal Parliament. This part deals with the control of coal mines and the powers of the Board in that connection. To accept such an amendment without doubt leaves the suspicion that the Government does not want the Joint Coal Board, which, incidentally, will be under the political direction of the Government, to control the mines. They hope to achieve their purpose of improved conditions in the coal mines and a big increase in the production of coal by paying the owners' bill for the reorganisation necessary.

One would normally have expected that the Labor Government would make some Labor appointments on such a Board and would have provided some place in the new apparatus for the Trade Unions, especially as the Miners' Federation have

shown that they knew most about the industry and its development or collapse over the past four years. While no names have yet been released, it is freely suggested in the lobbies that the people who may be appointed will not be labor men but are more likely to come from those who have been employed and trained by coal owners and monopolists. It is to be hoped that this will not prove fact.

Without doubt, the major weakness in the Bill, apart from the obvious unwillingness to nationalise, acquire or control the industry, is the refusal of the Government to provide for a definite place in the new set-up for the Miners' Federation. To achieve its purpose to increase coal production, very considerable reorganisation of the industry will be necessary, because even the Prime Minister himself admits that if every mineworker and every coal mine worked every day, output would still be insufficient.

In such a reorganisation of the industry, the Union could play a very considerable part, and the men on the job could be won to contribute very many ideas that would overcome bottlenecks and weaknesses in the layout of haulages, ventilation or equipment which now holds up production. In addition to this, the men would more readily accept any changes that were to be made after consultation and in agreement with their officers, than they would accept changes decided upon by a supposedly independent Board.

No such Board can be independent at all. If men are selected who know nothing of the coal industry, then they would need to appoint technical advisers who, without doubt, would come from men who have been employed by owners for the past fifteen years, and have received their training and carried out their work as representatives of the owners.

A further provision in the Bill, which will cause considerable uneasiness and suspicion in the minds of the mineworkers, is the provision that the Joint Coal Board may remove any person from the mining industry. This cannot possibly work evenly. It is impossible to remove the owner's agent or superintendent, because even though he may be prevented from attending coal conferences, it would be impossible to prevent him advising managers under his control by way of letter, telephone or personal discussion.

The mineworker, however, who is removed from the industry must necessarily break up his home in the coal fields, sever his family connections in that town or village, and move to some other place to try and get employment in a backyard industry, because no monopolist concern would employ a man who was considered to be too bad to continue employment in the mining industry. Granted that efforts by the Miners' Federation to secure discipline of their members regarding petty stoppages have not been as successful as desired, the Federation, without doubt, will resist with everything at

their disposal any decision to remove mineworkers from the industry which savours of victimisation.

One of the good features of the Bill, in a capitalist way, is that it will guarantee the continuance of the N.S.W. Mineworkers' Pensions Scheme, and also the continuance of reasonable compensation. For some time past the Miners' Federation has been worried that with the end of the subsidy payments to insurance companies, those companies would claim bankruptcy, and injured mineworkers would receive only a percentage of their compensation. It was also worried that the Mineworkers' Pensions Fund would require additional levies from mineworkers in order to remain solvent in the event of any radical change in the industry and numbers of employed workers.

It is accepted that the Chairman of the Joint Coal Board would be also the Chairman of the Mineworkers' Pensions Tribunal, and that this Fund shall be kept solvent. Provision is also made for the Board to establish a Workers' Compensation Fund which would be levied over the whole of the industry, and a Welfare Fund in which the N.S.W. Gov-

ernment would put an amount of £70,000 per annum, and the remainder would be met by the Commonwealth Government. A Coal Industry Fund is also to be established, from which advances will be made to the owners for purposes of reorganisation, either as a grant or loans.

It is anticipated that the Board will be able, by exercising its power, to fix the price of coal to repay into the Fund amounts equalising expenditure.

Despite the criticism of the Bill made by the Miners' Federation Executive and Central Council and the amendments sought, the Central Council has accepted the Bill as the best measure yet brought forward, and as one which should result in considerably improving the conditions of its members. It has agreed that it will give every chance to the new authority to make a success of the undertaking. In doing this, the Federation and the Labor Movement must remain conscious of the major weaknesses in the Bill, and be fully aware of its shortcomings.

INDIA PLAN A SWINDLE

(Statement of the Indian Communist Party, July 15, 1946)

The Cabinet Mission which was sent to India by Britain's Labor Government, to arrive at a settlement with Indian leaders, has finished its work after long and protracted negotiations of fully 24 months. On May 16th it issued its Award which is supposed to meet India's long-standing demand of freedom and complete independence.

Under the Award, there is to be a Constituent Assembly—not elected directly through adult franchise—but by the present Provincial Legislatures which are based on a very limited electorate. Also, these members who belong to different communities elect the Muslim delegates, the Sikh members (in the Punjab) will elect the Sikh delegates and members from all other communities (Hindus, Scheduled Castes, Christians, Anglo-Indians, Europeans) will elect the other delegates.

After the elections the delegates would gather, it seems, for only one meeting where their chairman and other officers would be elected. Immediately after they would split up into what are termed "sections." Section A consists of dominantly Hindu provinces, Section B of Bengal and Assam and Section C comprises the Muslim majority areas of the North West.

After determining the constitutions of these three sections, all the delegates would reassemble for the purpose of settling the final all-India Union Constitution. This constitution, however, must compulsorily have a Union Centre controlling Defence, Communications and Foreign Affairs.

It is at this stage that the representatives of the 582 native States step in. These representatives

will not be elected by the people of the States, but in effect nominated by their feudal Princes and will hold one-fourth of the total seats in the Constituent Assembly.

Thus we have the three group or section federations and a Union Centre. This professes to meet the demands of both the major Indian parties—the demand of the Indian National Congress for a constitution of "United" India with one central authority, and the demand of the Muslim League for a separate Muslim State of Pakistan comprising the Muslim majority areas of the North-West as well as Bengal and Assam.

Nobody in India, however, believes that freedom has been granted. Progressive dailies and certain Left spokesmen inside the Congress have been strongly condemning the Award as an Imperialist trap. The main limitations pointed out are:

First, that there is no clear-cut declaration of Independence.

Second, that the Constituent Assembly is not a Sovereign Body but has to function under the shadow of the British Power itself, with the British Army here and with the British Viceroy as the head of the Government.

Third, that one-fourth representation is given to the Princes, the traditional stooges of British Imperialism, who will be holding the decisive balance for their masters. In fact ironically the Princes are the only element in Indian life who have been given "freedom"—to maintain their autocratic feudal States!

Fourth, that compulsory grouping of provinces into "sections" is designed to intensify national con-

licts and put Indians against Indians. Sjt. Bardoloi, the Congress leader of Assam, for example, has made it quite clear that his 10 million Assamese do not desire to get swamped by 60 million Bengalees. In the same way, the Pathans in the North-west who have been arbitrarily dumped into "section C" want themselves to decide their own future and do not wish to be forced to go into any federation with the other Muslim majority provinces.

On the question of grouping of provinces, a leading member of the All-India Trade Union Congress has another important point to make. In his recent interview he declared:

"The 'groupings' above all are calculated to disintegrate India economically, leaving it open to British exploitation. It is no accident that the Union Centre is not supposed to deal with Customs, Tariffs and Planning. Under the Award each group or section federation would be having its own independent economic policy—thus preventing Indian Business from making a common front against British vested interests. And British Big Business hopes to exploit the political conflicts of the different section federations for their own economic penetration."

The fifth major defect of the British Award as it has been pointed out is that the Constituent Assembly has no time limit fixed within which it has to produce the Constitution. This has to be seen together with other shortcomings. First, the voting strength of the different communities in two of the three "sections" works out so that they are very unevenly balanced leaving a very narrow margin of

votes either way. Secondly the British plan makes a provision by which most of the vital decisions on the so-called "communal issues" cannot be taken by a simple majority in the Assembly but must be referred for arbitration to a British-appointed Federal Court. From this, all that could be visualised is a perpetual drift, a series of endless deadlocks with no provision for their solution except through British awards, formal and informal.

In fact the main strategy of the British in these negotiations has been to switch the Indian freedom movement from the demand for complete independence to a demonstration of India's internal differences. So that on the one hand the British are able to parade before the world their own "sincerity" and on the other hand inside India itself get into a strategic position for guiding the course of constitutional making.

It is here that matters stand today—the Cabinet Mission having packed off to Britain, solving not one of the urgent pressing problems facing the Indian people. In the meanwhile the newspapers have started headlining signs of famine and food and cloth scarcity in the whole of the South, as well as portions of Bengal. A strike-wave bigger than India's biggest one of 1921 is sweeping across the whole country, affecting every industrial centre. Politically too, conditions are as unstable, communal riots having broken out in Ahmedabad, Dacca (Bengal) and Bareilly (Behar).

India stands on the threshold of big changes, political and economic. Everything depends on the channels along which the coming struggles of the working people are directed.

OUTLOOK AFTER BOURNEMOUTH

HARRY POLLITT, London.

BY now most readers will have been made familiar with the main character of the discussions and decisions of the 45th Annual Conference of the Labor Party at Bournemouth. No one who attended this conference would doubt the tremendous feeling of victory among the delegates arising from the defeat of the Tories at the last General Election and the wide scope of constructive legislation on the home front that has either already been carried through by the Labor Government, or will shortly become operative.

This victory feeling was the predominant impression. Yet at the same time any serious political observer could not help thinking that there was a certain dangerous tendency expressed (mainly as a result of the leadership of the platform) towards being "giddy with success." For at no time during the proceedings was any serious effort made by the leadership to face the Conference up to the grim realities of the acute political and economic questions that will begin to arise with increasing gravity. No effort at all was made to give any analysis of Britain's economic position either in

relation to the situation at home or against the background of the international situation as a whole. From this follows failure to evolve the kind of perspective, based on a correct analysis, that would enable the Conference to formulate its policy decisions more closely in accord with the facts of the situation.

This weakness not only continues to feed existing illusions, but places the movement in a position where it may be taken off its guard, unprepared for the severity of the struggle which the British working-class will have to increasingly face from the capitalists. In this article I do not propose to go into every aspect of the Bournemouth Conference. I want to deal principally with the matter which, in the minds of all who were present, whether they would admit it or not, was the shadow that hung over the Conference. For shadow there was. It hovered over the Conference from the moment the delegates began to arrive to their preliminary meetings, right up to the end of the Conference. It was the shadow of war. I do not mean by that that war is imminent, but there was an instinctive

fear that, consciously or unconsciously, the course of foreign policy which the Labor Government is adopting may lead to a new world war some years from now, unless that course is altered.

