

331 *last read*

# COMMUNIST <sup>6<sup>D</sup></sup> *Review*

Registered at G.P.O.  
Sydney, N.S.W., for  
transmission through  
the post as a periodical



*335.44 R  
C73 R*



JANUARY

1940

# COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

EDITOR: R. DIXON

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: E. W. CAMPBELL

Room 2, 193 Hay Street, Sydney.

Vol. VII. No. 1.

Sydney: January, 1940.

Sixpence.

## Contents

WAR WILL WRECK LIVING STANDARDS	E. W. Campbell	1
INDIA: WORKERS STRIKE AGAINST WAR	S. S. Baltiwala	2
THE LIBERATION OF FINLAND	L. Sharkey	12
MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY. II.—THE DIALECTICAL METHOD		17
THE RED NAVY: NEW SHIPS, NEW MEN	H. Kruzhkov	21
DAWN IN INDIA	L. Harry Gould	23
CHARITY AFTERNOON (Story)	"Gordon"	26
THE FRENCH C.P. LIVES AND FIGHTS		30
"THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE" (Book Review)	G. P. O'Day	34
VON CLAUSEWITZ AND HIS THEORY		37
THE PEACE QUESTION	Lenin	38
THE DECISIVE ROLE OF THE SOVIET PURGE	Wm. Z. Foster	42
KARL LIEBKNECHT	Emile Burns	45
CEYLON: PEARL OF THE ORIENT	John Fisher	51
THE REAL ISSUES OF THE WAR	R. Dixon	54
THE LIFE OF STALIN (Biography)		59

LANCUT CASTLE in the south of Poland. Formerly occupied by the rich Potocki family. The name of Potocki in Poland ranked with that of the Kravinski, Poniatowski and Rodziwill. In those parts of the former Polish State which have reverted to the Soviet Union palaces like this have now been converted to the use of the workers and peasants.

# WAR WILL WRECK LIVING STANDARDS

E. W. Campbell



ONE of the lies spread to gain popular support for the present reactionary war is that it will bring increased employment and improved conditions.

Since it appeals to certain backward elements in the labor movement this argument cannot be lightly dismissed. It must be refuted on the basis of facts.

Stalin, in his report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (March 10, 1939), dealt with the effect of war on the national economy under capitalism.

"What does placing the economy of a country on a war footing mean?" he asked.

It means giving industry a one-sided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis."

Mr. Robert W. Gillespie, President of the Bank of New South Wales, is the last person in the world one would expect to find in complete agreement with Stalin.

Yet, in that part of his annual

report to the bank's shareholders which deals with the same subject, he confirms up to the hilt Stalin's observations.

"The fundamental problem at present," said Mr. Gillespie, "is to divert labor and capital to the more essential uses from those which are less essential in time of war."

"Transfers will be obviated to the extent that unemployed resources or excess capacity can be used."

"In general, transfers will involve a decline in present standards of living, since maintenance of these may not be consistent with the most vigorous war effort."

"Some supervision will be required to secure the necessary modification in consumption and at the same time to ensure the flow of capital into essential industries."

Thus from two authoritative but widely divergent quarters we have the common view expressed that war will worsen conditions.

Stalin calls this "reducing consumption by the population," Mr. Gillespie refers to it as "a decline in present standards of living."

Stalin formulated the whole question in a much clearer and sharper way than Mr. Gillespie. His approach was from a different angle. He spoke as a representative of the working class. His words constitute

a call to action against the war and worsened conditions.

Mr. Gillespie spoke as a representative of the ruling class which is united around the idea that "the chief purpose must now be to bring the war to a successful end for the Empire and its allies." His remarks were addressed to the capitalists and their governments, Federal and State. His was a call to action against the living standards of the masses in the interests of "the most vigorous war effort."

Already there is evidence of his remarks having borne fruit. The Chief Judge of the Federal Arbitration Court has stated that, in his opinion, it would be insane to alter wages either up or down in the present war situation.

The meaning of this is clear. Under the slogan of "stabilising conditions" an attempt will be made to peg wages at the prevailing low level. At the same time prices will continue to skyrocket as they have since the outbreak of war. Thus real

wages will suffer a drastic reduction.

The price-fixing legislation of the capitalist governments cannot be relied on to check profiteering. Similar legislation was without effect in the last war.

The prime purpose of these Acts is to placate public opinion. All sorts of demagogic promises are made but no real action is taken against the profiteers.

Prior to the outbreak of war a Royal Commission investigated the brick-making monopoly in N.S.W. There was much talk about the government launching prosecutions against the leading racketeers, but so far we have not heard of them being brought to trial.

The circumstances in which the price of tea was raised by 3d per lb. provides a further illustration of how little protection the people can expect unless they are prepared themselves to take united and energetic action.

## INDIA

### Workers Strike Against War

S. S. Baltiwala

#### THE BACKGROUND

FROM the day the second imperialist world war began, we were all very concerned. Not to say that the machinations of Chamberlain and his gang had enmeshed us in their glib talk about

"defence of democracy." What worried the Communists, leaders and rank and file, was how to effectively harness the opportunity, and create confidence in the Indian National Congress that the working class would not fall behind in the fight

not be rash, let us move with circumspection"—this was the advice freely given by responsible "leaders."

The Communists were faced with the task of breaking the spell of the Ordinance, and creating confidence in the masses. We, in Bombay, determined to give the lead, and naturally our first task was to organise a one-day political strike with the dominant section of the local working class, the textile workers, shouldering the burden.

#### THE HANDICAPS

We were faced with tremendous obstacles.

The local nationalist newspapers were crowing the imperialist tune under the direct gaze of the Press Censor. They refused to give us even a few odd lines in a remote corner of their journals for the purpose of giving the call. Legal leaflets and handbills could not be issued, as the owners of the printing presses refused to risk "confiscation against imperialism and for independence.

It was increasingly evident that the top leadership in the Congress was hesitant and wavering. It was adopting dilatory tactics, and going in for negotiations with the Viceroy.

The country was seething with discontent. The Defence of India Ordinance was demoralising quite a lot of political workers in the Congress fold through its ruthless provisions. "It is no more a question of going to jail as in the C.D. (Civil Disobedience) days; this time you face the gallows! Let us

tion" by publishing our manifesto or appeal. Even the "Kranti," our Marathi weekly, and the "National Front" had been forced to close down because no press was prepared to print "Communist" newspapers.

The police made bando-bast (arrangements) to prevent processions by enforcing the requisite of a "pass" to be previously obtained from the local police station.

Our most popular comrades on the textile front, the office bearers of the Girni Kamgar Union, the mass union of Bombay textile workers, were bound down by "bail-conditions." They were prohibited from addressing meetings, or otherwise taking part, directly or indirectly, in the furtherance of any strike. Thus, Comrades Dange, Mirajkar, Mrs. Dange, Patkar, Bhise and Bhogle were not available to us.

The C.S.P. (Congress Socialist Party) was not ready to co-operate.

The Trade Unions would have to be left out of count in order not to deprive the workers of their legal organisations in these days of economic hardship entailed by the war.

Besides all this, the issue would be a straight political one, not permitting the use of economic grievances for rallying support. A clear anti-war call would be given, the Ordinance would be defied in action and not in mere words, and we were to be ready for the full consequences of the action.

#### THE PREPARATIONS

A meeting of all Communists unanimously decided for the strike

to be called on October 2. The die was cast.

Our campaign immediately started with barely three weeks in hand. With hurricane speed meetings of contacts were convened, areas divided up, and details chalked out. From the first day, the street corner meetings were organised. All our speakers, good, bad and indifferent were posted in different localities. Under the Red Flag gathered toiling men and women to listen to the clear analysis of the war, the repudiation of any and every compromise, the exposure of "neutrality," the reasons why the working class was forced to take the lead and point the way to the rest of the nation, a call to immediate action.

From all corners came the demand for handbills and leaflets. With great difficulty the Manifesto was printed anyhow and circulated. The Congress Ministry had distributed 1,300,000 handbills, and the B.P.T.U.C. had printed 120 thousand before the general strike on November 7.\* Only ten thousand copies of the Manifesto could be printed for the strike of October 2. Further handbills were not possible to get.

Every day, after the mills closed, the working-class area hummed with activity. Cyclists with red-flags went shouting by. In the night, men with burning torches appeared at strategic corners and harangued the crowd. A new cadre which had not touched the textile workers be-

fore, took street corner and chawl meetings, and gave convincing proof of the ramifications of Communism in the city. They argued and carried conviction, patiently explaining the difficulties that loomed large before the workers. In the morning as the workers went to their mills and factories, they were greeted by hand-written posters in their chawls, on the walls of buildings, on the stairs they mounted, at the gates they entered, even on the road on which they walked. Group meetings of "contacts," the gatherings of promising workers selected for their mettle in previous local strike struggles, were organised by the hundred. Everywhere the effort was to clearly understand the political implications of the strike. These contacts emerging from these "study circles" widened the net of organisation, and proved to be the pivot of the strike. They brought home the lesson that effective Trade Union work is indispensable for a party professing Marxism, because that alone can supply the necessary links with the working masses and permit you to test and choose the right men. The patient work of our comrades for the last so many years in the Girni Kamgar Union was yielding the result.

Four days previous to the strike the first blow was received. Com. Sawant was arrested with a bundle of anti-war posters and taken to the lock-up. The comrades resolved, "We shall be more careful.

We cannot afford to lose comrades like this." The campaign was further intensified on the last days but no arrest of a similar kind could be effected by the police.

#### RALLY ON SUNDAY

The rally of workers at Delisle Road mustered only ten thousand men and a sprinkling of women workers.

"This means that the strike tomorrow will be a flop," said an interested press reporter in the hearing of our comrades.

"I beg your pardon," came the prompt reply, "What you do not see is the character of the gathering. We are working on a different basis this time. We are not relying on agitation and mass enthusiasm so much as on effective organisation. Here in this meeting there are representatives from every centre and area. The picked men, the contacts are here. And we are confident about success to-morrow."

But the press representative went away unconvinced. He had witnessed the rally that preceded the 7th November general strike. It had reached the colossal figure of nearly 100,000. This rally could not impress him.

Com. Joglekar presided at the rally. In his characteristic style, he brought the grimness of the occasion to bear on the workers. Com. Parulekar, Joint Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress and a member of the Servants of India Society, spoke next. In burning words, he tore the veil that covers the propaganda by the government. "Why should you offer your

lives at the altar of this British Empire? This is a war between two dacoits (thieves, gangsters). Let them fight between themselves. Why should we, the toilers, their victims, help them?" Comrade Ranadive made the best speech of the day. In quiet argumentative style, he posed one problem after another and demolished the bogey held up before the workers against the strike on October 2.

We are told we shall lose a week's wages by going on a day's strike. But who can deny that if we do not strike on this political issue, if we do not give the call for action so that national independence may be achieved, we shall lose not a week's wages but the wages of a whole lifetime, the wages of freedom from slavery, the wages of happiness from misery, the wages of relief from stark exploitation that is our misfortune today, and harder chains to-morrow? . . . We are not stealing the initiative from anybody. Through the strike, we assure the Congress, the Indian nation, that the working class will be solidly behind every struggle for attaining freedom, whatever the cost, however big the sacrifice demanded. . . . We give our assurance by deeds and not only by words. . . . Today the British lion has fallen into a pit which he dug himself. He had meant it for Soviet Russia, the land where Workers and Peasants rule. It is not our good fortune to claim that we have pushed him into the pit. But it is certainly our good fortune that he is in it. We are not going to help him to come out. The

\* November 7th Strike:

On November 7, 1938, a one-day general strike against reactionary trade union legislation took place in Bombay. It was one of the best and biggest demonstrations of its kind yet held.

lion is telling us: "Pull me out by my tail, dear lamb, and we shall be eternal friends." But we know full well that the lion will eat us up if he is once extricated. So all we are ready to do is to push him deeper down, to cover the pit, along with him, with dust and sand, and give this vicious exploiting Empire a decent burial. . . ."

There was loud and long applause. "Victory to the Red Flag," "Down with Imperialist War," "Long live Indian Independence" burst forth from every corner.

The meeting transformed itself into a procession, headed by the women with torch lights. Till late in the night, these men and women marched through streets and by-lanes carrying the message for the next day.

All night there was feverish activity. The finishing touches to the arrangements were completed by 2 a.m. And by 4 a.m., the pickets with Red Flags had already reached every mill-gate. Over and above these, there were pickets posted at strategic corners and chawl-gates. Then, with baited breath we waited. I turned to Com. Bukhari and asked: "What is your estimate of success?" A mysterious jumble of lines gathered on his forehead and with the left eye half-closed, he haltingly said: "Success—I am certain about. But numbers—I fear it may not reach even 50 per cent. of 7th November. You see, the odds are too great."