If after one year of a Tory Government the international position had deteriorated as it has done since July, 1945, and especially if relations between Britain and the Soviet Union had reached the critical stage they have, one could easily imagine how the mass pressure of the movement would have made itself felt on the Labor Party leaders and the reaction of the Bournemouth Conference to such a development. Short shrift would have been given to any attempt to place the responsibility on the Soviet Government or its people. It would have been placed squarely where it belonged — on the Tory Government. But when such a situation exists after a year of the Labor Government, despite Mr. Bevin's oratory, it is impossible to avoid facing his Government with the same responsibility.

Indeed, at the Blackpool Labor Party Conference in May, 1945, before the General Election, at which, on Mr. Bevin's own admission, the Labor Party did not expect to become the Government, the Right Hon. Hugh Dalton, M.P., placed the question of Anglo-Soviet relations in their right perspective when he declared:—

It is indispensable that we should do everything to ensure the closest contact and adopt every possible means of removing any suspicions which may linger between the Soviet Government and the British Government, or between the broad masses of the Russian people on the one hand and the broad masses of our own people on the other. Given that Anglo-Soviet relations are still clouded from time to time by suspicions and misunderstanding, I most emphatically hold that a British Labor Government is far more likely to remove these suspicions, than a British Tory Government.

You have only to read that quotation again and think of the present situation, to grasp how badly the Labor Government has failed to fulfil the aim that was set for it by Dalton.

If anyone thinks I am exaggerating the importance attached to the foreign policy of the Labor Government by the movement, they should take note of one very important fact. More resolutions on various aspects of foreign policy had been placed on the agenda by Divisional Labor Parties — and these are the bodies in close touch and who carry out the detailed work of the labor movement — than on any other subject. These resolutions were compressed into various composite resolutions in the drafting of which much of the original vigour and keenness of the original resolutions had been lost. Nevertheless, as they stood in relation to the whole character of the foreign policy in Spain, U.S.S.R. and Palestine they reflected the deep-seated concern that is daily being expressed in every workshop and local Labor organisation.

After nine speakers had moved, seconded and supported these resolutions, the debate closed. But Mr. Laski announced that he had received the demand from sixty-six delegates to speak and twenty-seven other delegates desired to speak on foreign policy. This is an unprecedented number. It reveals the widespread distrust, confusion and, as one delegate accurately put it, "bewilderment" that exists in relation to the Labor Government's foreign policy. Mr. Bevin's speech did nothing to remove these feelings. There was the same concern and anxiety at the finish as when he began. In fact, amongst the more thoughtful and far-seeing delegates the alarm was increased because if Mr. Bevin made one thing clear (apart from creating the impression that he is the only member of the Labor Government who has ever made any suggestion or had any ideas) it was that he is fully determined to do everything in his power to strengthen the Anglo-American bloc against the Soviet Union and the new democratic Europe.

I will say at once that if this course is persisted in, its consequences may be mass unemployment and war. This course, if persisted in, must lead to disaster, not for the people of the Soviet Union, but for the people of Britain. From the moment the Labor Government came to power its main orientation in foreign policy has been for an alliance with aggressive American imperialism as opposed to any honest or sincere efforts to secure an understanding with the Soviet Union.

Much play is made with Mr. Bevin's offer of a fifty years treaty to the Soviet Union. But surely it is not the length of this treaty that matters, whether it is for one year or for a hundred years — but the spirit and aim behind such a treaty.

The systematic efforts that have been made to destroy the unity of Britain, America and the Soviet Union are the real preliminaries for the Anglo-American bloc. Yet if a life and death military struggle against fascism demanded the unity of these three powers and without that unity fascism could not have been destroyed, surely the still more difficult problems of winning the peace in the interests of the common people demand an even stronger unity between these three powers.

Naturally, in such a complicated situation as the world faces today, there will be differences of opinion on various problems that arise. But there were serious differences between the big powers in the course of the war against fascism. The example was the quite definite view of America and the Soviet Union on the urgency of opening a Second Front as opposed to that of Britain, who had a totally different conception of military strategy. Nevertheless, deep as these differences were, they were amicably settled in the end. They had to be settled, because the victory over fascism had to be won. The differences which exist between the Big Three powers have, as they can be, also to be resolved if peace is to be made permanent and world security a reality.

How does it come about that from the moment that the war ended such a change could take place in the relations of the Big Three powers? I do not feel that any single explanation is possible. There are a variety of factors which have to be taken into consideration, amongst which it seems to me that the following constitute the principal reasons.

(1) The British and American capitalists never expected the Soviet Union to emerge from the war against fascism as the strong, virile power in international politics it is today. They knew they could not defeat Hitler without the Red Army and they worked in alliance with it, but they hoped the price of victory over fascism would also be a tremendous weakening of its greatest enemy — Communism. Instead of this, the opposite has been the case and all over Europe the influence of Communism is reflecting itself in the mass support it receives from the people, as witness the votes cast for the Communist Parties in Czechoslovakia, France and Italy in particular.

This, alongside the strength of the Soviet Union, is the fundamental reason why capitalism, through the Governments of Britain and America, is renewing its traditional hostility to the Soviet Union, and to Communists. That is why there is an Anglo-American bloc and why, in the name of "democracy", threats are being made to call separate peace conferences and make separate peace treaties.

(2) The struggle against fascism, representing as it does the most reactionary section of monopoly capitalism, obviously entails a weakening of the capitalist system as a whole. This has been strikingly proved by the political awakening that manifested itself in the General Election victory in Britain and the new democratic Europe that has emerged to play a stronger position in world affairs with every month that passes. This latter point is particularly applicable to the Balkan countries, where reaction has received a smashing blow and the world forces of progress new and powerful allies.

(3) The American imperialists never made any bones about their intention of trying to obtain for American imperialism the dominating position in world affairs that German fascism had sought to obtain. Neither do they make any bones about their intention of keeping Britain a very junior partner, as far as Anglo-American co-operation in the future is concerned.

(4) The unholy alliance of Social Democracy and aggressive American imperialism, against the Soviet Union and the new world, represents the last stages of the struggle between a dying capitalist form of society and the new advancing socialist order of society.

In my opinion, these are a few of the principal reasons which explain the change which has come upon the international scene. If there are any others, then, no doubt, they will be advanced. But if you read carefully the speeches of responsible leaders of America and Britain, you cannot fail to

note that they have deliberately embarked upon a war against the working-class, as expressed in the aims and aspirations for which Communism stands. They never make a single speech without referring to their desire for peace—but Hitler himself was an adept at this type of propaganda. They never make a speech without protesting their friendship for the Soviet Union and in the same speech they invariably make an attack on Communism, which they allege is contrary to civilisation. They make every effort to divide the world as between alleged "progressive democratic powers of the West" and the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union lying behind some mythical iron curtain, and this is what is bedevilling international affairs at the present time. The Labor Government cannot continue to damn the Soviet Union with faint praise at one moment and in the very next breath launch a full-blooded vicious attack against Communism, meaning the Soviet Union, without causing international irritation and suspicion, not only in the Soviet Union, but in the many European countries where the Communist Party is playing a key role in the government of these nations.

You cannot deny the Soviet Union access to the secrets of atomic energy, remembering the vital part played by the Soviet Union in achieving the victory over fascism and expect this to contribute to international understanding and future peace.

Certain sections of American imperialism are boasting of new rockets that can fly from America to the Urals. They give gruesome details of two new bombs which explode so high in the air that the sound is never heard, but which pollute the air far and wide in that area with germs of two of the most malignant diseases known to mankind. Naturally the peoples are asking who they are to be used against.

When reactionary elements in the U.S.A. unashamedly state their belief that "the wiping out of thirty million Russians would be a small price to pay for the abolition of Communism," thoughtful people in all parts of the world are bound to ask what lies behind it, and honest Labor supporters find increasing difficulty in justifying their Government's policy of alliance with American imperialism against the Soviet Union.

The concern and anxiety at Bournemouth was well founded. When all the clapping and the applause that the leaders of the Labor Party received there has died away, and sober reflection begins to mature, as the international situation unfolds, it will not be long before we see a mass movement beginning to develop to secure a reversal of the present reactionary policy.

It is this fight for unity of the Big Three which alone can make the United Nations Organisation a success and which can guarantee the future peace of the world, which is the supreme issue before mankind at this moment and above all before the British people.

I do not intend to go into detail about the debate on the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labor Party. The character of the opposition to our affiliation is the natural counterpart of the line on affiliation to fundamental ownership and foreign policy alike. I think I was the first to coin the phrase that "the honeymoon period of the Labor Government will not last for ever" and I noted that Mr. Morrison used this phrase in the course of his unmeasured and filthy attack on the Communist Party, Social Democracy and "democrats" of the Morrison type always direct their full venom, not against capitalism, but against the revolutionary section of the working-class. It is not the big employers who get the hard knocks, but the Communists who seek by their policy to weaken capitalism, strengthen the working-class and develop strongly in it the will to the conquest of power and Socialism.

The hostility of Social Democracy to Communism always becomes more aggressive and self-confident in time of trade prosperity and boom. It is nothing new we are witnessing at this moment. We saw it in full bloom in 1928, when the whole theory of Social Democracy in Germany, France, Britain and Czecho-Slovakia, to name only four countries, was advanced to astonishing proportions to endavour to discredit Communism and extol the "socialist" virtues of American Big Business in particular. "Fordism" had replaced "Marxism"—that was the burden of social Democracy's song. In 1929 the bubble was pricked and the whole world, with the exception of the Soviet Union, was launched into the greatest economic crisis ever known.

The defeat of Communist affiliation to the Labor Party is not a blow against the Communist Party, but against the hopes of those who wished to see the Labor Government speedily carry out its full General Election programme as a means of organising peace and prosperity.

It will encourage only the reactionary forces who seek to weaken the power of Labor, prevent the workers from obtaining better conditions and who are preparing for a new war.

Those supporting working class unity have been faced with a campaign of misrepresentation, intimidation and forgery of documents without parallel in the history of the labor movement. These methods will have a boomerang effect on those who organised them.

The character of the campaign which has had to be organised to produce the present decision is proof of how strong is the desire for unity amongst the active workers of the labor movement. They will not fail to note how the most enthusiastic supporters of Labor leaders opposing unity with the Communists have been Mr. Churchill, the whole of the capitalist press and the most reactionary elements in America and Europe.

The smug self-satisfied complacency of the Labor Party leaders will be shattered sooner than is yet realised. The illusions will be blasted by increasing class struggles. The open and concealed

enemies of the working class will soon be compelled to face great exposures. The class issues will become clearer and more sharply defined.

The Bournemouth Conference may have been well timed to open when Victory Parades were being organised, but its results are not going to turn out to represent victory for the working class in its bitter struggle against capitalism and for socialism.

This is why the decision against Communist affiliation is a blow against the best interests of the workers, now and in the future.

What will the Communist Party do now? Let me say at once to those who have so gratuitously given the advice that we should disband the Communist Party, that there is not the slightest possibility of such a retrograde step being taken. On the contrary, we will now make the greatest efforts to increase the influence and membership of the Communist Party on the basis of its fighting policy against capitalism and for Socialism; a policy which is in the present and future interests of the labor movement and the nation. The Bournemouth Conference itself was the most powerful argument against the liquidation of the Communist Party, for if it had been affiliated to the Labor Party, the character of the agenda, the discussion, and the decisions would have taken on an entirely different trend, and the platform would not have been able to get away with policies that can only lead to mass unemployment and war.

We will make our full contribution towards solving the emergency position Britain is now in. We will fight against rising prices and profits, for higher wages, shorter hours and more rapid demobilisation, for the success of nationalisation, not by buying the best capitalist brains, but by utilising the power and initiative of the working class. We will fully support every measure to ensure the successful carrying through of the housing programme, but on the basis of rents the workers can afford to pay.

We will support all measures essential for solving the present food crisis, which received no attention worth mentioning at Bournemouth. But we shall demand relentless war on the Black Market, social justice for the agricultural workers and drastic measures to increase the production of essential foodstuffs in Britain.

We will struggle side by side with the Indian and Egyptian peoples in their struggle for independence and the withdrawal of the British troops from these countries. Similarly, we will demand the withdrawal of British troops from Greece and Indonesia, and an end of British recognition of Franco and trade with Spain.

We will intensify our agitation for the stamping out of all fascist activity in Britain and warn against the dangers of fascist and reactionary activity hiding itself behind the cloak of religion.

We will work unceasingly for a policy of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union and the new democratic Europe, and the ending of a reactionary alliance with Imperialist America, which can en-

danger Britain's economic position and lead to a new world war.

To those who have attacked our Party, because it is alleged to be pro-Russian, let me say, we are proud to have always fought for friendship with the Soviet Union because we know that this has always been in the best interests of Britain.

We will now immediately organise one of the greatest political campaigns for our policy this country has ever seen, linking it at every stage with a widespread propaganda for the principles of

Socialism, and will invite all who agree with our policy to join the Communist Party.

The Bournemouth Conference has taken a serious decision against the unity of the working class, but the issue of unity still remains on the agenda. Time, events, experience, all alike will combine to bring it forward again and again, until the conviction and the determination for its realisation will have triumphed over those reactionary leaders in the Labor Party who are more anxious to secure the preservation of capitalism than the achievement of Socialism.

DE-BUNKING SWISS "DEMOCRACY"

NORMAN FREEHILL.

[I]t is high time Swiss "democracy" was de-bunked.

The stream of propaganda claiming monopoly rights to democracy by the capitalist nations flows stronger and muddier with each passing month. Its purpose is to make the peoples of the world believe that only under Capitalism is democracy possible. Thus there can be no democracy in Russia. Simple?

So we take the most quoted and idealised example of capitalist democracy and strip it naked.

The entirely wrong, widely-held conception of Switzerland as a sturdy, democratic little country is crystallised by Walter Theimer's completely false description of it. In his Political Dictionary he refers to it as "a model State," based on "ideas of civil equality," "harmonious relationships" and its "immunity to Nazi propaganda."

There is as much reality in that chocolate-box cover fantasy as there is in the Hollywood version of Switzerland as a country of never-ending skiing, carnival and gaiety; of beautiful scenery; of obsequious inkeepers dancing attendance on celluloid millionaires and their mink-decked mixxes.

As recently as July 1, Sydney Sun in a special cable from Berne reported that "the police used fire hoses and tear gas" against striking building trades workers. The message continued: "The strike was for holidays with pay. It was organised not by a Red union but by a Christian (Catholic) one." If tear gas for Christians, what for Reds? "Democratic" little Switzerland!

It needs no deep delving to uncover, beneath the flimsy fake of Swiss "democracy," the reality of Fascism in high places. It needs little research to show that the ruling group includes men who pulled, or helped pull, the strings to which Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco danced.

On May 23, 1946, the Swiss Government alleged, in a 60-page Red-baiting white paper, that the Swiss Communist Party continued to have White-foreign associations. It did not issue a White-foreign red paper disclosing that backers and members of the Swiss Government continued to have the foreign associations—Nazi associations! That the Red-baiters included callous, calculating accomplices of the world's mass murderers, Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco,

"Democratic" Switzerland for years has been ruled by a small group of capitalists who own or control the chief banks, the principal industries, and all but a few of the leading papers. The group has supplied from its own ranks key Cabinet Ministers. From the ranks of its executives it has filled the important posts in the Civil Service.

Switzerland's President in 1936, Edmund Schulthess, came from Switzerland's world-known electrical trust, Brown-Boveri—and went back to it. Brown-Boveri bulks largely in the picture of Swiss "democracy." We shall take a glance at it later.

Lesser conservative figures in the Cabinet know that they will be rewarded with banking or industrial directorships if they do sufficient work for their masters.

Meantime let us look at history. Switzerland has ruled itself since 1291. It was given the right of permanent neutrality in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna. More than once in its history, it showed that it was prepared to fight to maintain its independence against its warring neighbours.

It maintained its neutrality proudly and profitably until the Russian workers and peasants snapped their capitalist-feudal chains in 1917. Whereupon Switzerland threw its neutrality into the rubbish-bin. Since then its Governments have been implacable in their opposition to Soviet Russia.

Late in 1923, a Swiss citizen named Conradi and a Russian named Polunin murdered Vorovski and Ahrens, Soviet representatives to the Lausanne conference. They were found guilty, but the voting was less than provided for, he was released. The Conradi's admission sneered at the Russian demand for apology and compensation.

Russia broke off diplomatic relations. It was only in March of this year that the Swiss Government informed the Soviet Government that it had "modified its previous attitude," and successfully appealed for a resumption of relations. Whatever the reasons—and we shall not dig too deeply—dear little "democratic" Switzerland was the last country in the world to resume relations with the world's only true democracy.

From the official break in 1923 onward, leading members of the controlling group directed a consistently anti-Russian course, their successive Governments, under presidents many of whom came from the group, placing official seal on their policy, the group refused to act when the Red-Lithuanian Ligue Aubert called for the murder of Litvinov at the time he was campaigning for disarmament and peace.

Switzerland's Foreign Office chief and League of Nations delegate, Motta, at the opening session of the League made an intemperate attack on Soviet Russia. Until his death (January, 1940) he never ceased his bitter hostility, his unbridled and unscrupulous lying. A devout Roman Catholic, scoundrel, Red-baiter Motta was a stout suppoorthroting, Franco, porter of equally devout "favorite son" Franco, torturer and mass murderer of scores of thousands of Spanish Catholics. Motta, who was four times President, was the loud-speaker through which was broadcast much Vatican propaganda.

Motta's successor, Marcel Pilet-Golaz, took up the anti-Russian poison-gas cylinder as it fell from Motta's dirty fingers. (Pilet-Golaz was President from 1941 to 1945.)

Motta's counsellor and guide was Max Huber. Huber is Switzerland's armament king. He controls Swiss Aluminium Trust and the Oerlikon Arms Co. To servicemen and servicewomen it is necessary to say no more than that the Oerlikon factory is "democratic." Switzerland supplied Germany with everything it could. To the layman, it might be added that Oerlikon's manufactures covered all manner of aircraft, anti-aircraft and naval guns and shells.

Huber was interested in the Italian armaments industry through his association with Count Giuseppe Volpi di Misurata and former Fascist President Guido Donegani of Montecatini—backers of Mussolini—and was linked with the Nazis through his huge sales of aluminium and armaments.

Pierre Bonna, departmental chief of the Swiss Foreign Office under Motta and Marcel Pilet-Golaz, also was linked with Volpi and other backers of Mussolini through his brother Frederic, who was a director of Montecatini. Frederic was also director of Hentsch, which financial house was to Hitler what Montecatini was to the strutting thug Mussolini.

Huber's munitions and his armament auxiliaries and war subsidiaries helped Mussolini and Hitler to slaughter hundreds of thousands of good soldiers of the United Nations.

But Mr. Huber is a "democrat" who doesn't believe in letting his heart know what his gun factories do. His bank account bulging with gold and his heart with sentiment, he took the position of Hon. President of the International Red Cross, headquarters Geneva.

The other 19 members of the International Red Cross Committee are Swiss. All but a few of them are linked with the powerful group of bankers and industrialists who tell the Swiss people what to do and where to go.

At this juncture look at the Red Cross. Last year the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament awarded the Nobel Peace Prize to the Geneva International Red Cross Committee for work among prisoners of war. The duty of the International Committee is to check that war prisoners and sick and wounded soldiers are humanely treated.

We interpose this A.A.P. cable of May 31, 1946: "Four British servicewomen who parachuted into France were thrown alive into the ovens of the Natzweiler camp by Nazi Black Guards."

That crime has just been disclosed. But what of the mass murders and revolting atrocities on millions of prisoners of war and civilians at Maidanek, Oswiecim, Belsen, and a dozen other camps. What of the torture, burning, starvation, blood-draining, of the torturer, on live persons by the Nazi and experimentation on live persons by the Nazi sub-humans. These crimes are history. Yet representatives of the Geneva Committee, reporting on hundreds of German camps, found them "good." The nice Germans! ("Four servicewomen thrown alive into the ovens . . .")