I asked Com. Vaidya the same question. He said: "The Bombay working class has never failed us.

But I agree the odds are very great. No press, no handbills, no effective opposition to give momentum, no effective aid from others. They are trying to kill us by isolation, by putting us in cold storage. . . . Yes, yes, I believe we can draw easily about thirty thousand or so — because the issue is a straight political general strike, and the terror of the Defence of India Act is so widespread in the city."

I asked a young worker lad: "What are the workers feeling? Will there be a strike?" He was visibly annoyed. "Have you doubts about it? Come to my chawl and speak to the workers themselves. The worker is quite confident about the strike. We have done it before, we shall do it again." And then the momentous day arrived. All our sober calculations were smashed up by the militant working class. The Bombay textile proletariat rose to the occasion and gave a bigger and a better demonstration than November 7.

#### THE RED LETTER DAY

We had only one motor lorry to give the call on the day of the strike. The loud-speaker was not available. Nor were Coms. Dange or Mirajkar available.

Police arrangements were thorough. In front of every mill gate, at every street corner, the police with their lathis strutted about under the direct supervision of a sergeant or a sub-inspector. In three or four places, armed policemen with rifles were present in batches of twelve and more. Four loaded police vans continuously pat-

rolled the labor areas, going round and round, stopping before each mill gate, exchanging greetings and going ahead.

#### BUT WHERE WERE THE WORKERS

The slogan given was: "You need not stir out of your houses. Do not throng near mill-gates, or the police may take the excuse for a lathi-charge or more." And the order was being obeyed. The streets remained empty, especially in front of mill-gates.

Picketing was hardly needed.

At the Morajee Mills I got mixed up with some Bhaya workers. One of them was saying: "Bhaiya, (brother, also used as we use comrade) this time we must not be disgraced like last time. We are not going in at all—nowhere near the gates. They blamed us as strike-breakers. Don't you remember the rebuke of Swamiji (Swamiji Shahajannand, the great peasant leader) when he came here the other day?" And the others—to a man—concurred.

In Madanpura, the Muslim workers seemed equally determined. "This is our strike too. The Britisher is no friend of Islam. And we know the Red Flag stands equally for everybody."

I asked: "What is the position in your area?"

The prompt reply came: "More than fifty per cent. of Muslim workers have obeyed the Red Flag consciously. At Worli, a dozen women workers were arguing strenuously. I overheard: "Who is going to stop me? Come, I shall lead

you in." "No, no, you are foolish—what will you gain by going in?"

"Are you going to lose wages for these good-for-nothing?"

"Don't say that—I am not coming. I am a follower of these Red Flaggers. Have you never heard Usha-tai speaking at a meeting?"

In the end all went home. They said the children at home were better company than the inhuman machines.

#### POLICE TRUCULENCE

We almost ran into two volunteers with Red Flags being pursued by a dozen lathi-wielding policemen under the valiant lead of an Anglo-Indian (Eurasian) Sergeant at Foras Road.

The volunteers complained that they had been assaulted, the flag torn, and now they were being bodily hustled away from the area.

We asked the sergeant why he was behaving in this fashion. "I don't want anybody lurking about here. They tried to hold a meeting in the garden next door to the Mill. Supposing they throw stones from there. I shall not permit it."

We had to sternly tell him that he was over-stepping the bounds of his duties that he could not stop meetings like this in anticipation of stone-throwing.

"I do not care. I am the master here." And he started strutting about the place, brandishing his "stick."

A crowd had collected. We decided to report him to higher authorities. We got our volunteers to resume their meeting as well as

picket-posts with the flags. As we were moving away to the police station, the sergeant walked us. "Look here, mister. I did not mean any harm. The flag was accidentally torn. Honest truth. Let us treat the whole incident as closed."

And when we told him that his explanation was unsatisfactory, he said: "But I am an Indian, I was born in India, I wish to live in India. We are all brothers."

This was something new from an Anglo-Indian sergeant.

But the police tried to keep a neutral attitude in most cases. They did not take sides as on November 7.

#### SOME INCIDENTS

At Worli, the manager and higher staff of a mill came out and started using undue pressure on their men to get in, actually hustling some of them inside. The volunteer at the gate gave an extempore speech. In order to silence him a stone was pelted at him from inside the mill gate. It caught him in the back. The result was at once visible. Even the dozen or so who had weakened and were about to be dragged in, walked away disgusted with the mill authorities. The manager made a piteous appeal, saying he was a "labor-wallah" (friend of labor), but to no avail. In half an hour, the fifty who had previously gone in also came out and joined the strike. The mill completely closed down for the day by 9 a.m.

At Kohinoor Mills, men were brought into the mills from 3 a.m. Nearly a thousand and five-hundred—nearly half the complement—was

in by 8 a.m. But by 11.30 a.m. the whole mill came out *en masse* and joined the strike.

Nearly 40 mills remained completely closed from the beginning, not a single worker crossing the gate.

Another 15 tried to work with depleted complements, but most of them had to give up the ghost by 12 noon.

In the north of Bombay, where the labor areas are situated, all the colleges and the most important schools also closed down. Nearly ten thousand students came on the streets. Three meetings of students took place and fiery speeches against war, and declaring solidarity with the workers, were made. It is interesting to note in this connection that these students attended the evening Kamgar Maidan meeting, and the workers greeted them with "Vidyarthi-Kamgaranchi Jai."

At Girgaon, a group of hotel workers went from restaurant to restaurant with two demands: (1) one hotel worker to join the group in propaganda; (2) the restaurant to shut down in sympathy with the strike.

The Dharavi leather workers had joined the strike. So also a majority of the Ambarnath match factory workers. The seamen held a demonstration and meeting in sympathy. Sections of building workers laid down their tools.

Comrade Taher was first arrested for "obstruction to traffic" and released. Once again he was arrested for "stone-throwing" and bailed out for ten rupees.

Two volunteers were also arrested for "obstruction," and bailed out for varying amounts.

But the whole day passed without a single affray or "incident." The workers behaved with great restraint, and earned the unstinted unanimous compliment even from the hostile local press that the strike was absolutely peaceful and no force was used at any stage.

By 9 a.m. the strike was practically complete. I totalled 89,000 workers when we approached the desk of the Coms. Deshpande and Bhandarkar at the "Kranti" office for reports from the various centres. The comrades had worked with iron discipline. The organisation functioned through the new contacts and had worked wonderfully. The Phoenix Mills workers, men and women, on strike for the last six months, had done yeoman service. After the success of 7th November interested parties had maintained that the success of the general strike was due to the unholy alliance made by the Communists with Ambedkar (self-styled leader of the untouchables. A British protege and careerist). Ambedkar and his party have now declared for co-operation with Britain. And yet the call of the Communists had found a bigger response from workers than 7th November, and in a sober and quieter mood. The strike had made a record in numbers and in the peaceful way in which it was accomplished.

**"ARM IN ARM, WE MARCH  
TO VICTORY"**

As we went along to the historic Kamgar Maidan, Com. Ranadive

remarked: "For the next strike, we need only one public rally, one meeting of contacts and one hand-bill, and the task would be accomplished." Nobody contradicted him, so well was everybody impressed by the cool, silent and yet effective strength displayed by the workers. There was no fuss, no excitement, but with quiet, determined, grim faces that had forged a huge political weapon for themselves and evolved the technique of its use.

We reached the Kamgar Maidan and a sea of heads greeted us. The maidan was decked in huge Red Flags. Com. Sahid, with his stentorian voice and wide sweeping gestures, was casting a spell on the audience.

Com. Guran retailed in song, in a beautifully worded Marathi *po-vada*, the history of the Russian Worker before, during and after the Revolution. Every phrase was eagerly taken in, and as he stretched the pitch of the last words, thundering applause greeted him. Com. Tambitkar sang and the huge multitude, transformed into a militant mood, sang with him, rocking to the tune.

Com. Joglekar once again presided at the meeting and gave a stirring call to action. "We, the workers of Bombay, have proved today that we shall never be found wanting in the struggle for independence. . . . English statesmen shall no more fix who is our friend.

"This Hitler whom they called a friend yesterday is now the worst criminal on earth. . . . We have nothing to do with their quarrels. We

"Bombay workers are organising a protest strike on 2nd October against war and in order to declare that India can help the world democracy and the cause of peace only by establishing democracy and freedom for herself. This policy is in line with the declared policy of the Congress.

I greet the action of the Bombay working class as giving a lead to other classes for action in this hour of crisis.

I take the strike as proof that our people are prepared to back up the Congress Working Committee in any call for struggle.

The workers are striking for a day; let the entire nation simultaneously declare for freedom and against imperialism.

—SUBAS BOSE.  
1938 President of Congress.

stand for a free India and are determined to achieve our independence."

Com. Ranadive moved the main resolution of the day. In a speech which went directly to the heart of the workers he explained how the war had come about, who was involved in it and why. He said: "If Gandhiji stands pledged to non-violence, it is understandable why he wants India to support Britain which has resorted to violence. . . . We have had a peaceful exhibition of our strength today, and we pledge that till the last worker is

\* Jallianwallas:

In 1919 General Dyer ordered his troops, without warning to shoot on a crowd of 12,000 to 15,000 peaceful demonstrators at Jallianwalla Bagh in the Punjab. Firing with quick firing guns was indiscriminate and lasted for more than fifteen minutes. Twelve hundred were killed outright, the majority being innocent peasants, including women and children, present to see the fair. The ammunition exhausted, the military marched away and the wounded were left lying in the square without care or attention.

alive, we shall fight for the cause so dear to the Indian nation." He gave the history of the workers' struggle in Bombay and India, and asked, "With what face can Imperialists and foreign capitalists ask us today to help them? Have they forgotten their own misdeeds? And what is the guarantee that the shootings on workers, the Jallianwallas,\* will not be repeated in the future? We are not likely to give milk to the serpent who has bitten us before and whose teeth have not been drawn by us. . . . If the Russian worker could effect a revolution during the last World War, the Indian worker can also rise to the same heights now."

He ended up amidst cheers when he declared: "They say the war will last for three years. We have sworn today to resist imperialism, and within three years, we are sure of bringing it down to dust."

The resolution was read out:—

"This meeting declares its solidarity with the international working class and the peoples of the world, who are being dragged into the most destructive war, by the Imperialist Powers. The meeting regards the present war as a challenge to the international solidarity of the working class, and declares that it is the common task of the workers and people of different countries to

defeat this imperialist conspiracy against humanity, so that peace and goodwill is restored among the nations of the world.

"This meeting condemns the Nazi aggression against Poland, and expresses its deep sympathy with the Polish people, who have been the victims of barbarous atrocities.

"This meeting is further of opinion that the war between Nazi Germany and British Imperialism is born out of imperialist rivalry, and that Br. Imperialism is neither defending democracy nor the independence of nations.

"This meeting, therefore, is of opinion that loyalty to Indian freedom demands resistance to war on the part of the Indian people.

"This meeting strongly protests against the attempts of the government to exploit Indian resources and man-power and impose the war on India in spite of India's declared opposition to it.

"This meeting strongly condemns the Vice-Regal Ordinances which virtually place the country under martial law regime and demands their immediate repeal.

"This meeting is of opinion that the full resources of the country should be utilised at this critical stage by forcing the pace of Indian democracy. This meeting, therefore, requests the coming meeting of the A.I.C.C. to give a bold lead to the country, by throwing overboard all compromise proposals and starting a nation-wide war resistance movement.

"This meeting pledges itself to war resistance and declares that any

other path at this critical juncture would be a crime against Indian freedom and independence."

Comrade Bukhari in his simple and forceful Urdu (Language of Mahomedans of N. W. India), seconded the resolution. He explained the task of the working class in the present epoch, dilated on the foreign policy of Soviet Russia, and appealed to the Congress to launch a country-wide struggle from which we must emerge victorious.

Com. Parulekar was greeted by the workers as he advanced to the microphone. He said, "Today your success has created a stir in the Assembly Chambers. Prime Minister Kher acknowledged to me that the strike has been a phenomenal success. I greet you on your strength and unity."

Com. Indulal Yagnik, Jt. Secretary of the All-India Kisan Sabha (All-India Peasant Congress) then rose to give fraternal greetings on behalf of the A.I.K.S. and the Forward Bloc.

"I am returning from my tour of Gujerat and I bring you the admiration and affection of the peasants. You know how to do things in a big way. We, the poor peasants live in small isolated villages, but we, too, are copying your example. We have also started resistance against war.

The resolution was adopted amid loud slogans of "Down with Imperialist War," "Long Live Indian Freedom."

The Marathi version of the International was cheered to an echo and the meeting dispersed.

# THE LIBERATION OF FINLAND

L. Sharkey

THE daily Press is full of the angry outbursts of the bourgeoisie of the whole capitalist world at the new advances of the Workers and Peasants' Red Army.

Judging by the frantic outcry, the capitalist class has been shaken to its back teeth; for there has hardly been such a concerted howl of impotent rage since the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The London "Times" quotes the New York "Times" and both quote the reactionary papers of Sweden and France and all the other organs of counter-revolution throughout the world, to "show the indignation" of the "whole of humanity." No "Left" papers are quoted. The utterances of the imperialists disguised as Labor leaders, Blum, Dalton, Atlee, Morrison and others hit the headlines.

The largest air fleet in the world was bombing a small town with a population of less than 250,000 for a week and this little town is still there. Had the Red air fleet really bombed Helsinki, instead of confining itself to military objectives, there would have been a new inland sea where Helsinki stands because the Red Air Force can drop about 10,000 tons of bombs each flight.

Similarly, the capitalist Press had won the war for the Finns; won battle after battle (on paper), until the Red Army communicate calmly pointed out that it had ad-

vanced 21 miles beyond Petsamo and broken through the "impregnable" Mannerheim line.

These rapid advances were made in difficult country, in the midst of Arctic storms; but this did not prevent the "learned" ones from pointing out the "inefficiency" of the Red Army and that it was "badly clothed and equipped." Anyone who has seen the Red Army knows just how much such stories are worth.

The imperialists know of the great sympathy of the proletarian masses for the Soviet Union; they know of the dangers to which their commencement of a new war exposes them from the anger of the masses and they strive with might and main to discredit the great centre of Socialism, the Soviet Union. They will infallibly fail in these efforts just as their Riga lie factory collapsed in the past; just as their stories of the "nationalisation of women" and the "starving millions" failed.

The Manifesto of the Communist International declared that the leaders of the petty bourgeois parties, as well as the reformists, had gone over to the camp of imperialism.

This is to be seen in the present situation; from the "liberal democrat" President Roosevelt, down to the petty commentators of the daily press and radio, who previously

donned a "liberal," "democratic," "radical" mantle, are now shouting at the top of their voices for Chamberlain's war and against the Soviet Union. The mistake these gentlemen make is that they think the masses of the people have shifted their point of view also. The masses have to man the trenches and bear the economic sacrifices and they by no means share the warmongering anti-Soviet enthusiasm of the so-called petty bourgeois intellectuals. The capitalist Press and the leaders of reformism try to brand the action of the Soviet Union as "aggression," "invasion," and so on, but history records innumerable instances of one nation assisting another to throw off the yoke of tyrants. Lenin had this in mind when he wrote:

Not every appropriation of "foreign" territory may be described as annexation, for, generally speaking, Socialists are in favor of abolishing frontiers between nations and the formation of larger states; nor may every disturbance of the *status quo* be described as annexation, for this would be extremely reactionary and a mockery of the fundamental concepts of the science of history; nor may every military appropriation of territory be called annexation, for Socialists cannot repudiate violence and wars in the interests of the majority of the population.

The term annexation must be applied only to the appropriation of territory *against the will* of the population of that territory, in other words, the concept annexation is in-

separably bound up with the concept self-determination of nations.

Those words of Lenin should quiet the minds of those who sincerely have misgivings; whose minds are still actuated by the concepts created by the agitation against the aggressions of Hitler and Mussolini.

It is obvious that here there is a class distinction. Hitler and Mussolini and before them, the British and French imperialists, seized upon their victims against their will, forced them into slavery and set about plundering and exploiting them. In Western Ukraine and White Russia, the Red Army liberated an utterly oppressed people from the claws of a similar imperialist gang of Polish exploiters. There certainly is a difference between fastening the handcuffs on the wrists of a victim and he who smashes the handcuffs and frees the prisoner.

It is a fact that at one period in the Revolution the Red Army was confined largely to the territories around Moscow and Leningrad whilst reactionary governments spouting all manner of labels ruled Ukraina, White Russia, Georgia, Armenia and the Central Asian Republics of the U.S.S.R. The Red Army advanced into these areas and, assisted by the local populations, overthrew the cliques who ruled in the interests of world imperialism. According to some people, this should not have been done, but the masses should have been left subjected to their tyrants.



Lenin wrote that "having organised Socialist production the revolutionary country would rise against the capitalist world." That would mean wars of liberation against the imperialist states. When the enemies attempt to quote Lenin over Finland, they fail miserably.

What are the facts? Finland was ruled for the past 20 years by the clique of Mannerheim. This clique came to power at the point of the bayonets of German imperialism which overthrew the Socialist government that the workers had established in Finland during the course of the Russian Revolution, murdering between 30,000 to 50,000 Finnish and Russian workers in the process.

Disarming the Finnish working class, they established a White terror dictatorship, suppressing the Communist Party and refusing legal recognition of the trade union movement right up to their last hour.

The government of Kuusinen is therefore the legitimate successor of the government of the Finnish people which was overthrown by the German bayonets of Mannerheim and Von Der Goltz in 1920.

The imperialists and their hangers-on endeavor to misrepresent the action of the Soviet Union as being equivalent to the oversetting of the Czech state by Hitler, with Chamberlain's assistance. The Czechs were deprived of such liberty as they possessed; the Finns will be liberated by Kuusinen's government from the oppression of Mannerheim's Whiteguards and the

exploitation of Finland's resources by the foreign capitalists.

The Czechs were plundered by the Germans but the U.S.S.R. will pay for the railway lines built by the Finns, the sum of 120,000,000 marks and, for the territories ceded to the Soviet Union, 300,000,000 Finnish marks. The Red Army will be withdrawn as soon as the Finnish people are in power.

In addition, Soviet Karelia, with an area of 27,000 square miles, will be added to the Finnish Republic.

What has all this to do, this just bargain, with the British oppression and spoilation of India, of the Nazi oppression and plundering of the Czechs, Austrians and the Polish people?

The answer is that there is nothing in common. Force was used in the one case in the interest of imperialist robbery and oppression, in the other, in the interest of freedom and justice. "Force, wrote Marx, is the midwife of history."

Like most other things, it can be used for or against progress, for or against the people. The fact that the Russian revolution uses force as the "midwife of history" does not place the working class in the category of the imperialists; as the quotation I have used from Lenin proves.

The clique of Finnish Whiteguards were mortal enemies of the Soviet Union. They spoke and wrote of the day when world imperialism would liquidate the Soviet Union and the Finnish capitalists dreamed, not only of seizing Leningrad and Soviet Karelia, but all

Russia to the Ural mountains! Crazy, you will think, yes, but does not each of the ruling cliques in the capitalist "Great Powers" dream of conquering the whole planet for itself? Such is the dream not only of the Japanese, Italian and German imperialists, but of the British, French and American ones as well.

The capitalist half-wits make great play as they jeer about "4,000,000 Finns" being a menace to the "180,000,000 in the U.S.S.R.," that is simply begging the question. Finnish reaction was dangerous because it was a puppet state of world imperialism, a dagger in the hands of British and French and German imperialism. It was a danger because its terrain, in the hands of a strong army, would make it a most powerful military base. It was dangerous in the hands of world imperialism because its guns dominated Leningrad and Murmansk; it was dangerous because it commanded the approaches to vital parts of the Soviet Union.

The imperialists would like to turn the Anglo-French-German war into a grand capitalist coalition against the U.S.S.R. If the German imperialists are victorious in the present war, then the U.S.S.R. must keep its powder dry to meet them. In the event of an Anglo-French imperialist victory, and especially if followed by a Revolution in Germany, then the Soviet Union must be ready to face them also.

All manner of supporters of British imperialism shriek that this "good" imperialism has no designs on the Soviet Union.

It was the British imperialists, led by Churchill, who financed, organised and armed the Russian "Whites," spending £200,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on this venture. Not only that, but they themselves openly sent armed forces to fight against the Russian Revolution.

The only warrant that those who say that the U.S.S.R. has only to fear German imperialism have is that Churchill, Chamberlain and Co. do not shout their anti-Soviet intentions from the house tops.

The Soviet Union has to protect itself against the attentions of all the imperialists.

The Finn Whiteguards could have had a treaty with the Soviet Union on the same terms as the three Baltic States. This they refused. Believing in the support of British and French imperialism, they behaved provocatively, even firing on the Soviet troops, because they believed themselves, not a little clique, but part of the imperialist world.

Leon Blum, that old scoundrel of French imperialism, fresh from nailing the Spanish working class to the cross which he fashioned with the "non-interention" policy which he invented, fresh from casting the French workers under the iron heel of the French imperialists, by destroying the People's Front, in a special cable to the Sydney "Daily Telegraph," which specialises in publishing the pen villainies of renegade dogs such as himself and Trotsky, said that he did not believe that the Soviet government

would use force against the Finnish Whiteguards.

The Finns negotiated, or rather sabotaged for two months; perhaps they and their backers believed that the Soviet Union could be spat on with impunity. They know better now.

The Red Army has ended "a dangerous seat of war," maintained by the imperialist powers in Finland.

The mutual assistance treaty between Kuusinen's Finnish government (the capitalist rulers of Finland are of Swedish extraction) and the new bases in the Baltic Sea make Finland and the Soviet Union secure from attack. The Red Army positions in Western Byelorussia and Ukraina were referred to by Karl Marx himself, when writing on the Crimean War, as one of the strongest military positions in the world.

The Soviet government wanted Turkey to close the Dardanelles, which Marx, in the same series of articles, declared could be held against the combined navies of the world. Besarabia, seized by the Rumanians, also has an important strategical bearing on the defence of the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union is anxious for an understanding with Rumania on that point.

The Turks, stimulated by a huge loan of £90,000,000 from the British moneybags, who never lend anything unless they see big political and economic profit for themselves,

is embarking on an adventurous and dangerous imperialist policy aimed at bringing war to the Balkans and the Black Sea. This is a vital matter for the Soviet Union. The Italian fascists are also anxious to start something in the Balkan States.

The Soviet Union is taking a series of steps that will enormously strengthen, if not make invincible, its own position. The Soviet government strove earnestly to secure its own position and that of other States through Collective Security and the League of Nations. It is ancient history now, how and why the imperialists of Britain and France, with their bitterly anti-Soviet policy, frustrated the Peace Policy and the peaceful efforts of the U.S.S.R.

They chose the path of lighting a new war conflagration instead. The Soviet Union, therefore, has to take its own measures to secure its frontiers and its own peaceful existence.

The toiling people of the whole world will rejoice at the liberation of their brothers in Finland and Poland; they will rejoice that the great bulwark of Socialism and real freedom, is becoming stronger and yet more secure, they will spit on the lies of the capitalists, whether these are to be found in the columns of the millionaire press, the nice voiced radio commentators, the columns of the press of the labor imperialists or from the foul lips of the trotskyite hirelings.

## MATERIAL ON THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.(B.)

# Marxist-Leninist Philosophy

## II.—Dialectical Method

**THIS IS THE SECOND OF A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON THE HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U. WE INVITE COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM OUR READERS.**

*Last month's article concluded with a statement summarising the Marxist dialectical method as characterised in the Short Course of the History of the C.P.S.U. (B).*

*The basic features, it was stated, were: the doctrine regarding the general connection between natural phenomena, regarding their mutual conditionality and regarding nature as a whole; the doctrine regarding continuous movement and change, continuous renewal and development of nature; the doctrine regarding qualitative and quantitative changes in natural development; the doctrine regarding the inner contradictoriness of natural phenomena.*

*Let us now proceed to briefly examine each basic feature of the Marxist dialectical method in contrast to the metaphysical method.*

**M**ETAPHYSICS regards nature as an accidental agglomeration of objects and phenomena, regarding phenomena in isolation one from the other as an independent of one another.