Perhaps the Germans were too clever for the earnest souls who guide the Geneva Committee. Perhaps not! For the same sickening reports of "good camps" were offered the world in the International Red Cross Review when Maidanek and a hundred other horrors were already known. The same nauseating reports were issued while the world was shuddering at press and news-reef pictures of Germans still sweating from the heat of the mass-death furnaces; of brutes still slaving over their mutilated victims; of cannibalism by starved, tortured, brutalised Nazi prisoners. "Good camps!"

Whom do you think the Swiss Committee's sweetly innocent reports of "good camps" helped—the oppressed peoples, the mourners of children, outraged sisters, tortured mothers, murdered sons, brothers, fathers? Or the Nazis?

It seems inconceivable that the Nobel Committee did not know these things. Were they growing mushrooms underground during the war years?

Let us leave the Nobel Committee to its conscience and tie us back to Brown-Boveri and the other members of the Swiss group.

Swiss War-Industry-Head Speiser came from Brown-Boveri. Margaret Boveri's war effort was to write articles for Goebbels' paper, *Das Reich*.

Anyway, who better (for the industrialists) to occupy the position of Minister of Economy (which they have done for years) than members of the big engineering firms? Who better (for the bankers) to run the State Treasury (which they have done for years) than members or supporters of the Swiss Banks? Who better to run the Foreign Office and the diplomatic service than the members, relations or executives of the same big industrialists and bankers?

As the British and American troops crossed the Rhine and the Russians were beating the Germans back to Berlin, when all Germany's other friends had deserted her, Swiss banks (Kreditanstalt of Zurich,

Bankverein of Basle, the Eidgenossische and others) kept on supplying the Nazis.

Even when the Swiss Government promised the mission led by Roosevelt's special representative, Mr. Lauchlin Currie, to cease helping the Nazi war machine, it played a double game, for in less time than would show on a stop-watch, Swiss industrialists resumed trading.

Also one glaring evidence of their pro-Nazism the Swiss bankers and industrialists could not hide: the Stock Exchange lists. Prices on the Swiss stock exchanges rose with German victories—or rumored victories—and dropped with German reverses.

With the foregoing facts in mind, to know that the Swiss Government suppressed the Communist Party during the war will hardly raise an eyebrow.

So arrogant and bitter was the "democratic" Swiss Government in its attitude towards Nazism's chief antagonist that it did not bother to hide its hatred. It ill-treated Russian escapees from German prison camps. It handed back many hundreds to the Germans. It gaoled its own citizens who protested. In these anti-Russian, pro-Nazi acts the Swiss Government had the approval of President Eduard von Steiger.

This pro-Nazism was in keeping with von Steiger's background. Von Steiger was a member of the Ligue Aubert. So was Conradi, murderer of Vorovski. But where Conradi murdered with the men behind the Hitler, Mussolini, and Francos, sheltered behind the "legality" of Government action. Von Steiger did not murder the anti-Nazi Germans he handed over to the Nazis. Von Steiger did not murder the Red Army soldiers he forced back into Germany—the Nazis did. Von Steiger did not murder the Jewish refugees from southern France or the anti-Nazi Yugoslavs. He merely handed them over to the Nazis. They did the killing.

Von Steiger was against those the Nazis hated. He saw good in those whom the Nazis favored. And so did the rest of the ruling group in Switzerland.

While anti-Nazi escapees were thrust back into the hands of Himmler's uniformed murderers, the wealthy Quislings, the supporters and backers of Hitler, were welcomed. Indeed, Switzerland, comported with England as a home for dispossessed royal parasites, gangsters and vicarious murderers.

King Leopold of Belgium, undesired of his people, was warmly welcomed. Dr. Otto Koecher, Nazi Minister to Switzerland, is happy and undisturbed in his Swiss home. So is Colonel Vauchnik, a servant of King Peter of Yugoslavia (assassin-aided in France) one of the bloodiest dictators and large-scale thieves who ever held a nation in subjugation.

On May 22 last, it was announced that Switzerland would turn over 58,140,000 dollars to be divided among France, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and other nations looted by the Nazis. This doubtless included three tons of gold, portion of Him-

mler's thefts, which Swiss banks bought from the Reichbank in April of last year, but certainly did not include "the 445,000,000 of Belgian gold bars" and "loot stolen by the Nazis all over Europe, especially France and Belgium" (cable, *Mirror*, 2/7/46).

More important was agreement (May 21, 1946) on the sharing of proceeds from the liquidation of German assets in Switzerland, valued at 700,000,000 dollars. Britain and the United States were entitled, under the Paris Agreement, each to 28 per cent., France 16 per cent., and Yugoslavia 6.6 per cent. Russia, which agreed to the Paris pact, did not seek a share.

These distributions represented no eager, voluntary surrender. Following on earlier representations to the Swiss Government on the matter of help to the Nazis, the United States issued a strong warning in January, 1945. The Swiss Government first refused, then resisted, protested, shuffled. By these means it gained an extra 16 months' German business for the Swiss bankers and industrialists.

Following the defeat of Germany, seized documents unfolded damning proof of the relations between the Swiss bankers and industrialists and the Nazis. As a result the Allied attitude stiffened, to culminate in Switzerland's sullen distribution of loot and assets mentioned. But thus far (July, 1946), it has refused to give up the 445,000,000 of gold and the other loot mentioned above. And nothing is being done about those millions which the Swiss ruling group smuggled to Spain and the Argentine for the Nazis.

Today, the lovers of Nazism, the friends of those who wrote the murder plots for lesser actors to play, the haters of true democracy who made sickening tributes to neutrality and sent human fuel to the Nazi ovens—today, these Fascist figures are gaining encouragement from the blustering puppet of British Reaction, Bevin, and the representative of "Jim Crow," South Carolina Senator J. F. Byrnes.

Which means that the fight will now become more open.

The Swiss workers have a tradition that has been obscured by its ruling class, betrayed by its Social Democrats. The Swiss workers supplied a contingent to the International Brigade which fought with Spanish Catholics against Franco's Moorish troops and Nazi airmen. The "democratic" Swiss Government gaoled the remnants of the contingent when they returned to Switzerland.

In the November, 1943, elections, the Social Democratic Party, largest Party returned, called for immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with Russia. Four months later the Party motion before the National Council (Parliament) demanding renewal was withdrawn at the request of Pilet-Golaz!

Hope for real democracy in Switzerland lies with the working class. When they have won unity among themselves and the Social Democrats have discarded their Right Wing leaders, they will have taken a firm step towards a democracy that will not have to be written in inverted commas.

THE ACTIVATING FORCE OF MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY

(Editorial in the "Bolshevik" (No 23-24, December, 1945), theoretical and political journal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.)

Seven years have passed since the publication of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Before the war more than 20 million copies of this book were issued. At present the History of the C.P.S.U. is going through a supplementary printing of 11 million copies. The publication of an additional printing of many millions of copies takes place in response to the lively interest of the Soviet people in the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party. This interest has grown especially now in connection with the great historical role played by the Bolshevik Party during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. The growing desire to study the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party is an expression of the fact that the Party has become even more closely related to the people; an expression of the growth in the political activity and consciousness of the masses.

The Soviet people won their victory in the Great Patriotic War under the guidance of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which unified and organized their forces and wisely directed them to a single goal. The intelligence and will of the Party and its unsurpassed organizing ability played the greatest role in winning a victory which has no equal in history. The Party fulfilled this role because under new conditions it creatively applied its great theory, its rich historical experience. It emerged from severe trials enriched and made wiser by the new historical experience. In their desire to understand profoundly the conditions and means which helped to enable our Party to organize the victory of the people in the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet people are turning to the study of the entire history of Bolshevism. This is understandable, for the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War was prepared by the whole preceding activity of the Bolshevik Party, by its struggle for the socialist transformation of our Motherland.

The importance of studying the history of Bolshevism is determined by the fact that without this a profound mastery of our Party's theory is impossible. It is impossible to grasp the theory of Bolshevism without knowing its history; a study of the history of our Party provides a clear notion of the indissoluble connection between Marxist-Leninist theory and Party policy. The study of Party history has special significance for the new reinforcements that entered the C.P.S.U. during the war years; for they have still to master the experience of the great Party of Lenin and Stalin.

The history of the C.P.S.U. is Leninism in action. It is the history of the political life and struggle of our Party, of its varied practical activity, and at the same time, it is the history of its ideolo-

logical life, of its ideological-theoretical struggle. The whole of the History of the C.P.S.U. is permeated by the indissoluble connection between Leninist-Stalinist teaching and Bolshevik action.

The history of the C.P.S.U. shows that, in the hands of our Party, theory has become a great transforming force, because the Party has never treated theory as an abstract ideal, as a lifeless "symbol of faith." The Bolsheviks have continuously directed their efforts toward putting revolutionary theory into practice. The Mensheviks and other opportunists only chattered about socialism, without making the slightest effort toward bringing socialist theory to life, toward practical struggle for socialism. Putting up a screen of chatter about socialism, they put off struggling for it to the misty distance of ages and thus helped capitalism fortify its positions.

Characterising the activities of the Second International, Lenin wrote:

"Socialism as a goal in general, in contradistinction to capitalism (or imperialism), is accepted now not only by Kautskyites and social-chauvinists, but even by many bourgeois politicians. . . ."

"The whole Second International . . . countered socialism to capitalism in general, and for just this too general 'generalisation' it suffered bankruptcy." (Lenin Miscellany, Vol. XVII, p. 113.)

Bitter experience has convinced the workers of Western European countries of the fruitlessness of chatter about socialism; they have paid a high price for the treacherous activities of the leaders of the reformist parties, who, by the splitting policy they conducted in the labor movement, weakened its forces in the struggle against fascist reaction. The Mensheviks in Russia, and right in line with them, the Trotskyites, who later sold themselves to the fascist secret services, in their time also chattered about socialism, and, screening themselves behind this chatter, strove to "prove" the impossibility of the victory of socialism and in alliance with foreign imperialists sought to restore capitalism in our country.

Only the Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin and Stalin, have brought to life the great doctrine of the socialist transformation of society. From the very first steps of their revolutionary struggle the Bolsheviks have steadfastly heeded Lenin's injunction that "All agitation for socialism must be converted from the abstract and the general into the concrete and the immediately practical." (Lenin Miscellany, Vol. XVII, p. 181.)