A clear example of the metaphysical interpretation of natural phenomena in the sphere of natural science is provided by the teachings of Linnaeus (1707-1778). This scientist played a tremendous and positive role in systematising and classifying natural phenomena. He divided all natural phenomena into three kingdoms: the animal world, the plant world and the realm of minerals, and these he divided into genera and species. This step was necessary for the subsequent development of the teachings regarding

nature. But since Linnaeus was a metaphysician, and regarded natural bodies apart from their development, out of connection with surrounding conditions, separated from them, then he came to the conclusion that there was no interconnection between the plant world and the animal world, and that they must be regarded in isolation one from the other. Linnaeus did not regard nature as a single whole, where individual phenomena are interconnected and pass one into the other. According to Linnaeus, the animal world is separated from the plant world by an absolute, eternally-existing boundary. Having divided natural bodies into genera and species, Linnaeus was unable to explain their origin in a natural-

scientific manner, for he regarded them in isolation one from the other. As a metaphysician Linnaeus proved to be absolutely helpless in solving this problem and resorted to the old misleading conclusion, that explains nothing. According to Linnaeus all types of bodies are the creation of God, and exist in the same condition in which they were created. This is a clear example of how the metaphysical approach to the analysis of natural phenomena inevitably leads to God, and consequently limits our power to understand nature, and in the last analysis becomes a brake on the development of science.

Dialectical materialism regards nature as a single whole, where there exist the mutual connection and inner-penetration of the separate phenomena. There is no impassable boundary between the plant and animal worlds. The origin of the animal world is a lengthy process of the development of nature. The discoveries of the natural-scientists, Kant, Laplace, Darwin, Schleiden and others showed the connection between, and the mutual conditionality of, the parts of nature. The subsequent development of science still further substantiated the correctness of the principles of dialectical materialism regarding the examination of nature as a single whole, and the examination of different phenomena as being mutually connected open up wide perspectives for scientific research work and for the comprehensive and most complete

study of natural phenomena.

In his splendid book "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," Lenin, in exposing the subjective-idealistic and metaphysical philosophy of Machism, shows the strength and power of dialectical materialism in apprehending nature. The Machists, in their criticism of materialism, asserted among other things that the materialists do not explain the "origin" of sensation. Lenin, in dealing with this "argument" of the Machists, shows that dialectical materialism does not place any barriers between nature possessing the faculty of sensation and nature devoid of faculty. Nature is a unity, and dialectical materialism admits transitions of non-sensitive into sensitive matter. Science has not yet shown specific forms of this transition, but the principle of the unity of nature, the principle of the examination of sensitive and non-sensitive matter, not in isolation one from the other, opens up before science the possibility for investigating this problem.

*"Materialism clearly formulates the as yet unsolved problem and thereby stimulates the attempt to solve it, to undertake further experimental investigation. Machism, i.e., a species of muddled idealism, befores the issue and side-tracks it by means of the futile verbal evasion 'element'." (Lenin, Imperialism and Empirio-Criticism, p 33.)*

The doctrine of dialectical materialism regarding the many-sided examination of phenomena,

regarding the inter-connection of phenomena is of enormous significance in practice, in the building of socialism.

Let us take the question of the planfulness of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. The development of the different branches of the national economy is regarded in the Soviet Union from the point of view of a single whole, of the entire national economy. The development of railroad transport, for example, cannot be examined in isolation from other branches of the national economy. The dialectical approach in determining the degree of the development of railroad transport demands an analysis of the changes in other branches of the national economy; in the iron and steel industry, engineering, agriculture, etc. If, however, any branch of industry is examined in isolation from the whole of the national economy, this is a metaphysical approach to the study of social phenomena and in actual fact leads to the disorganisation of economic life.

A most profound dialectical analysis of social phenomena is given in his works by Comrade Stalin, who always employs dialectics as a most important political instrument for the comprehensive examination of events in their mutual connection and conditionality, in their cohesion, in their movement.

In reply to a letter by the Young Communist Ivanov, Comrade Stalin, in examining the question of the final victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., pointed out that the

U.S.S.R. must not be regarded in isolation from the capitalist world that encircles it. The problem of the final victory of Socialism must be examined in the light of the foreign relations of the Soviet Union. Comrade Stalin said:

*"It follows that this question contains two different problems:*

- "1. The problem of the internal relations in our country, i.e., the problem of overcoming our own bourgeoisie and building complete Socialism; and*
- "2. The problem of the external relations of our country, i.e., the problem of completely ensuring our country against the dangers of military intervention and restoration.*

*"We have already solved the first problem, for our bourgeoisie has already been liquidated and Socialism has already been built in the main. This is what we call the victory of Socialism, or, to be more exact, the victory of Socialist Construction in one country.*

*"We could say that this victory is final if our country were situated on an island and if it were not surrounded by numerous capitalist countries.*

*"But as we are not living on an island but 'in a system of States,' a considerable number of which are hostile to the land of Socialism and create the danger of intervention and restoration, we say openly and honestly that the victory of Socialism in our country is not yet final." (Stalin, Letter to Ivanov, pp. 6-7.)*

Socialism has been built in the main in the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union is surrounded by capitalist countries, and as long as this encirclement exists, the danger of military intervention is not ruled out. And that is why the question of the final victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. is indissolubly connected with the struggle against the capitalist encirclement. This question can be solved by uniting "... the serious efforts of the international proletariat with the still more serious efforts of the whole of our Soviet people." (Ibid. p. 7.)

This is a dialectical solution of the question as to the final victory of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., for the Soviet Union is not regarded in isolation from the outer world that surrounds it.

The dialectical analysis of the phenomena of social life gives us a correct political orientation. Only the dialectical method contains the principle of the comprehensive ex-

amination of phenomena, of the interconnection between phenomena, a principle which makes it possible to correctly orient oneself in a situation, and provides a correct approach to the analysis of phenomena.

*"The dialectical method therefore holds that no phenomenon in nature can be understood if taken by itself, isolated from surrounding phenomena, inasmuch as any phenomenon in any realm of nature may become meaningless to us if it is not considered in connection with the surrounding conditions, but divorced from them; and that, vice versa, any phenomenon can be understood and explained if considered in its inseparable connection with surrounding phenomena, and as one conditioned by surrounding phenomena."* ("History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)—Short Course," p. 106.)

Herein lies the first and basic feature of the Marxist dialectical method.

(To be Continued.)

# THE RED NAVY

## NEW SHIPS, NEW MEN

H. Kruzhkov

ONE who has not visited the Baltic in the last two or three years will find many astonishing changes in the fleet. In Kronstadt Harbour where the navy's ships lie at anchor, he will see a whole flock of new destroyers, graceful, high-speed and severe for any enemy.

There is everything in the Baltic—fleet leaders, ships of a new type, something in the nature of a cross between a destroyer and a cruiser, new underwater craft of all dimensions, from mighty submarine cruisers to "baby submarines," a swarm of torpedo boats, these "horns of the sea," capable of sending any ship to the bottom by their devastating attacks.

The decisions of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government which express the thoughts and aspirations of the Soviet people who want to see their navy a grim force against all enemies, are being put into practice.

The cruiser "Kirov" is one of the new ships—and what a beauty! The men of the Baltic have every right to be proud of the "Kirov," which combines both speed and might. It is considered an honor to serve on it. When the "Kirov" sails, accompanied by new flotilla leaders and destroyers, it is really a great spec-

tacle, a spectacle of a powerful squadron.

The "Kirov" leaves a long stream of roaring waves in its wake as it cuts through the waters of the Baltic, it is as if the sea is angry with the cruiser, enraged by its audacity—how does it dare to push forward at such a speed!

The modern warship is like an intricate factory. This is doubly true of the "Kirov." It is equipped with the very latest, complex and precise instruments which help to steer its course, range its artillery and direct the work of its torpedo tubes. These complicated mechanisms are, perhaps, more perfect than man himself. However, in order to master these machines one must acquire no small amount of skill and knowledge. Even more knowledge and skill was required to design and build these machines. And they were designed and built in Soviet factories, by dexterous hands of Soviet workers.

Most of the officers of the "Kirov" were present at its birth. But they were not there as guests, they contributed by their work to the construction of this mighty ship. This explains their warm fondness for their cruiser. Senior Lieutenant Klimentenko, artillery officer of the

cruiser, speaks of his guns with fatherly tenderness. Klimentko is tall and perhaps a bit phlegmatic. But what a change one notices in him when the subject turns to artillery: a smile appears on his lips and his gestures become sharp and determined.

Up to 1931 Klimentko was a miner at Pit No. 29 in Rutchenkovo, Donbas. He combined work in the pit with studies in a workers' preparatory school for the university. Admitted to the Frunze Naval School in 1931, this Donbas miner displayed excellent abilities and was a diligent student throughout the entire course, always eager to acquire more and more knowledge.

Today Senior Lieutenant Klimentko is considered one of the best artillerists on the "Kirov." This 27 year-old naval commander is an excellent example of how people grow and develop in the Soviet Union.

Every Red Navyman who displays an interest in the Navy is afforded all opportunities of becoming a commander. In the final ac-

count, the life story of the Soviet commander is usually as follows: Red Navyman, boatswain, junior commander, studies in special courses in the Naval School and then, lieutenant of the fleet. For those who wish to continue their career, there is every opportunity to do so. The only condition is hard work and study, which leads to the Naval Academy. Upon graduating the Academy one can become a first-rank captain, then flagman . . .

Indeed, all roads for development and promotion are open!

Night sets in on the Gul of Finland, but it is the transparent and light night of the North.

Ships pass each other in the harbour. Looking at their clear-cut, grim silhouettes one cannot but help feeling that this is a mighty force!

And there are many of them, these glorious Soviet ships, the steel nurslings of the Five-Year Plans. But there will be still more, for the Soviet Navy grows with every passing day, with every passing hour. . .

# DAWN IN INDIA

L. Harry Gould

*"It is quite clear that in case of any world war India will not be drawn into it to the advantage of any Imperialism. Only the people of India will decide what they are to do, and the people of India will take part in no Imperialist war."*—Jawaharlal Nehru in an interview in England in 1938.

**P**OVERTY is the mainspring of India's rebellious discontent. The path of revolutionary struggle on to which her people are entering was hewn out of breaking toil and suffering. Hunger is the lever which will tip over the centuries-old domination of the British masters.

In the same interview Nehru declared:

"What is India like today? Her people poor beyond compare; short-lived and incapable of resisting disease and epidemics; illiteracy rampant; vast areas devoid of all sanitary or medical provisions; unemployment on a prodigious scale."

India has 40 million unemployed! Five million persons die annually from malaria. The life expectation is 23 years compared with 50 to 55 in western Europe. The infant mortality rate in Bombay, where the majority of the inhabitants live in one-room huts and sleep in the streets, is 524 per thousand. Countless millions of peasants exist in what is described as debt serfdom; interest rates reach as high as 300 per cent. The wages census carried out by the Bombay authorities in 1935 revealed that in cotton textiles, one of the premier and best orga-

nised industries, the monthly earnings of 18 per cent. of the workers in Gokak were between 3/- and 9/-, of 32 per cent. in Shalapur between 7/6 and 15/-. Children under 12 work 12 to 14 hours a day in the factories for twopence!

\* \* \*

Marx pointed out that it is in the colonies that the profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of capitalist rule becomes unveiled before our eyes. At home the rule assumes respectable forms; everything is done in the name of family, honor, religion and democracy. In the colonies, however, capitalist "civilisation" goes naked. The bestial acts of fascism alone parallel the infamies committed by the white lords in their colonial empires.

But history has its retributions. "There is not the slightest doubt," wrote Lenin in 1908, "that the age-long plunder of India by the English, that the present struggle of these 'advanced' Europeans against Persian and Indian democracy, will harden millions and tens of millions of proletarians in Asia. . . . The class conscious workers of Europe now have Asiatic comrades whose number will grow by leaps and bounds."

And those conscious agents of history, the proletariat and its allies, are learning their lesson well and are becoming thoroughly hardened in their struggles.

Other articles relate the recent developments in India: the position of the Congress Party, the shiftings of Gandhi and the right-wing; the threats of the Viceroy and Sir John Simon. (See Gerald Peel's "India's Problems, 1939" in the *October Review*). The purpose of this article is to describe briefly the growth and strength of the proletarian core of the mass movement, and to chart the probable course for the fight for freedom on the basis of past and present estimates.

\* \* \*

Modern manufactures and railway construction received their first large growth in the third quarter of the last century. From then up to the present, industry in the vast sub-continent shows a steady development. By 1911, investments in railways totalled £654,000,000. Most of the capital came, of course, from Britain. By 1919 there were 3523 factories, which number increased to 7515 ten years later. In 1905, the coal mined totalled nearly eight million metric tons; the figure was 20 millions in 1931. Engineering establishments number 755 in 1929, employing 267,126 workers. There are about three million textile operatives at present. India offered a classical illustration of one of the forms of early capitalist accumulation, namely, outright plunder of its people by the conquering British.

India presents today a classical illustration of one of the features of imperialist control and exploitation—the export of capital from the home country instead of as previously the export of commodities.

But capitalist production in India has, just as at home, created its own grave-diggers—the industrial workers, the proletariat. There is proletarian class-consciousness to lead and unite the heterogeneous social groups and strata and give them firm direction in the battle for national independence; and proletarian discipline to stiffen the amorphous mass—350 millions!—and impregnate it with its own revolutionary consistency. The Party of the Proletariat, the Communist Party, is also there! Its record of leadership of the people's struggles is a great one, and not even the terror of the imperialist lords has succeeded in driving it completely underground. In the All-India Trade Union Congress of 1938 one of the principal demands was that the Congress ministries restore the legality of the Communist Party. Though banned, the Party, thanks to courageous work, enjoys in many areas a certain non-legal legality.

The process of hardening has been a bloody one. The most elementary rights were won only by the most bitter struggle. In 1919 occurred the Amritsar massacre, when thousands were shot down by the military. (So powerful is the agency of repression that it was not until eight months later that the British public knew of it.) The Indian

mine or workshop is poor soil for the growth of the dank weeds of reformism. The Peasants' Party has adopted the hammer and sickle as its emblem. Demonstrations of 50,000 and more are common. Floggings, arrests and shootings are daily experiences in India. But, said Lenin even before the last World War, "No power in the world will re-establish serfdom in Asia, or wipe out the heroic democracy of the masses in Asiatic or Semi-Asiatic countries."

What are the specific historical conditions in which India's struggle for freedom is being fought out? First, it is the period of imperialist decline, the time when the social revolution has become "a practical necessity" (Stalin). Then it is occurring in the course of the second imperialist world war, with all that *that* means! Third, the struggle takes place and intensifies when the beacon light of the Soviet Union—with its amazing triumphs for the formerly oppressed toilers, races and nationalities—shines ever more brilliantly in a world darkened by capitalist hate and war. Fourth, from the internal standpoint, the fight for freedom is integrally bound up with and, indeed, arises from the basic demands of the workers for improvements, the stirrings of the native middle classes and the march of the multi-millioned peasant masses towards their agrarian revolution. Here are some puzzles for the British Raj far more subtle and insoluble than even the famed Indian rope trick!

The specific task for the Indian people is to brush aside its vacillating native bourgeoisie and the right-wing generally within the Congress Party. "The compromising section of this (Indian) bourgeoisie," said Stalin in 1925, "has already managed in the main to come to an agreement with imperialism. Dreading revolution more than imperialism, concerned more about its moneybags than about the interests of its country, this section . . . is completely going over to the enemies of the revolution. . . . It is a question of preparing the proletariat of such countries as India for the role of leader in the liberation movement, and of dislodging, step by step, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen from this honorable position." The native princes long ago bartered away their country's freedom in return for British bayonets to maintain them in power. The native capitalists, like the capitalists of Spain, France and every other country, are incapable by the very nature of their position in society of defending their country's national interests. Only the working class can display unflinching patriotism.

The responsibility of workers in other lands towards the Indian people is clear. India's strivings for freedom fall into the same category as those of China, of Austria, Spain and Czechoslovakia. Independence for India, as for all the other imperialist colonies and semi-colonies, will place the stamp for real liberty upon the social conditions in the "home" countries. The Lascars who demonstrated recently in Sydney receive 27/- a month. To maintain such savage exploitation and to reduce the level of the white worker—this is what the second imperialist war is being fought for! The fight of the Indian masses is our fight. Or, as Marx so aptly worded it: "Labor in a white skin will never be free while it is branded in a black skin."

# CHARITY AFTERNOON

"Gordon"

(A letter rescued from the waste basket of a "fashionable" house in Sydney.)

Toorak Road,  
Melbourne, S.E.2.

DARLING PENELOPE,

I know you haven't replied to my last letter yet, but I just couldn't wait to tell you about the lovely "afternoon" I was at yesterday. The one at Mrs. Gunn's. Yes, you knew I was going, because I distinctly remember telling you I was going to wear my new Molyneux ensemble for the first time. Pen, it's the most gorgeous thing! If only you could have seen their faces! And you won't wonder when you get the photograph. Yes, it will be in next week's Table Talk. Isn't that marvellous? Even mother has only been in Table Talk once. I won't forget to send you a copy. Mrs. Gunn can be a darling—sometimes. It was she who did it. The photographer asked her and Lady Bludgeon to pose, and she called me over. I could have kissed her. Mind you, I don't think she'd have done it if she hadn't wanted to score off Lady Bludgeon. That sounds catty, but it's true. Lady Bludgeon was wearing one of the very latest things from New York and thought she was going to make us all squirm. But everybody said mine was far more distinctive. And so it should have been considering how much it

cost. Daddy's still grumbling. And I know positively that Lady Bludgeon's was only a hundred guineas. Daphne told me so, and she ought to know.

But here I am talking about frocks when I should be telling you about the lovely time we had. It was in aid of the Sir Julius Lydite Orphanage, so we weren't just playing ourselves, were we? Aunt Emelie is one of the trustees, and she told us they're having a frightfully anxious time. Expenses have gone up terribly, and with the income still the same they don't know what to do to make ends meet. It's outrageous, of course, that we should have to be worried about these things, but there you are; somebody has to do it. If the working class can't provide for their destitute children then I suppose we must. We can't stand aside and see the little darlings suffer, can we? It isn't their fault. And, anyway, it gives one a nice feeling to make a sacrifice sometimes. But what annoys me is the horrible ingratitude of the people who bring these children into the world. Imagine it, they call us the idle rich! They just can't see that orphanages are charitable institutions. Some busybody was complaining in a newspaper the

other day about the food and medical service at one of the church orphanages. He said that the children didn't get nearly enough milk and eggs, and that their teeth were deplorable. Yes, deplorable! That was the very word he used. But daddy happens to be one of the directors of that paper and he's going to have something to say about the editor at the next board meeting. Milk and eggs! with eggs at 2/- a dozen! For orphans. I wonder where that fool thought the money was coming from.

Still, all this ingratitude only makes the sacrifice bigger. I wish some of those wretches could have seen Mrs. Gunn yesterday afternoon before the other guests arrived. Mother and I were there early and she was telling us all sorts of things. I felt so sorry for her, because she really is a sweet old thing. It's a true saying that troubles never come singly. You probably know her husband has big interests in the iron industry—I think that's how they call it. And he lost frightfully over the affair at Port Kembla. I don't know much about it myself, but it seems the wharf laborers refused to load iron on to the ships because they said it was going to Japan to make bombs to kill Chinese babies with. Did you ever hear such flapdoodle? The whole world's going mad. I don't believe in babies being bombed, but what about those stupid workmen's own children? Apparently they were to starve so that Chinese babies could live. The extraordinary thing is that lots of usually sensible people regard them

as heroes and martyrs. I think they're idiots. From all I've heard a few Chinese babies would hardly be missed. They shouldn't have them, anyway. But you see who it is that really suffers for all this? Mrs. Gunn says that Edward—she calls him "Edward" to everybody—has lost thousands of pounds over it. They were going to send Natalie—that's their only child—to Paris to finish her education. Now they might not be able to do it. And all over a few Chinese babies and a handful of crazy wharf laborers.

And—you must tell your mother this—they're going to build flats in Lansell Road! Yes, flats in Lansell Road! Can you believe it? Mrs. Gunn was nearly crying. And do you blame her? She says the whole tone of the neighborhood will suffer. And, mind you, it isn't the flats themselves she objects to, because they can build them really nice now. It's the kind of people that get into them. They're such a mixed lot, neither upper nor lower class, nor anything else. Although most of them have no doubts themselves on the subject. Flighty new-weds, theatricals, commercial travelers, and all sorts of other riff-raff.

Mrs. Gunn says she has no illusions about what she's in for. There'll be about twenty different kinds of flivers rattling up and down the road, not to mention the tradesmen. You know it takes as many tradesmen to supply a block of flats as it does a whole street of people like us. They've all got to have their own milkman and breadman.

Mrs. Gunn says the road will never be empty. And that's without saying anything about their own comings and goings, or their wireless sets, and parties, and—my goodness, I very nearly wrote "children"! As if people who wanted children would go to live in flats! That's what makes me so wild. Here's the country crying out for population, and half the people living in flats. Just because they're too lazy and selfish to have children. I often wonder why the Prime Minister doesn't do something about it. I went to a lecture the other day on "Civic Responsibilities." Not that I'm interested in lectures, but Irene Bonehead was going and it was a chance for me to get out without mother. Mother still thinks I should run around with her; that's the worst of not having any brothers and sisters. Anyway, the lecturer said that if we didn't hurry up and populate the country some other race would do it for us. And at the finish Mrs. Gunn got up and said that the first thing to do was to prohibit the building of flats. Wasn't that marvellous of her? She'd never done a thing like that in her life before. Mother said she deserved a medal. Mr. Gunn has been trying hard, too, but in a different way. He knows one of the city councillors very well, and two of the others owe him money. But somebody else must have been working from the other side, because when the matter of flats came to be discussed Mr. Gunn's men were beaten.

But I was telling you about Mrs.

Gunn's troubles. That's two of them, and as if they weren't enough her gardener has to come and ask her for two shillings rise in his wages. And, mind you, he's getting £3/19/- now, and Mr. Gunn gives him all his old coats, and ten shillings every Christmas. I don't know what servants are coming to these days. They think they own the earth. They've been given far too much in the past, that's the trouble. Jackson, that's the Gunn's gardener, never was content. He's in one of those unions, and every time they have a win in the Arbitration Court—whatever that might be!—he comes and takes it out of Mr. Gunn. I don't know what "basic wage" means, and I don't care, but I do know that if he was more careful with his money he wouldn't need to complain so much about poverty. Mrs. Gunn told us that it came to her through her cook that Jackson's wife paid 17/6 for a new frock. Imagine it, 17/6! And only last week Payne's were advertising frocks for 3/11! But, of course, a 3/11 frock isn't good enough for a gardener's wife—17/6, if you please. And Mrs. Gunn is asked to pay for it at 2/- a week. She told mother that if he wasn't such a wonderful gardener she'd have sacked him on the spot. As it is she's going to pay. She was in trouble with the Trades Hall once before over a houseman, and it was only Edward's influence that kept it out of the papers. He says there'll be no peace in Victoria until somebody puts a bomb under the Trades Hall. Incidentally, Jackson has five children! How on

earth could he expect to rear five children on a gardener's wage?

Still, they say that every cloud has a silver lining, and poor Mrs. Gunn did have one little thing to smile over. Chu's better! Yes, really and truly better. Isn't that marvellous? I've never kept a Pekingese, but it seems to me they're more worry than they're worth. They're so delicate. And expensive! Do you know that Chu cost £45? Mrs. Gunn told me so herself. No wonder she was worried. You'll remember me telling you he could hardly stand? A kind of ricketts, the vet said. Undernourishment and weakness caused by taking him away from his mother too soon. I think it's much the same sort of thing that poor children get. Anyway, the vet prescribed a special diet for him and he's made a wonderful recovery. It cost a lot, of course. A guinea a visit for the vet, and some pills at 15/- a box. The diet didn't count, because, as you know, Mrs. Gunn keeps her own cow and poultry. She wouldn't care, anyway. She says Chu's well worth it. He

really is a little darling. He does the sweetest tricks.

But oh, Pen, I set out to tell you all about the party, and I've told you nothing. And now I'm so tired I can't write any more. Isn't that just like me? I'll have to leave it till next time. But I won't forget, really I won't. Write soon and tell me all about your trip to the Islands. I'm just dying to hear.

All my love,

Judith.

P.S.—I really can't close without telling you how much we raised for the Orphanage. £15! Wasn't that marvellous? Really it was only £14/10/- but Sir George Flushe gave us the 10/- to make it up. Did you ever meet him? They call him the "Dynamite King," because that's what he made his money in. Pen, he's a darling! You should have seen the beautiful expression on his face when he was looking at the orphans. They say that if there's another war he'll be richer than Mr. Chamberlain.

Judith.

THE END.



# THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY LIVES AND FIGHTS

FROM AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN THE MOSCOW COMMUNIST PAPER, "PRAVDA."



M. THOREZ, leader of the French Party, reported as having been sentenced to six years' imprisonment.

**“UNRESTRAINED** terror has been declared against the Communists in the country of boasted bourgeois democracy, France,” Pravda wrote. “The ruling circles of France called themselves a government of French democracy.

They are even attempting to convince the French people that the war against Germany was undertaken in the name of the defence of democracy.

## THE MASK IS OFF

“The banning of the Communist Party, the persecution and arrests of Communists and their sympathisers, tear the mask from these

outright defenders and agents of French capital. Their vows and declarations of love and devotion for the ideals of democracy are hypocrisy and lies.