In the long and stubborn struggle with all kinds of enemies of socialism, who hid themselves behind

the screen of accepting it verbally, the Bolsheviks proved in fact that socialism is not an empty dream and does not lie somewhere in the misty distance of ages. They organized and realized the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the earth. In the USSR the question of the victory of socialism is "Today . . . no longer a debatable question. Today it is a matter of facts, a matter of real life, a matter of habits that permeate the whole life of the people." (J. V. Stalin Speech delivered at a meeting of the voters of the Stalin electoral area, in Moscow, December 11, 1937.)

The scientific theory of socialism created by Marx and Engels was rendered lifeless by the opportunists, since they deprived it of all practical significance and meaning. While Marx and Engels turned socialism from a utopia into a science, the opportunists, as Lenin pointed out, substituted for scientific socialism a purely philistine, "dream-cloudy" inclination toward socialism in the abstract (see Lenin Miscellany, Vol. III, p. 494). Making the axis of their whole propaganda the thesis that socialism is a matter of the very distant, practically indefinite future, the Mensheviks and other opportunists produced something that suited the bourgeoisie. For this reason the bourgeoisie even saw in them a social bulwark, because without coming out against socialism directly, they distracted the masses of the workers from the practical struggle for the socialist transformation of society. It was precisely this that made Menshevism, opportunism, the most artful and shrewd device for maintaining the domination of the bourgeoisie.

In Bolshevism, however, the bourgeoisie recognised a serious threat to themselves, because the Bolsheviks were conducting a real struggle for socialism, for bringing revolutionary theory to life. In this active approach of the Bolsheviks to their theory is expressed their genuine revolutionary spirit, their actual devotion to the fundamental interests of the people.

Precisely because the Bolshevik Party throughout its whole history fought actively to bring revolutionary theory to life, theory itself in the hands of the Bolsheviks always was and is ever a progressive science, which they unwaveringly move forward, enriching it with new ideological acquisitions. The Mensheviks and reactionary leaders of the Second International destroyed theory—destroyed it precisely because, not wanting to realise it in practice, they reduced it to a state of immobility and stagnation, deprived it of its revolutionary soul, distorted and deformed it. They did everything they could to prevent opportunities in the struggle for emancipation and from being inspired by faith in its own forces. The whole practice of the opportunists, which was directed against bringing socialism to life, gave rise to all sorts of "theories" to the effect that socialism is impossible in the immediate perspective, that it is a matter of the very distant, practically indefinite future.

On the contrary, the Bolshevik Party, in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society, advanced Marxist science on the path of an ever deeper understanding of the laws of social development. Lenin, Stalin, and the Bolsheviks disclosed that in conditions of a new epoch—the epoch of imperialism—there existed a new disposition of class forces and new possibilities, permitting the toilers, with hope of success and with confidence in their forces, to conduct a practical revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society.

The Mensheviks and other opportunists, who never took seriously the theoretical propositions of Marxism and had no intention of putting them into practice, also did not set themselves the task of spreading the revolutionary ideas of Marxism among the masses. Characteristic of the opportunist leaders of Social-Democracy is a haughtily disdainful view of the masses, according to which theory is allegedly inaccessible to the masses. The opportunists concealed from the masses the revolutionary heart of Marxist theory because they feared that education in the spirit of Marxism would lay bare before the masses the defects of capitalism and cause its foundations to waver.

In contrast to the opportunists, the Bolsheviks have always taken care that the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism penetrated the masses on an ever deeper and broader scale. This corresponds to the active attitude of the Bolsheviks to their theory. The Bolsheviks have not elaborated theory in order to pigeonhole its conclusions, but in order to embody them in life. In this the Bolsheviks have taken as their point of departure the position that the masses decide the fate of history. They therefore have considered it their duty to bring advanced ideas to the consciousness of the people, and have never ceased taking care that theory becomes the property of the masses.

Contrasting the Bolsheviks, the Communists, with the Mensheviks and all other opportunists, in his article "Lenin as Organizer and Leader of the Communist Party" (1920), Comrade Stalin pointed out that there are two groups of Marxists and that between them there lies a whole gulf, for their methods of work are diametrically opposite.

Characterising the Mensheviks and opportunists, Comrade Stalin said:

"The first group usually confines itself to the superficial recognition of Marxism, to solemnly proclaiming it. Unable, or not wishing to study the essence of Marxism, unable, or not wishing to apply it in practical life, it transforms the living revolutionary propositions of Marxism into dead, meaningless formulae. It bases its activities, not on experience, not on the results of practical work, but on quotations from Marx. It takes its guiding lines and directives not from an analysis of living reality, but from analogies and historical parallels. Discrepancy between word and deed—such is the principal disease from which this group suffers."

This discrepancy between word and deed, which the opportunists made their principle and norm of behavior, led in the final analysis to their repudiating more and more even a verbal acknowledgement of Marxism, to their going over to the position of bourgeois ideology, to their becoming plain servants and accomplices of the policy of the imperialists.

The Bolsheviks saved Marxism and developed it further.

Characterising the Bolsheviks, the Communists, Comrade Stalin said:

"The second group on the other hand transforms the centre of gravity of the question from the superficial recognition of Marxism to its realisation, to its application in practical life. Indicating the path and means of realising Marxism for various situations, changing the path and means when the situation changes—this is what this group concentrates its attention upon mainly. It takes its directives and guiding lines not from historical analogies and parallels, but from the study of surrounding conditions. In its activities it relies, not on quotations and aphorisms, but on practical experience, testing every step it takes by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others to build a new life. This, properly speaking, explains why in the activities of this group there is no discrepancy between word and deed, and why the teachings of Marx fully preserve their living, revolutionary force."

This unity of word and deed, a unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice, permeates the whole history of our Party. This is why it is impossible to master Marxism-Leninism without studying the history of the Bolshevik Party.

The History of the C.P.S.U. shows the unity and integrity of Marxism-Leninism in all its component parts and discloses the all-sided connection between the policy of our Party, its strategy and tactics, with its ideological and theoretical principles. The History of the C.P.S.U. is a classical work of Marxism-Leninism. It provides a theoretical generalisation of enormous practical experience, a demonstration of the indissoluble connection between the policy of our Party and its world outlook and theory of social development, and a disclosure of how the Party of Lenin and Stalin has enriched and advanced Marxist theory.

In his work, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, Comrade Stalin developed further the Leninist ideas on the unity of method and theory in the world outlook of the Bolshevik Party.

This unity is embodied in the fact that both method and theory are consistently revolutionary. In Marx's words, his dialectic is "in its essence critical and revolutionary." And, as Comrade Stalin points out, "it is precisely this critical and revolutionary spirit that pervades Lenin's method from beginning to end." Marxist-Leninist dialectic is a weapon in the struggle for the revolutionary

transformation of capitalist society, for the victory of the new over the old—in its essence it looks forward into the future. But the Marxist-Leninist method has the special property that it exists in unity with materialist theory. For materialist theory liberates man from false, idealist notions and ideas of a "supreme reason" and "supreme will" as predetermining everything in this world, including the division into exploiters and exploited, etc. Materialist theory gives the toilers firm ground in the struggle against outlived social orders and for a progressive reconstruction of society.

Counterbalancing the revisionists, who rejected Marxist dialectics, Lenin and Stalin showed that dialectics is the revolutionary soul of Marxism, that the Marxist world outlook is an indivisible unity of the Marxist dialectical method and Marxist philosophical materialism.

Similarly, dialectical materialism and historical materialism are indissoluble. The all-embracing proof by Lenin and Stalin of the inseparability of dialectical materialism and the materialist conception of history has great significance in the struggle against opportunists and revisionists, who have tried from different angles to undermine the foundations of the Marxist world outlook. It is known that double-dealing with regard to Marxism has been exemplified in the case, for example, of Bogdanov and other empiriocritics who in words acknowledged historical materialism, but rejected dialectical materialism.

Lenin and Stalin razed to the ground these attempts to set Marx's historical theory in opposition to the philosophy of dialectical materialism. With exhaustive completeness they showed that it is precisely the extension of all the propositions of dialectical materialism to the cognition of social phenomena that leads to a genuinely scientific explanation of social development.

The History of the C.P.S.U., created by Comrade Stalin, liquidated the harmful gap between Marxism and Leninism that had existed in the sphere of propaganda, the estrangement of Leninism from dialectical and historical materialism, from party history. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. in its decision "On the Organisation of Party Propaganda in connection with the Publication of the History of the C.P.S.U.," reunited into one whole the artificially split-up component parts—dialectical and historical materialism and Leninism—and made the connection between historical materialism and the policy of the Party. The History of the C.P.S.U. is a guide of this sort, in which the indissoluble unity, integrity and successorship of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, the unity of Marxism-Leninism, are demonstrated. Set forth in it is the new element introduced by Lenin and his disciples into Marxist theory on the basis of a generalisation of new experience in the struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

Already in his work *Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "... Lenin's criticism and further development of the critical and revolutionary method of Marx, of the critical dialectics." In the same work Comrade Stalin indicated the new that was introduced by Lenin in the development of Marxist philosophical materialism. Comrade Stalin wrote: "... None other than Lenin undertook the very serious task of generalising, in line with the materialist philosophy, the most important achievements of science from the time of Engels down to his own time, as well as of subjecting to comprehensive criticism the anti-materialistic trends among Marxists."

Accordingly, it is impossible to study Leninism, the theory and history of our Party, apart from dialectical and historical materialism, which is a component part of Marxism-Leninism.

In the history of philosophical and social thought there have been not a few theories which contained attempts to explain the historical process and interpret phenomena of social life. Among these theories there were also those that served only to obscure sense. But all even of those social theories that carried within them certain kernels of truth shared the same fate: they could not become reliable guides for historical action, because the basic line of historical development was not correctly represented in them—they could not disclose the motive forces of the historical process.

Only Marxist-Leninist theory provides a genuinely scientific explanation of social development and is a fully reliable guide to correct action. This is proved by the history of the Bolshevik Party, which in all its steps had as its guiding star Marxist-Leninist theory and emerged from the struggle victorious. The history of the Bolshevik Party is therefore the brightest testimony to the force and

vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory. The History of the C.P.S.U., in shedding Marxist illumination on every step in the history of our Party, shows how our Party applied theory and moved it forward in concrete historical surroundings, and in so doing it teaches Party cadres and the Soviet intelligentsia by concrete historical examples how to find correct guidance in the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

No other party in the world has had such a rich and scientifically generalized political experience, such advanced theory, as the Bolshevik Party. Only the Party of Lenin and Stalin relies in its activities on knowledge of the laws of social development, tested by great historical practice. The History of the C.P.S.U. has generalized the enormous historical experience of the Bolshevik Party.