“Their decree of dissolution against the Communist Party crowned an entire series of acts of persecution and provocation against the proletarian vanguard. Even before France declared war on Germany, the central newspaper of the Communist Party, *L’Humanite*, was closed down, and dozens of other Communist and Left newspapers after it.

“They were banned because they explained to the French people the real reason for the collapse of the political and military negotiations between England and France on the one side and the Soviet Union on the other—the negotiations which came to a deadlock through the fault of the governments of France and Britain. This is what freedom of the press means in France!

“After France’s declaration of war on Germany, the French ‘democratic’ authorities threw thousands of Communists into jail. Thousands of workers, intellectuals and soldiers who opposed the present war—an unjust and imperialist war—were arrested and sentenced.

## BLOWS AIMED AT REAL PATRIOTS

“Civil and military courts are working at high pressure in the cities and villages of France. Thousands of sentences have already been passed against the real patriots of the French people, whose only fault is that they understand how unnecessary and fruitless is the war France is waging, who understand that this war can only bring hundreds of thousands of victims to the French people, can bring only seas of tears and of the blood of the people.

“And this is the country where hundreds of venal newspapers—Radical and Socialist—howl that there is freedom of the press, freedom of opinion!

“Despite the efforts of the French authorities and their subservient press—both the openly bourgeois newspapers and the self-styled ‘Socialist’ papers—the masses of the people of France are not being convinced of the need for the present war. Anti-war agitation is becoming more and more open every day. Everywhere one sees leaflets demanding an end to the war. A leaflet headed ‘Immediate Peace’ has been distributed throughout France.

“The French pogrom-makers, thirsting for the blood of the best sons of the French people, want to make use of the war situation to settle accounts with the flower of the French proletariat, to destroy them physically.

“The newspaper *Le Temps* and others print articles of incitement

demanding ‘the prosecution of Communist and their ruthless annihilation.’ The ‘Socialist’ sheet *Le Populaire*, organ of the outright traitor, Leon Blum, does not lag behind in this rabid outcry.

## FASCIST SPIES, TRAITORS WALK FREE

“The best sons and daughters of the French people are being arrested, but the Cagouards, the worst enemies of France, the traitors and the spies, walk freely through the streets of Paris. And even receive state posts.

“This is how the present leaders of France, who not so long ago, in July of 1938, vowed their loyalty to the people and to democracy, display their ‘democracy’ and ‘patriotism.’

“These pygmies on the payroll of French capital, these politicians involved in the shady dealings of the Oustrics and Staviskys, commit the sacrilege of calling themselves the descendants of the Jacobins.

“The Jacobins were friends of the people, they loved their people, they were noble sons of the French people.

“The present political leaders of France, donning in the democratic garb of the Jacobins, are oppressors of the working people, persecutors of the best sons of the French people.

## CONDITIONS OF MASSES WORSEN

“The banning of the Communist Party of France is a victory of the most reactionary elements of

French imperialism. It is the beginning of a new offensive on the working class.

"The Belgian paper La Voix du Peuple has published data on the extraordinary worsening of the conditions of the French people in connection with the war and on the intensification of reaction.

"This paper quotes facts about the conditions of the workers of the industrial district of Jeumont, in the Nord department. The 40-hour week which the French workers won some years ago has been replaced by a 60-hour week. Only 40 hours are paid for though 60 are actually worked. In addition there are numerous deductions, including a 15 per cent. tax for war requirements.

#### REACTION DIRECTED BY THE 200 FAMILIES

"The newspaper points out that the capitalists are reaping enormous profits and that all the burdens of the war are placed on the backs of the working people.

"It is becoming increasingly clear to the working people of France that the persecution of the Communists, the abolition of the last remnants of democratic liberties, the acute worsening of the material conditions of their existence, the war for the sake of world domination being waged by the French government, are all links of one chain.

"The French ruling circles are doing what they are told by their masters—the 200 millionaires of France!

"The black-guard Blum and his friends can consider that they are

dealing a blow to the vanguard of the working class, that they have eliminated the only party which prevented them from deceiving the working people.

"Their joy is premature! The French working class will gather still more firmly around its party, will still more clearly understand the treacherous roles of the Blums—the agents and allies of maddened French reaction.

"The more brazenly and cynically, the more shamelessly the renegades like Blum, Paul Faure and Leon Jouhaux support the measures of the Daladier Government, the more the "Socialist" sheets Le Populaire and Le Peuple and their ilk lie and slander, the more attentively do the French workers and peasants heed the voice of the Communists, their speeches and appeals.

#### MASSES RECOGNISE C. P. AS REAL LEADER

All the forces of bourgeois France are united to slander and persecute the French Communists. But the Communist Party has already become such a force that it is impossible to smash it either by slander or terror.

"There are thousands of Communists, men and women, in the cities and villages of France, in its factories and plants, in its schools and in the army. Millions of workers organised in the trade unions see their leader in the Communist Party.

"The Communists enjoy the confidence of workers who enthusiastically elected them to the leading

bodies of the trade union organisations. Now the traitor Jouhaux demands the expulsion of the Communists from the trade unions.

"But the French workers will not permit this. They know that thanks to the work of the Communists, the French trade unions in the last three years have become organisations embracing many millions.

#### CZAR TRIED SAME THING— AND FAILED

"It is well known that the Tsarist government also attempted by unrestrained terror, by sentences to penal servitude and the gallows, to destroy the Bolsheviks. It is well known that when the Bolshevik Party immediately and without hesitation raised the banner of determined struggle against the first imperialist war, the autocracy closed down the only Bolshevik paper, Pravda, and expelled and exiled the Bolshevik deputies in the State Duma (Parliament).

"The Russian Mensheviks, like their French brethren today, grovelled before the tsarist authorities and in every way endorsed the actions of the government of Nicholas II against the Russian Bolsheviks.

"But the brutal punishment meted

out by the autocracy against the best sons of the working class did not help tsarism. Nor did the support of the Menshevik traitors.

#### CANNOT HIDE

#### IMPERIALIST

#### WAR AIMS

"The fierce persecution, arrests and terror against the advanced workers, peasants and intellectuals will not help the French bourgeoisie either to hide from the people the character and aims of the imperialist war it has undertaken, however much the French imperialists attempt to cover themselves with the mask of defenders of democracy.

"A Party like that of the French Bolsheviks may be disbanded, thousands of French workers, soldiers and intellectuals may be arrested and condemned for agitation against the imperialist war, but it is impossible to stop the indefatigable struggle for the French Communist Party for the happiness of the French people.

"This struggle will continue. And there is no doubt that it will be crowned with success, for the cause of the Communists is the cause of the French people."

## BOOK REVIEW

**"THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE"**

By Neville Chamberlain

G. P. O'Day

SOME little time before the present war Mr. Neville Chamberlain issued this book. It contains the speeches made by him on the subjects of War and Peace from the time he became Prime Minister of England, May 28, 1937, down to April 3, 1939, a period of constant crisis in international affairs. The office that Mr. Chamberlain holds—that of the real Head of the British Empire—is certainly one of the most important and responsible in the world. In his own words: "No major point of policy can be decided, no real fateful step can be taken without the assent of the Prime Minister." In Mr. Chamberlain's hands, the Prime Minister's power has certainly not dwindled. Rightly or wrongly, the general impression is that Mr. Chamberlain is more nearly a dictator than one is accustomed to consider the English Prime Minister to be—and this impression is not disturbed by these speeches.

As is customary with politicians in the capitalist sphere, Chamberlain takes care to present a careful picture of himself. We learn that he springs from a family of respectable tradesmen who were fairly eminent shoemakers (cord wainers) two

hundred years ago. Since then he says the Chamberlains have found other ways of keeping body and soul together. These other ways are not revealed.

It would come as a great shock to any uninformed person reading these speeches to learn that these other ways include—nay, are, mainly armament manufacture. As a true artist Mr. Chamberlain has correctly felt that such a crude detail would spoil the picture. He is a sober and temperate man, we learn, sound in mind and limb, blessed with a perfect wife. He never sought this or any other office—and regards his present position not as a prize, but as an opportunity for service to be used in the interests of the country as a whole.

He is not a hypocrite for he does not pretend to be an abstainer from alcohol or tobacco—nor does he do a daily dozen before breakfast.

From the days when he was a councillor in Birmingham, "he has realised that a man cannot have everything his own way, and that those who get things done are those who are ready to work with and for others who are prepared to give up something themselves in order that

they may receive something in return. In dealing with foreign countries, we do not give ourselves a chance unless we try to understand their mentality, which is not always the same as our own, and it really is astonishing to contemplate how the identically same facts are regarded from two different angles." I have marked this last passage with quotation marks. The reader, however, must understand the statements in this article, except those obviously my own, are verbatim extracts from the speeches.

The picture is completed by finding Mr. Chamberlain a firm believer in individual liberty and democracy—and a constant deplorer of the waste of money in armaments as such money could be put to far better use "in the alleviation of suffering, the care of the old and the development of the minds and bodies of the young." In fact, the thought that the hard-won "savings of our people should have to be dissipated upon the construction of weapons of war seems hateful and damnable to him."

Surely we must all feel that no better Prime Minister could be found. If such a man does not achieve Peace—Well Peace is not for this world. Or is it that another Don Quixote or another Pecksniff has appeared on earth?

This truly perfect gentleman (or honest tradesman) then begins to lead a country equally perfect whose "record in matters of international good faith is completely clear." He himself "was brought up in a house-

hold where we were taught the importance of telling the truth, even though we got into trouble by doing so," and so today "speaks plainly what he believes to be true, and doesn't promise what he can't perform."

Before proceeding to Chamberlain's political theory and practice as displayed in his speeches, we would draw attention to the marked contrast already perceptible when comparing him with the proletarian leaders, Dimitrov, Lenin, Stalin and Molotov. These latter do not seem to deem it desirable to paint a picture, flattering or otherwise, of themselves in their speeches any more than, say, a chemist, physicist or biologist does in his lectures on his special subject. Apparently they rely more upon the content, the actual analysis and the things done or about to be done than on the appealing claim that being nice persons they must naturally be right.

Extraordinary, is it not, that they discard such an ancient and honorable practice so well followed in our days by Baldwin, Chamberlain, Lyons and the Right Honorable R. G. Menzies.

And, indeed, Mr. Chamberlain's theory and practice are based more on his personal character (as described by himself) than on any profound analysis of world politics. From the outset he frankly states that things are perilously poised, the threat of war hanging like a cloud over the world. Still this may be removed, he feels, by ascertaining any genuine grievances and remedy-

ing them, by removing any misunderstandings and by re-arming Great Britain so that her formidable strength may deter war makers. Economics, he acknowledges, cannot be entirely divorced from politics. His re-armament operations (and those of others) will maintain industry, notably in Birmingham—his home town—till such time as confidence in peace is established. Once confidence in peace prevails, enterprise will be stimulated and international trade replace armament as a basis of economic maintenance and advance. By war no one gains, all lose, and peace is the first requirement of the British Empire. His heart is lightened by the fact that firstly the United States of America will certainly never again be at war with Britain and secondly that Russia is more an Asiatic than a European power and therefore needs (for three-quarters of his book) no consideration. France, Germany and Italy provide his problems and it is in his negotiations with these three powers that the solution will and must be found. As he gains some personal acquaintance with Hitler and Mussolini, his confidence visibly grows.

The vast assumptions so lightly and easily made are deemed so obviously true that Mr. Chamberlain neglects to provide any proof for them. We gather from his speeches that there are other ideologies in the world, namely fascism and communism. These are un-British (and he rightly disdains discussion on these

unseemly products of foreign mentality).

History also is neglected, except to remind us that Britain fought for liberty in the Great War and will do so again if necessary.

Remedying grievances and removing misunderstandings Mr. Chamberlain localises the Spanish War with the non-Intervention Committee—and honorably accepts Mussolini's assurance that, should the Republican Government be defeated, Italy will retire from Spain. Avoiding war and believing Hitler, Chamberlain finds that Great Britain can honorably leave Austria to her fate. Then Czechoslovakia also, after Runciman has done his best to find a way out in the interests of all. The Munich negotiations seem to crown an honorable and distinguished career. Mr. Hitler declares that Germany has no more territorial ambitions in Europe and feels certain that England and Germany will never go to war. Sparing a moment of pity for the misfortune of the Czechs, who could, Chamberlain says, deny "that we have earned the gratitude of the vast majority in the world"? More, "if we can get rid of suspicion, we shall all be ready to disarm together" and in his judgment "political conditions in Europe are now settling down to quieter times."

In March, Hitler's seizure of Prague is regretted, but Mr. Chamberlain still aims to substitute discussion for force. Forty-eight hours later, however, the threat of force is made at Birmingham—and seven

days after that threat, Poland receives a guarantee and negotiations are commenced with Russia.

The rest we know. On the declaration of war with Germany, Chamberlain said: "All my hopes, all the things I have planned for years have crashed in ruins." We must suppose that these hopes and plans mean peace and confidence that restores enterprise, etc.

Still an element of doubt enters. Is it credible that the head of the British Empire should be such a dear

old Christian gentleman (or tradesman) with such a superficial sentimental view of world politics?

Was Lenin correct when he said that the British bourgeoisie ruled by deceit? Was Chamberlain really hoping and planning for an anti-Soviet war?

Anyway, read his book. You may find an answer to this question. At any rate, if you aspire to be a Menzies you will find there all the cues and the necessary spiritual approach on principles of eternal morality to the higher politics.

## VON CLAUSEWITZ AND HIS THEORY

Von Clausewitz (1780-1831) was regarded by Lenin as "one of the greatest writers on the history of war."

He entered the Prussian Army as Ensign in 1792 and served in the campaign on the Rhine. In 1801, at the age of 21, he entered the military school in Berlin. His instructors were considerably impressed by his brilliance.

In 1806 he became aide-de-camp to Prince Augustus and in the war against France was wounded and taken prisoner.

On his release and return to Prussia he was placed on the staff of General Scharnhorst and played a leading role in reorganising the army.

Shortly after this he was selected as Military Instructor to the young Crown Prince.

From 1812 to 1815 he served, together with other high Prussian officers, in the Russian Army.

In 1818 he returned to the Prussian Army and was elevated to Major-General and Director of the Military School.

His writings, contained in nine volumes, were published after his death in 1831. The best known and most famous of his works was the treatise "on War" in 3 volumes.

This work contains the ideas about Russia referred to by William Z. Foster in his article on page 42. On page 158/9 of Volume 3, Kegan Paul, London, 1918 edition, we find the following:—

"The Russian Empire is no country which can be regularly conquered, that is to say, which can be held in possession, at least not by the forces of the present States of Europe. . . .

"Such a country can only be subdued by its own weakness, and by the effects of internal dissension. In order to strike these vulnerable points in its political existence, the country must be agitated to its very centre."

# THE PEACE QUESTION

Lenin

WRITTEN IN AUGUST, 1915. FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE  
MAGAZINE PROLETARSKAYA REVOLUTSIYA, NO. 5 (28), 1924.

THE question of peace as a programme most agitating the Socialists, as well as the question of peace conditions connected with the former, interests everyone. One can only be grateful to the paper, the Berner Tagwacht, for attempts made in it to approach that question, not from the usual petty-bourgeois national, but from a real proletarian international point of view. The editorial remark in No. 73 ("Craving for Peace") to the effect that the German Social-Democrats who wish for peace must break with the politics of the Junker government, was excellent. Excellent was also Comrade A.P.'s attack (Nos. 73 and 75) on the "pompous airs of powerless phrase-mongers" who are attempting in vain to solve the peace question from the petty-bourgeois point of view.

Let us see how this question must be approached by Socialists. The peace slogan can be advanced either in connection with definite peace conditions, or without any conditions at all, as a desire, not for a definite peace, but for peace in general. It is obvious that in the latter case we have a slogan that is not only not Socialist, but that is entirely devoid of meaning and sense. Absolutely everybody is in favor of peace in general, including Kitchener, Joffre,

Hindenburg, and Nicholas the Bloody, for every one of them wishes to end the war. The trouble is that every one of them advances imperialist (i.e., predatory in relation to other peoples), oppressive peace conditions for the benefit of "his" nation. Slogans must be advanced in order to make clear to the masses, by means of propaganda and agitation, the irreconcilable differences between Socialism and capitalism (imperialism); they must *not* be advanced in order to *reconcile* two hostile classes and two hostile political lines by means of a little word which "unites" the most divergent things.

The further question is: Can one unite the Socialists of the various countries on certain *conditions* of peace? If so, those conditions must undoubtedly include the recognition of the right of self-determination for all nations; also, renunciation of all "annexations," i.e., violations of that right. If, however, this right is recognised only as far as *some* nations are concerned, then you defend the privileges of certain nations, i.e., you are a nationalist and imperialist, not a Socialist. If, on the other hand, this right is recognised for *all* nations, then you cannot single out Belgium alone, for instance; you must take *all* oppressed peoples, both in Europe (the Irish

in Britain, the Italians in Nice, the Danes in Germany, fifty-seven per cent. of Russia's population, etc.) and outside of Europe, i.e., the colonies. Comrade A. P. did well to remind us of them. England, France and Germany have a total population of some one hundred and fifty millions, whereas the populations they oppress in the colonies amount to over four hundred millions! The essence of the imperialist war, i.e., the war waged for the interests of the capitalists, consists not only in the fact that the war is waged with the aim of oppressing new nations, or dividing the colonies, but also in the fact that the war is waged primarily by the foremost nations which *oppress* a number of other peoples, forming the *majority* of the earth's population.

The German Social-Democrats who justify the seizure of Belgium or reconcile themselves to it are, in reality, not Social-Democrats, but imperialists and nationalists, since they defend the "right" of the German bourgeoisie (partly also of the German workers) to oppress the Belgians, the Alsations, the Danes, the Poles, the Negroes in Africa, etc. They are not Socialists, but *satellites* of the German bourgeoisie aiding it to rob foreign nations. The Belgian Socialists who demand the liberation and indemnification of Belgium *alone* are also in reality defending a demand of the Belgian bourgeoisie, which is out to plunder the 15,000,000 Congo population as it did before, and to obtain concessions and privileges in other countries. The Belgian bourgeoisie have

invested abroad something like three billion francs. To safeguard the profits from those billions by means of all sorts of fraud and tricky machinations—this is the *real* "national" interest of "gallant Belgium." The same applies in a still greater degree to Russia, England, France, Japan.

It follows that if the demand for the freedom of nations be not a lying phrase covering up the imperialism and nationalism of *some individual* countries, it must be extended to *all* people and to *all* colonies. Such demand, however, is obviously meaningless if not accompanied by a series of revolutions in *all* the advanced countries. Moreover, it cannot be realised without a successful *Socialist* revolution.

In the face of such conditions, can the Socialists remain indifferent to the peace demand that is gaining ground among even greater masses? By no means. For the slogans of the class-conscious vanguard of the workers (revolutionary Social-Democracy) are one thing, and the elemental demands of the masses quite another. The yearning for peace is one of the most important *symptoms* of an incipient *disappointment* in the bourgeoisie lie concerning the war for "liberation," concerning the "defence of the fatherland," and similar lies by which the class of capitalists beguiles the mob. This symptom must attract the closest attention of the Socialist. All efforts must be directed towards *utilising* the sentiment of the masses in favor of peace. But how shall it be utilised? To accept the peace

slogan *per se*, and to repeat it, would be encouraging the "pompous air of powerlessness (what is worse: hypocritical) phrase-mongers"; that would mean deceiving the people with the illusion that the present governments, the present ruling classes, are capable, before they are "taught" a lesson (or rather eliminated) by a number of revolutions, of granting a peace even half way satisfactory to democracy and the working class. Nothing is more harmful than such a deception. Nothing throws more dust in the eyes of the workers, nothing imbues them with a more deceptive idea about the absence of deep contradictions between capitalism and Socialism, nothing embellishes capitalist slavery more than this deception. No, we must utilise the sentiment in favor of peace to explain to the masses that the benefits they expect from peace cannot be obtained without a number of revolutions.

The end of wars, peace among peoples, cessation of pillaging and violations are our ideal, to be sure, but only bourgeois sophists can seduce the masses with this ideal, while separating it from a direct and immediate preaching of revolutionary action. The soil is ripe for such preaching; to practice it one must only break away from the opportunists, the allies of the bourgeoisie, who directly (not stopping before informing the authorities) and indirectly hamper revolutionary work.

The self-determination of nation's slogan must also be connected with the imperialist era of capitalism. We are not for the *status*

*quo*, nor for the philistine Utopia of shrinking away from great wars. We are in favor of a revolutionary struggle against imperialism, i.e., capitalism. Imperialism consists of the striving of nations oppressing a number of other nations to widen and strengthen that oppression, to redistribute the colonies. This is why the question of self-determination of nations pivots, in our times, on the conduct of the Socialists of the *oppressing* nations. A Socialist of any of the oppressing nations (England, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, the United States of America, etc.) who does not recognize and does not struggle for the right of oppressed nations to self-determination (i.e., to the freedom of separation) is, in reality, not a Socialist but a chauvinist.

Only on this point of view furnishes the basis for a non-hypocritical and consistent struggle against imperialism, for the proletarian and not the philistine approach to the national question of our times. Only this point of view furnishes the principle for a consistent struggle against every kind of oppression of nations; it eliminates mistrust among the proletarians of the oppressing and oppressed nations; it leads to a united international struggle for a Socialist revolution (i.e., for the only realisable regime of full national equality) and not to the philistine Utopia of freedom for all small states in general under capitalism.

It is this point of view that is assumed by our party, i.e., by those Social-Democrats of Russia who

rally around the Central Committee. It is this point of view that was assumed by Marx when he taught the proletariat that "no people can be free that oppresses other peoples." It is from this point of view that Marx demanded the separation of Ireland from England, having in mind the interests of the movement for freedom, not only of the Irish, but particularly of the *English* workers.

If the Socialists of England do not recognise and fight for the right of separation for Ireland, the French for the Italian Nice, the Germans for Alsace-Lorraine, the Danish Schleswig, and for Poland, the Russians for Poland, Finland, the Ukraine, etc., the Poles for the Ukraine, if all the Socialists of the "great" powers, i.e., the powers that perpetrate great robberies, do not defend this right as far as the colonies are concerned, it is solely because in fact they are imperialists, not Socialists. It is ridiculous to cherish illusions that people who do not fight for "the right of self-determination" for the oppressed nations, while they themselves belong to the oppressing nations, are capable of practising Socialist politics.

Instead of leaving it to the hypocritical phrase-mongers to deceive the people by phrases and promises concerning a possible democratic peace, the Socialists must explain to

the masses the impossibility of a more or less democratic peace outside of a number of revolutions and revolutionary struggle in every country against their respective governments. Instead of allowing the bourgeois politicians to fool the peoples by phrases relative to the freedom of nations, the Socialists must explain to the masses of the *oppressing* nations the hopelessness of their liberation, while they aid the oppression of other nations, while they do not recognise and fight for the right of those nations to self-determination, i.e., freedom of separation. Here is a Socialist, not an imperialist line of politics common to all countries as regards the question of peace and the national question. This line, of course, is in most cases incompatible with the laws provided against high treason, but neither is there a compatibility between those laws and the Basle resolution so shamefully betrayed by almost all the Socialists of the *oppressing* nations.

Here is a choice: for Socialism or for submitting to the laws of Messrs. Joffre and Hindenburg, for a revolutionary struggle or for servility to the bourgeoisie. There is no middle course. The greatest harm is caused the proletariat by the hypocritical (or stupid) authors of "middle course" politics.

# THE DECISIVE ROLE OF THE SOVIET PURGE

Wm. Z. Foster

CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

WHEN the Communists of the U.S.S.R. and other countries stated that the purge of the Trotskyite, Zinovievite, Bukharinite spies and wreckers in the Soviet Union during the years 1936-37 constituted a major defeat for Hitler and the other imperialists who were contemplating a military attack to overthrow the Soviet government, many liberals scoffed at this analysis. They were shocked by the drastic elimination of these traitorous elements from Soviet activity and declared that the Soviet government, abandoning its Socialist principles, was butchering a legitimate opposition and turning into a brutal tyranny.

Now, however, in the Soviet-German non-aggression pact and the tremendous events that are flowing from it, the decisive and constructive importance of the role played by the Soviet purge stands out so clearly that only those wilfully blind politically can ignore it. Ever since the foundation of the Soviet government in October, 1917, the British and French Tories have plotted, boldly and unblushingly, for its overthrow, sometimes one group and sometimes the other taking the lead in the growing international anti-Soviet

front. And when Hitler, the champion of German imperialism, seized power in 1933, he immediately began to fit his course in with this anti-Soviet orientation. Upon all occasions he shouted his determination to conquer the Ukraine and he even talked of over-running the Soviet Union as far east as the Urals; it was Hitler also who launched the great agitational campaign "to save the world from Bolshevism" and initiated the anti-Comintern pact between Germany, Japan and Italy, a pact which was directed towards the destruction of the Soviet government.