Now that the fascist aggressors have been destroyed and our country has entered a period of peaceful development, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people face new tasks in the sphere of building our economy and culture, tasks for further strengthening the military-economic might of the U.S.S.R.

As a result of the victory over the fascist aggressors, big shifts have taken place in the life of states beyond our borders, in their mutual inter-relationships, and there have been changes in the role played by individual states on the international arena.

We are faced with a new page of historical development, one that our cadres must comprehend in order to orient themselves freely in the whole internal and international situation. Hence the necessity for a continued unremitting theoretical and political arming of our cadres, for a systematic study by them of the works of Lenin and Stalin, for a profound mastery of the theoretical and ideological foundations of our Party and its historical experience.

STORY OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

P. MORGAN-THOMAS.

[Before coming to Australia, Mr. Morgan-Thomas was for many years a contributor to Socialist papers in Britain; consequently his views are of interest. However, some points made are open to question, for example, the statement that "Socialism was growing in England and the workers were more united than today in their desire for real Socialism." Also the Labor Party leaders mentioned as "opposed to the war" (of 1914-18) did so only from the pacifist-consciousness-objector standpoint and not from a consistent Marxist-Leninist attitude.]

THE British Labor Party was launched in 1899. Its real founder was the late J. Keir Hardie who ever remained faithful to the working class. But J. Ramsay MacDonald, and Philip Snowden (afterwards "Lord" Snowden) always claimed their share in the formation of the first English Labor Party which had for its object the election of Labor representatives to the House of Commons. The party was made up of the Independent Labor Party, the Fabian Society and the Trades Unions, also, for a short while only, the British Socialist

Party. The latter, however, at that period was definitely "Marxian" and revolutionary, and soon found that the new Labor Party, which was ruled for the first few years of its existence by the Independent Labor Party, was too "opportunistic" for any organisation which believed in real socialism to associate itself with. The policy of the Independent Labor Party, being anti-revolutionary and anti-Marxian, appealed more to the ever conservative British workers than the Marxian programme of the British Socialist Party.

Ramsay McDonald began to perceive this a few years before the formation of the Labor Party. Arriving home from abroad in 1893 he had joined the British Socialist Party, but later he resigned from that party and joined the Independent Labor Party, in which he soon made his influence felt. Hardie unfortunately believed in the sincerity of R. McDonald right up to his (Hardie's) death in 1915. Hardie could have often enriched himself at the expense of his ideals, which were altruistic and faithful to his class, but did not deign to do so. He was guileless and could not detect McDonald's self-seeking.

The chief partner in this new Labor Party was a mild "Socialist" organisation — the Independent Labor Party, formed in 1892, which by 1899 had built up many branches up and down Britain, especially in the North. Their weekly organ "The Labor Leader" had now a very fair circulation, and had every week notices of the Branches, which announced socials, lectures and dances (which attracted many, especially the dances, for young workers of those days had little amusement). Hardie, Snowden and McDonald were constant contributors to this "Labor Leader" and travelled the country organising and lecturing for this party. But their programme was vaguely "Socialist" and unlike that of the British Socialist Party — who set out their programme weekly in their organ "Justice", clearly and concisely, the abolition of the Monarchy and House of Lords being first among its steps to revolutionary socialism. On the other hand the Independent Labor Party often claimed you could have a King under socialism!!! But then they wished to get their representatives into the House of Commons, and for centuries there had only been 2 parties in that Assembly, and Liberal and Tory had carried on a "sham" fight between themselves. This was characterised by the British Socialist Party as a fight between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, but the opportunist Labor Party refused to admit this. For the first several years after the launching of the British Labor Party, the only representative they had in the House was Keir Hardie, who had sat there since 1892 as an "Independent." The Boer War 1899-1902 which showed how Britain looked after small nations (except when there were Diamond and Gold Mines to confiscate) stopped the growth of the "forward" movement for a while; and although in 1902 Henderson was elected as a Labor representative in the House of Commons, it was not till 1906, when the Liberals secured a big majority for Free Trade (over 150), that 29 labor members were elected and the parliamentary Labor Party led by Keir Hardie entered the British House of Commons.

The entry of the new party caused quite a stir — although out of the 29 members only a dozen were members of a socialist organisation, the rest being (Liberal) Trades Unionists. However, both Liberal and Tory were genuinely alarmed at the growth of "Socialism" in such a conservative country

as Britain, and newspapers and magazines vied with one another in printing articles on socialism for months; and, of course, articles by the successful Labor candidates (whose party posed as 'Socialist') as to how and why they won these seats.

A year later 2 other workers' members were added to the 29. One of these, however, was too revolutionary for the Labor Party caucus and was not endorsed by the Party. Yet he beat Liberal and Tory standing as an out and out Socialist. And amazing as it may sound, Snowden helped him win; and incurred the wrath of the Labor bosses. This man, Victor Grayson, was one of the very few real Socialists ever to enter the British House of Commons and fight for the unemployed in the House in season and out of season — and generally fighting alone. He was expelled from that capitalist assembly for a time. In 1910 there were 2 General Elections and the British Labor Party added a few members at both these to their number. In spite of the "opportunist" policy of the Labor Party socialism was growing in England and the workers were more united than today in that country in their desire for real socialism.

The war of 1914-18 was the capitalist saviour both in England and abroad; had it not taken place the chances are the U.S.S.R. would not be the only socialist country today. When the war broke out, however, there was a division in the Labor Party. Six of the members, including R. McDonald, Snowden and Keir Hardie opposed the war and spoke against it. The organ of the Independent Labor Party—"The Labor Leader" and the Party itself to its credit, opposed what Lenin called "this criminal imperialist war." However, in 1915 when Asquith — the then British Prime Minister — formed his coalition cabinet he invited a few of the Labor members to enter it, and Henderson (the one time anti-militarist) and 2 others were given seats on the cabinet. Later in 1916 the Trades Unions held a vote on conscription which was defeated by a large majority. Nevertheless the 3 Labor cabinet ministers refused to resign and a measure of conscription was carried for the first time in Britain for the duration of the war.

Towards the end of the 1914-18 war the feeling in England was one of growing hatred for war and the Labor Party called their representatives out of the cabinet a little before the termination of hostilities and refused to let them enter Lloyd George's coalition formed just after the armistice. But at this snap "Khaki" election the Labor Party more than doubled their number in the House, and for a while it looked as if the Party, now led by Ramsay Mc-
 (Hardie having died in 1915), was going to be more revolutionary than pre-war, when they preached the possibility of a King under socialism. For in 1920 they formed soldiers' and workers' councils up and down Britain, and these in conjunction with Trades Unions plainly told Lloyd George that in the event of war with Russia they would declare a general strike. That upset Lloyd George's

appreciate and he called the war off. From then, he grew one less opportunist.

However, finding themselves the largest single party in the House of Commons after the elections in 1923, they ruled the country with the help of the Liberals in a strictly "Liberal" way for 6 months, when the Tories turned them out. In 1926 there was a general strike in Britain; this strike roused the ire of the capitalist class and seriously alarmed it. However, just as it looked as if the strike were going to be successful and after 11 days of its duration, the Labor "Leaders" paid their tribute to the master class and called it off.

From that time onward the policy of the leaders of the British Labor Party has been one of reaction, of hatred of the Soviet Union, and a desire to serve the capitalist class at all costs (and thus themselves). This was perhaps not so apparent while George Lansbury led the Party from 1931 until 1935, when he resigned fearing sanctions against Italy would lead to war; Lansbury had been a lifelong opponent to carnage. Indeed, every year during his leadership he got a resolution passed at the Labor Party conference ordering a general strike in the event of war. Lansbury was an honest man and much beloved of the workers. The Trades Unions who were now ruling the Labor Party disliked him and were glad to get rid of him and substitute an automaton for a leader—Attlee.

Directly Lansbury had gone W. Citrine (afterwards knighted for his work for the capitalist class) caused the resolution for a general strike, if war was declared, to be abandoned both by the Labor Party and Trades Unions. Henceforth the once anti-militarist Labor Party swallowed anything the warmongers asked them.

In the 1929 General Election the Labor Party found themselves the largest party in the House. J. Strachey (now turned reactionary), in his book *The Coming Struggle for Power*, tells us how R. McDonald earnestly hoped the election would give them an absolute majority and kept saying "I hope the Liberals do well." His wish was granted and the Party were able to say they could not bring in socialism because they had not a majority. Strachey ably argues in the book quoted that it was not the absence of a majority but a desire to let capitalism still flourish, that caused their administration to do nothing for the workers when the Labor Party ruled in England from 1929-31. From that time until the war the attitude of the Labor "opposition" in and out of the House of Commons was one of hatred for the Soviet Union and for Communism. They argued it was through the Communists that Fascists were made, and they were more dangerous than the Fascists. Again and again they refused to co-operate with the Communists, or to join hands in a United Front against Fascism. Even men like Stafford Cripps came under their wrath in this direction, and yet had they and their fellow Social Democrats on the continent co-operated with

the Communists the war might have been averted.

When the war came they gladly helped the war makers, and began a tirade against the Soviet Union for not joining the Allies. Their leaders entered the war cabinet and one of their number (Morrison) became Home Secretary and promptly suppressed the Communist "Daily Worker" and "The Week." Directly the war was over (and even a little before) they began to slander the Soviet Union, and when they came to power last year their venom and hatred of the Soviet increased. Mosley, the leader of the English Fascists, was allowed a "carte blanche," and was able to spread his poison up and down England, while Attlee (the automaton) directed no doubt by the Foreign Secretary (Bevin) who hates the Soviet Union, and Communism, made a speech which was a tirade against Communists, declaring them a danger and hoping that at the Labor Party Congress a vote against them being admitted to the Labor Party would be large.

In the meantime, in order to pave the way for a war with the Soviet Union (planned by the British and American monopolists) the British Labor Party have planned to form an anti-Communist International, also a drive to kill the Communist Party in Britain.

Had they been a true friend of the working class they would not have been a party to the present capitalist policy of starvation for the British workers. At the termination of hostilities the capitalist rulers of England had 2 alternatives—(1) to buy the needless food from America, which the British people had money to pay for; (2) to save capital and build motor cars and other luxuries to sell abroad at large profits for themselves and let the British people half starve. They chose the latter (knowing the rich could get all the good things) and the Labor Party with its large majority stood for this unkind policy. The Labor Party's budget was applauded by the Stock Exchange. Its fake nationalisation has proved a boon to shareholders for which the workers must pay. Bevin has helped Franco, and backed Fascism in Greece, Argentina and elsewhere, while frankly hating the Soviet Union, and now the plan of the British and American monopolists is plain to see, and is backed by the British Labor Party. A drive to discredit the U.S.S.R. because of the great success of the work begun by the immortal Lenin, and carried on by Stalin. A drive against the land, where food rationing has been abandoned; insecurity, and unemployment gone; and where science, literature, art, and music are for all Soviet citizens; and the greatest scheme of education and recreation for the young children carried out. Capitalism is facing a crisis. It knows that if the U.S.S.R. is left alone that country will become an earthly paradise; but one which by its very success will doom capitalism. One of the other must go. Therefore with the aid of the British Labor Party this new drive against the U.S.S.R. has been planned. Only the victory of socialism can save the world from a terrible catastrophe.

THE PARENT AND THE TEACHER

C. A. SHORT, B.Sc.

THE principal weakness of a highly centralised system of education, such as exists in the Australian states, is the tendency for the school to become divorced from the community. Where there is a decentralised system as in the U.S.A., there is a great variation in the quality of education. A wealthy and progressive district or city will have an education as effective as any in the world, while poor and backward districts may have education of an incredibly poor standard. But, in general, the more direct participation of the citizens leads to a keener interest in education. This participation in education on a local basis has its reactionary side in interference with the work of liberal-minded teachers but, as previously stated, it has its progressive side, and on the state or national scale, in the greater real interest of the citizens in the educative process and in the provision of a larger percentage of the national income to instituting improvements in education.

Wherever socialist movements achieve even temporary power, even in limited areas, they have laid great stress on education. This was true of Spain and Greece. It is true of China and Yugoslavia.

Education in the Soviet Union is, next to defence, the most important activity of the community. Though highly centralised, there are strong links with the character of the locality, with the home and with production. "It is felt that parents cannot escape the responsibility for their children by handing them over to the school. In 1941 a great educational campaign began to educate parents in various ways. In a park in Leningrad, there was a festival of the home and the school; parents' evenings in the school are organised by their children. Forty towns have started Parents' Universities, which fathers and mothers attend, not only for lectures in psychology but also to discuss the qualities desired in Soviet children, including the very homely ones; consideration for others, a readiness to help whenever and wherever necessary, a respect for things so that broken objects are mended and belongings cared for. Other qualities are accuracy and precision in work, a desire to excel at a task and readiness for adventure." (Education in the Soviet Union, Doris McRae.) Anyone acquainted with literature on the Soviet Union will have read of the links between the school and the factory, the school and the collective farm and of the pioneer and technical clubs. So we see that a highly centralised system does not necessarily lead to apathy, on the part of the community, toward education.

The attitude of a considerable number of Australian parents toward the school and the teacher is one of indifference if not of actual hostility. The school is too detached from society. It is not

considered a disgrace to the community that in many of our school playgrounds pupils are not allowed to run because of overcrowding, that buildings are dilapidated, dull, drab and more or less continually out of repair. It is not considered an anomaly that any one of a hundred insurance offices and banks is better than the best of our schools which house "the most precious things in the community." There is no great outcry about the fact that children eat lunches brought from home in conditions which no body of workers would accept for two days.

Throughout the Commonwealth, tens of thousands of parents who ARE concerned about education attend Parents and Citizens' Association meetings and Mothers' Club meetings. But the work of these associations is largely directed to helping out the meagre supply of equipment provided by the Education Departments. They use up all or most of their energies providing duplicating machines, stencils and paper, carpets, books, pianos, radios, sewing machines, etc. The total sums raised probably amount to less than one per cent. of the amount spent on education. The road forward lies, not in an intensification of their effort along the lines of present activity but in a reorientation of effort. The Parents' Association of any particular school can help in establishing healthy relationships between that school and the community. In regard to money, instead of raising a few pounds to mitigate the bad conditions of the schools, or of that particular school, the parents would achieve real results by joining in a broad political campaign for adequate finance for education.

In New South Wales the central organisation of citizens' associations, the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations, is aware of the real nature of the problem. The most active of the members who come together as delegates have made common cause with the N.S.W. Public School Teachers' Federation in endorsing a programme for education. Although most teachers agree with this programme it is doubtful whether the majority of members of P. and C. Associations understand and agree with it.

To say that most teachers agree with the programme is not to say that they actively support it. The disinterest of the community and bad conditions, the parsimonious attitude of the Government to Education and the lack of equipment have soured many teachers. Some are resentful of any participation of the community in the school life, misunderstanding it as probable interference in their work and their methods. But the great majority of teachers are very sincere in their work and are potentially strong supporters of a campaign for educational reform. It is significant that teachers' organisations have, in the past, been the leaders of

such campaigns. Teachers, through their organisations, can form the core of a great mass movement for a modern education, but the interest and support of parents and citizens are essential to its success.

The present campaign centres on the necessity for larger amounts of finance for education than the States are able to provide. The Federal Government has taken the first hesitating steps toward providing finance for education. It is estimated that a capital expenditure of about £25 million is required to bring our schools up to modern standards. This must surely be regarded as a modest sum, a very small percentage of our war expenditure. Yet it will require a mass campaign of teachers and parents to enforce it and to see that it is expended to build really good schools and proper sites, not to patch present obsolete and overcrowded buildings.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Conducted by L. H. GOULD.

"Why is there still the state power in the U.S.S.R.? Didn't Marx and Engels say that with the ending of exploitation the state would 'with away'?"—L.T.J.

DISCUSSING the problem of the relation between Socialism and the state, Stalin elaborated the above question as follows:—

"It is sometimes asked: 'We have abolished the exploiting classes; there are no longer any hostile classes in the country; there is nobody to suppress; hence there is no more need for the state; it must die away. Why do we not strive to put an end to it? Is it not time to throw out all this rubbish of a state?' Or further: 'The exploiting classes have already been abolished in our country; Socialism has been built in the main; we are advancing towards Communism. Now the Marxist doctrine of the state says that there is to be no state under Communism. Why, then, do we not help our Socialist state to die away? If it not time we relegated the state to the museum of antiquities?'"

What precisely is the state?

Engels defined it as "a particular power of suppression." The state is the apparatus of power, represented by the army, police, courts, etc., in the hands of one class to suppress another, or other classes. In slaveholding times, the slaveholders controlled the state in order to maintain their rule over the population which consisted in the main of chattel slaves. In feudalism, the feudal monarchy and the great landowning nobility needed the state to suppress the masses of peasants and serfs, and also to suppress the emerging bourgeoisie (the burghesses of the towns). In capitalism, the state is in the hands of the class of capitalists (today, of course, monopoly-capitalists or imperialists) to suppress the workers and all the toilers.

Communists throughout Australia should be active in influencing their fellow citizens and fellow teachers in their organisations. Whatever the attitude of the press on other matters, they will not be found altogether unsympathetic on this issue. The support given by all sections of the press to the recent campaign in N.S.W. for increased salaries for teachers is a proof of this.

In rebuilding the devastated areas of the Soviet Union priority was given to schools. The campaign for decent accommodation, efficient equipment, larger playgrounds and adequate supplies of books must become a mass campaign on the broadest basis similar to the campaign for housing. In this campaign for a new deal for education, teachers and parents have a mutual interest.

The first thing to emphasise then is that the state expresses the existence of classes and class struggles within society. The state came into being with the break-up of primitive Communist society, that is, when mankind divided into classes of rulers and ruled, exploiters and exploited. In his splendid *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels describes the beginnings, the first steps towards the establishment of the state power. Suffice it here to say that the state is not something neutral; it is not an agency standing above classes in order to "reconcile their conflicting interests." Consider the fiction of the Arbitration Court—that it "reconciles" the conflicting interests of capital and labor. It cannot. To repeat, the State (of which the court is one arm) is a suppressive power operating in the interests of the capitalists. It is a dictatorship; but in capitalist democracy a concealed dictatorship.

To continue, Stalin defined the main functions of the state as follows: "Two basic functions characterise the activity of the state: at home (the main function), to keep in restraint the exploited majority; abroad (not the main function), to extend the territory of its class, the ruling class, at the expense of the territory of other states, or to defend the territory of its own state from attack by other states. Such was the case in slave society and under feudalism. Such is the case under capitalism."

Why does the proletariat, after it comes to power, need the state? For precisely the same reason as with other ruling classes, namely, to suppress its enemies (the old exploiting minority, the capitalists). Not only do the capitalists remain (capitalist exploitation cannot be completely abolished overnight), but they constitute for a long time a very dangerous oppositional force, actively resisting the establishment of the new order of Soc-

alism. The capitalists, it is true, are now no longer the ruling class, but they possess technical skill, connections, military knowledge, movable wealth and, of great importance, so long as the outside world is still predominantly capitalist, powerful allies in those capitalist states as fiercely determined as themselves to overthrow the new Socialist state.

This capitalist encirclement is of great significance. Marx and Engels worked out their doctrine of the state only in its general forms, i.e., as applied to socialism on a world scale. But historical development set a special problem for the Marxists of this century: how is the Marxist doctrine of the state to be applied if Socialism comes at first only to one country, and the rest of the world continues capitalist? Basing themselves upon Marxism, Lenin and Stalin brilliantly solved the problem.

The state under Socialism disappears — yes, but not immediately! Nothing would suit the bourgeoisie better than for the working class, just arrived to power, to abolish the army, etc., to do away with the apparatus to restrict, coerce and suppress them! (In the Spanish revolution of 1934, the anarchists committed the most awful blunders — indeed, real crimes against the working class — by their fierce opposition, not only to the capitalist state, but also to the proletarian state. They released militarists, monarchists, and landowning nobles from gaols on the grounds that gaols are evidence of the existence of a state, which they "opposed on principle"! The released prisoners were not so punctilious; they soon returned with armed gangs and massacred tens of thousands of the anarchists and others.)

The question therefore should be put in a more valid form: "How long a time must elapse before the state in Socialism can disappear?"

BOOK REVIEW

Crux Ansata (H. G. Wells)

S. MOSTON

H. G. Wells, the famous English novelist and historian, has written a brief history of the Roman Catholic Church, *Crux Ansata* (The Cross with a Handle), which is at the same time an indictment of that body's hierarchy. He was apparently impelled to write this work by the failure of Britain and America to bomb Rome (in 1942) in spite of mass demands.

Although, and unfortunately, Mr. Wells lacks a Marxist approach to history, his little book provides some very useful information as a background to a study of the present-day role of the Vatican in world affairs. The data provided facilitate a fuller understanding of such articles as "The Vatican's War on Peace" by V. J. Jerome published in recent issues of the "Communist Review".

Catholicism was definitely formulated in the 4th century A.D. and at that time, Mr. Wells points out, "the spirit of Constantine the Great is as evi-

dent as, or more evident than the spirit of Jesus." There can be no doubt that whatever may have been the original Christian outlook of sympathy for the poor and downtrodden, the Church adapted itself to the wealthy rulers, its own hierarchy merging with, and becoming a substantial part of the ruling class. "Its priests and bishops had forgotten about the Fatherhood of God, they wanted to see the power of the Church, which was their own power, dominating men's lives."

For a thousand years, the Roman Church is characterised by a ruthless cruelty to and intolerance of anyone doubting the Catholic interpretation of the Bible. Among the religious sects to suffer were the Waldenses early in the 13th century. Pope Innocent III preached a crusade and "every wandering scoundrel at loose ends was enrolled to carry fire and sword and rape and every

But externally, the U.S.S.R. is still encircled by a capitalist world. What, then, is the answer in regard to the "second main function" of the state, namely, defence of Soviet territory from aggression? The answer is that the Soviet state has had to be continuously strengthened; it is more powerful now than ever before — very fortunate indeed for the whole of progressive humanity.

Socialism will develop in the U.S.S.R. into the higher stage of Communism, but the state will continue if the imperialists are still about. "Will our state remain in the period of Communism also?" Stalin asked. "Yes, it will, unless the capitalist encirclement is liquidated, and unless the danger of foreign military attack has disappeared. Naturally, of course, the form of our state will change again in conformity with the change in the situation at home and abroad."

[References: Lenin's *State and Revolution*, the final section of Stalin's *Report to the 18th Congress of C.P.S.U.*, and Engels' book mentioned above.]

conceivable outrage among the most peaceful subjects of the King of France."

For some centuries the clergy were the only scholars, few others being able even to read and write. While performing a historically useful function, even this monopoly of learning was turned to very ordinary use by the Church.

"Monkish chroniclers employed by the Princes and Potentates... sat and toiled to make their manuscripts as bright and pleasing to their employers as possible. A reeking slum of human indignity is lit up by the flattering brightness of the subservient chronicler... and it is only when we subject them to closer scrutiny that we are able to grasp the squalid facts of human life of that period."

Other historians have shown that not even the Holy Writ was free from the distortions of these unscrupulous chroniclers, to say nothing of their fraudulent insertions into the works of Roman and Jewish writers of the time. The forgery of legal documents, depriving the peasantry of land and adding to their oppression was another popular and lucrative pastime of these learned men. There seems to be good reason for the policy of illiteracy as practised in Franco Spain and other countries dominated by the Hierarchy.

The lessons of the English Peasant revolts in the 14th Century seem very modern and immediately remind us of Greece, Indonesia, India and Palestine, the Atlantic Charter and other broken pledges of the imperialists (the Australian monopolist promises to our workers included).

"Richard II... that tragic and inglorious king lied and cheated his way out of the Peasant Revolt; the people trusted him and were massacred for their touching disposition to accept the word of a gentleman."

The great Peasant Wars that went on in Europe for about four centuries were generated by the same basic material factors as the Reformation, which made a great breach in the spiritual and temporal power of the "Holy Roman Empire." The growth of commodity production, of merchant and moneylending capitalist, undermined the feudal unity of that state, and marked the beginnings of its disintegration.

However, Mr. Wells shows that the Vatican continues to wield not only spiritual but considerable

economic and political power, which it desperately tries to bluster up. "The tragedy of the (Roman) Church is that she put her spiritual influence to evil ends and abused her freedoms beyond measure." So it was in the past, so it is today.

Mosley, Captain Ramsay, Dean Inge, Mussolini and Franco are but a few among the enemies of humanity and progress that have received the benefit of the Hierarchy's "spiritual" influence. In the U.S.A. and Latin America, the Vatican and its agents are busy, but not in the interests of democracy.

There are many more interesting stories that can be mentioned in a review. The Crusades, the Jesuits, St. Francis of Assisi, Charlemagne, St. Dominic the Spaniard, have their place in the picture, brightening or softening, but often horrifying, the scene.

Crux Ansata has an important message for all honest trade unionists, though there is no direct reference. It makes clear the ambitions to restore the old power and "glory" of Catholicism, by any means. Therefore we can see that the hierarchy's labor activities in Australia are not an accident, but part of the offensive described in "The Vatican's War on Peace," as well as by Mr. Wells. Today, the labor movement is the basis, with the Communist Party the heart, of nearly every progressive force, so then the Roman Hierarchy in order to perpetuate its reactionary domination is everywhere disrupting and attacking labor and progress.

Although Mr. Wells suffers (as I said at the outset) from the lack of Marxist approach, he is inspired by a righteous indignation, which in this book sharpens his honestly objective approach, and so he has produced a work well worth studying. His information is valuable ammunition to be used by the great armies of enlightenment.

The best weapons for using his ammunition are to be found in the armoury of Marxism-Leninism, and can be wielded only by Communists. Dialectical Materialists can critically analyse the material supplied by the liberal bourgeois and use it to batter down the fortress of reaction and ignorance.

(*Crux Ansata*, by H. G. Wells, published by the Free Citizen Press, Sydney, price 2/6. Our copy from Pioneer Bookshops.)

MY DEAD BODY

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

AN Aberdeen councillor was sent to penal servitude for stealing coffin-lids which were used again instead of being burned. As he made the relatives pay for them, he was rightly condemned, but I have some sympathy for his plea that our present funeral customs are wasteful.

Our attitude to corpses is not only pre-scientific but pre-Christian. Most primitive people bury the

dead with tools and weapons for use in a future life, and often give them food for a journey to the land of the dead. The ancient Greeks gave the dead a small coin to pay their fares on the ferry over the River Styx. The tombs of rich Egyptians were complete houses, more solidly built than those which they occupied when alive. Our coffins are only slightly modified from those which they used.

We still spend money on the dead which we grudge to the living. A good many children would be alive today if the money spent on their funerals had gone to feed them when alive. A reform can only come by voluntary effort.

I know what I want done with my corpse. If I have died of an interesting disease I want a post-mortem examination. This is specially desirable if I die of certain diseases of the nervous system, where a difference of a tenth of an inch in the place affected may completely alter the symptoms. This is particularly true of some parts of the brain which control, or at least influence, the chemical behaviour of the body; for example, the amount of fat laid down under the skin.

If we know the exact function of a part of the brain we may be able to say with fair confidence that a particular set of symptoms is due to a tumour pressing on that part, and to attack the tumour by operation or X-rays. But such knowledge is only obtained by dissecting the brains of people who have died after displaying the symptoms in question. If my next-of-kin refuses to allow a post-mortem examination in such a case, he or she will be condemning someone else to death.

If I die of some more ordinary disease or from an injury which does not smash me too extensively, I want my brain removed and sent to the Wister Institute of Anatomy in America. The workers in this Institute have already examined the brains of many people of intellectual distinction, including my father, as well as those of men and women of average and of low intelligence.

They have not yet reached any very definite conclusions. Probably, even with a microscope, we cannot yet study sufficiently fine detail. Lenin's brain was exhaustively examined, but its most striking character was the great development of cells in the pyramidal area, concerned in the control of muscles. This development can hardly account for Lenin's great intelligence. It is more likely to be connected with his habit of making constant slight movements, which has been so carefully copied by Shukin, the actor who represented him in "Lenin in October" and other films.

I should like the rest of my body to be used for the teaching of anatomy. If a body is hardened, and then sawn into slices which are preserved in spirit, it is useful for demonstration. There may be enough such sections at present. There certainly will not be if we start all the new medical schools which are needed to train an enlarged medical profession.

(World Copyright Reserved.)

Alternatively, my body might be used for an ordinary dissection and buried or burned afterwards. But I should prefer to save the expense of a funeral and to continue to be of use to my fellows for as long as possible.

Unfortunately, the matter does not rest with me, but with my next-of-kin. One cannot dispose of one's body in a will, and in consequence convinced atheists with pious wives or sisters often receive Christian burial, though it is hard to see how anyone can believe that this will improve their prospects in a future life.

At present anatomy is largely taught on the bodies of paupers, to some of whom at least the prospect of dissection would be repugnant. I should like to see it done entirely on the bodies of people who have expressed a wish to be dissected, and whose nearest relatives agree. As things are, there is a considerable shortage of corpses. Several students have to share one leg or arm, and a young surgeon who wishes to practice cannot get all the material that he would need to attain as much skill as he should have before he begins on living patients.

In the Soviet Union they are beginning to use the dead in another way, namely, as a source of tissues for the living. Blood from people accidentally killed is as good as, or better than, blood from donors.

But the most striking results were obtained by Filatov, of Odessa, with grafts from the cornea, the transparent window in the front of the eye. This can only be obtained from living persons if they have already lost their sight from some other reason. So although the operation was invented in Austria and improved in Britain it was rather rarely used. Filatov has performed it on a great scale because eyes of dead men and women are constantly available. He has restored the sight of many hundreds of men blinded in the war, though unfortunately most eye wounds destroy more than the cornea, and cannot yet be treated in this way. He and his pupils have also successfully used skin from dead people for grafting.

It may be that the tissues of old people are not so useful for this purpose as those of the young. If so, no part of my body will go on living after my death.

But as men begin to think rationally about death on the one hand, and on the other to find their main satisfaction in helping others, I expect that funerals will become unfashionable, and that the greatest honour which can be paid to a dead man or woman will be to use the body as fully as possible.