The British and French reactionaries applauded all this and proceeded systematically to strengthen Hitler's hands through the appeasement policy that the world now knows only too well. Thus, there gradually more and more took shape a great imperialist front of Germany, England, France, Japan and Italy, the central purpose of which was eventually to destroy the Soviet Union. The spearhead of this anti-Soviet movement was fascist Germany.

Hitler based his strategy upon the ideas of von Clausewitz, the military

strategist who held the theory that the only way Russia could be decisively defeated militarily was by the attacker being assisted at the same time by an organised revolt inside that country. With this conception in mind, therefore, Hitler and his Japanese allies bought up the Trotskyites, Bukharinites and other associated traitors. These elements were to strike their blow at the Soviet leaders and government simultaneously with the German and Japanese military attack from without. In return for surrendering the Ukraine to Hitler and the maritime provinces to Japan, these traitors were to be placed at the head of a puppet Russian government sustained by foreign fascist bayonets. As this anti-Soviet conspiracy gradually ripened, England and France encouraged Hitler from the back-ground.

But the purge of 1936-37 completely upset this carefully thought-out strategy of British-German-Japanese-French imperialism by wrecking the counter-revolutionary organisation of Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, etc., upon whom Hitler was depending to stage a revolt simultaneously with his attack from without. Therefore, with his putsch forces inside the Soviet Union destroyed, and in line with von Clausewitz's theory that *Russia could only be defeated with the help of internal revolt*, Hitler had to give up for the time being at least his long-projected and deeply-cherished military assault against the Soviet Union. The purge thus blocked Hitler's march to the east and forced

him to direct his attention elsewhere for conquests.

The general consequence was that the ranks of the imperialist powers were split, their strategy thrown into confusion and the mutual antagonisms among them enormously sharpened. Their plan to attack the Soviet Union through Hitler was hopelessly disrupted. The British and French Tories, however, did not accept the full consequences of this situation as quickly as Hitler did. They kept on trying, through concessions, promises and threats, to force Hitler to resume his drive to the east against the Soviet Union. They surrendered Czechoslovakia and Austria to Hitler and they systematically aided him in building up his land, air and naval forces, all with the aim of directing his aggression against the Soviet Union.

But Hitler refused to take the path they wanted him to take, because, guided by von Clausewitz's theory, he was convinced beforehand that a German attack would not succeed in the face of a united Soviet people. Instead, Hitler, in his campaigns of aggression, kept pressing more and more against Great Britain and France and consequently getting into ever greater conflict with them.

The final result of this clash of imperialist aims we now see in the war between England and France on the one side, and Germany on the other. The imperialist wolves, balked of their anticipated prey, the Soviet Union, have turned about and are devouring each other.

Hitler, stopped in the east by a

Soviet Union made immeasurably stronger by its thorough-going purge of traitors, was compelled to sign the non-aggression pact. And the aftermath of that pact shows by the acid test of life itself that the whole Soviet course of the purge and the pact was correct. The pact has smashed the fascist axis and thereby dealt world fascism a heavy defeat; it has stopped Hitler's drive to the east; seriously weakened German, French and British imperialism in the Balkans and the Baltic and Japanese imperialism in the Far East; it has also enormously strengthened the strategic position of the Soviet Union and raised its prestige among the oppressed peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. In short, the Soviet-German pact, which flowed from the defeat of Hitler in the Soviet purge of 1936-37, represents a great victory for the forces of Socialism and peace.

Many intellectuals and liberals did not understand the purge any more than they now understand the Soviet-German pact. But this is not unusual on their part. It is one of the striking facts of the Russian Revolution that practically all the important steps taken forward, those that were really decisive in the life of the revolution, have been widely misunderstood by liberals and have only come to be grasped in their full significance after a considerable lapse of time. Thus, these people condemned the overthrow of the Kerensky regime in October, 1917, although the passage of time has clearly shown that without this the revolution must have failed com-

pletely in Russia. They also repudiated the Brest-Litovsk Treaty in 1918 as a betrayal of democracy, but now even conservatives admit that this treaty was a great strategic achievement by Lenin and that without it the revolution could not have survived. Many liberals also excoriated the New Economic Policy of 1921 as an abandonment of Socialism and a surrender to capitalism, but again they were completely wrong. Today the NEP, like the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, is understood almost everywhere to have been an indispensable measure for the upbuilding of Socialism.

Now, like so many times in the past, the liberal ranks again are all hot and bothered over the Soviet-German pact. Once more everything is lost. And these liberals, confused by the breakdown of the world capitalist system, are wandering in a swamp of pessimism and chaos. Eventually, many of them will doubtless come to understand the true significance of the pact and the purge, even as they have got an inkling of the real meaning of the overthrow of the Kerensky regime, the signing of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, the establishment of the NEP and many other measures which, in their day, deeply alarmed and confused them. The course of the proletarian revolution is unique and full of many surprises, and by the time the liberals catch up with the true significance of the Soviet-German pact, undoubtedly they will be then confronted by still more startling and world-shaking developments that will give them new cases of jitters and confusionism.

# KARL LIEBKNECHT

FROM A SERIES OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE  
"WORKERS' WEEKLY" AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1934.  
AUTHOR, EMILE BURNS.

January 16 is the 22nd anniversary of the death of Karl Liebknecht who, together with Rosa Luxemburg, was murdered at the instigation of the German Social Democratic Ebert-Scheidemann government which betrayed the Revolution of 1918 and paved the way for the Hitler dictatorship of today.

Liebknecht's life and work, particularly his struggle against militarism and the war of 1914-18 have many lessons for us today.

**K**ARL LIEBKNECHT was born on August 13, 1871. His father, Wilhelm Liebknecht was already a leading member of the German and International Socialist movement.

From his earliest years, therefore, Karl Liebknecht was associated with the Socialist movement. At the age of eighteen he began to specialise in law, and after qualifying as a lawyer in 1893 he went through military service in one of the Guards regiments at Potsdam.

It was from this period that he began to concentrate on the fight against militarism which later became his chief activity in the movement.

\* \* \*

Karl Liebknecht—at first with Bebel and Kautsky, later with Rosa Luxemburg—fought against the reformist tendencies within the German Social Democratic Party and in the Second International.

But he could not yet understand the need to fight reformism to the end: to make it an issue on which to split the Party and to form a revolutionary "Bolshevik" party.

Instead of this he remained a "left" critic and even in August, 1914, hesitated to make an open breach with the reformist leadership.

Nevertheless, from 1900 onwards Karl Liebknecht was untiring in his fight against militarism.

\* \* \*

In 1907 Liebknecht published a book, "Militarism and Anti-Militarism," which had considerable influence within the Party.

This book raised sharply the question of the impending imperialist war and urged the need for anti-militarist work.

Liebknecht's opposition to war was based on the class struggle. The central theme of his analysis was that colonial policy, the struggle for markets benefited only "capitalism, the hereditary foe of the proletariat," he tried to break down the glamor of war, and show its class basis.

"The proletariat knows that the wars which are waged by the ruling classes impose on it heavy sacrifice of life and property for which it is rewarded with miserable pensions for the disabled, funds in aid of veter-



*ans, street organs and kicks of all kinds after it has done the work The proletariat knows that in every war brutality and baseness are rampant amongst the peoples participating in it and culture is set back for years. The proletariat knows that the Fatherland, for which it must fight, is not its fatherland, that in every country it has only one real foe — the capitalist class which oppresses and exploits it."*

And Liebknecht fought militarism not only because it meant war:

*"Militarism is not only a means of defence against the external enemy; it has a second task, which comes more and more to the fore as class contradictions become more marked and a proletarian class consciousness grows.*

*"Thus the outer form of militarism and its inner nature take a more definite shape: its task is to uphold the prevailing order of society, to prop up capitalism and all reaction against the struggle of the working class for freedom . . ."*

Liebknecht's main weakness was his failure to analyse, in relation to imperialism, the "patriotic" tendencies within the Social Democratic Party.

Nevertheless, he consistently fought the open opportunists, the open chauvinists, the supporters of German imperialism within the Party.

At the Essen Congress in 1907, he attacked Noske's line of "defending the fatherland"—then couched in the form of "preparedness for defence."

Two months later Liebknecht was

sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment in a fortress for writing "Militarism and Anti-Militarism."

Huge demonstrations took place outside the court, and early in 1909, when he was still in prison, he was elected a member of the Prussian Diet. In 1912 he was first elected to the Reichstag.

In 1913, Liebknecht made the historic attack on the armament firm of Krupp and the government. He proved from documents that the Krupp firm had its servants in every State department, knew every State secret, that it was steadily organising war propaganda, and at the same time supplying both the German State and rival States with huge quantities of war material.

\* \* \*

His anti-militarist activities and his fearless exposures of the government and the banks and big industry won Liebknecht the love and admiration of the working class.

But the machine of the Social Democratic Party was in the hands of the "patriots" and Liebknecht himself did not realise that when the war actually broke out these "patriots" would use the Party machine not only in support of the government, in support of the war, but against himself and every other Social Democrat who remained an International Socialist.

On the eve of the war Liebknecht visited Paris to convey a message of international solidarity to the French workers. He had only just returned to Germany when war was declared. And when he arrived at the meeting of the Social Democratic Frac-

tion of the Reichstag it was to hear the leaders of the Party proposing that the fraction should vote for the war credits demanded by the German governments.

Liebknecht fought to the end against these "patriots" but when the vote was taken after three days' discussion, the fraction decided by 78 votes to 14 to support the credits.

Liebknecht then tried to convince the other thirteen members of the minority that they must come out openly against the majority decision and vote against war credits when they came up in the Reichstag. But they refused to do this, arguing that it was necessary to maintain the unity of the Party, to submit to the discipline of the majority of the fraction.

Liebknecht could not persuade them that a break was necessary, and finally decided not to vote against the credits himself, but to start a vigorous campaign against the war, gradually building up an opposition within the Social Democratic Party organisation.

It was not until December, 1914, that Liebknecht first voted against the war credits, recognising that he had made a mistake by not doing so in August.

\* \* \*

Liebknecht carried his opposition into the local meetings of the Party, and at the end of August he attempted to organise mass meetings under what he thought were still "legal" slogans: "Against annexations!"; "For peace!"

But the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party con-

demned his activities and the police prohibited the meetings.

Liebknecht and his colleagues began to organise an underground apparatus with bases in Holland, Denmark and Switzerland, from which illegal papers and leaflets were brought into Germany and distributed among the workers. This was the beginning of the movement which by 1915 became known as the Spartacus movement.

A new session of the Reichstag opened on December 2, 1914. Once again the government was asking for war credits. When the Social Democratic Fraction met to determine its policy Liebknecht led the fight against voting for the credits.

When the vote was taken the minority against voting for war credits had risen to seventeen. But Liebknecht's sixteen comrades were still under illusions of discipline and "preserving the unity of the party," and, in spite of all his arguments they refused to vote against credits in the Reichstag. Liebknecht, however, now realised it was necessary to act alone. When the vote was taken in the Reichstag, therefore, he voted against the credits, while the other 110 members of the Fraction voted for them.

The President of the Reichstag refused to allow Liebknecht to speak, and also refused to read the written declaration he handed in, or to allow it to be printed in the official report. Liebknecht, however, had the machinery ready and within a few days the declaration was circulating illegally. Extracts from the text of this historic document

are as under:

"The present war, which was not willed by the people of any one of the nations participating in it, is not being waged for the interests of the German or any other people.

"This is an imperialist war, a war for capitalist control of the world market, for the political domination of vast territories in order to give scope to industrial and banking capital . . .

"It is also a bonapartist device whose purpose is the disorganisation and dismemberment of the rising movement of the people . . . The German slogan, 'Against Tsarism,' like the English and French slogan, 'Against Militarism,' aims at utilising the best instincts, the revolutionary traditions and hopes of the peoples for purposes which are alien to humanity. . . .

"It is necessary to demand immediate peace, a peace which will injure no party to it; a peace without annexation. It is necessary to welcome every effort directed to this end. Only the simultaneous endeavor of all who aim at such a peace in every belligerent country can end the bloodshed and prevent the complete exhaustion of the peoples involved in it. Only a peace founded on the international solidarity of the working class and on the freedom of all nations can be enduring. The task of the proletariat of all countries even now, during the war, is the united Socialist struggle for peace."

It is true that this declaration is not clear from the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. The slo-

gans are limited to peace without annexations. There is not, as Lenin pointed out, the necessary conclusion to the statement that it was an imperialist war, namely, the revolutionary call to transform this imperialist war into civil war. But the fact that Karl Liebknecht voted against the war credits, against the policy of the social patriots who led the Social Democratic Party over to the side of the class enemy was a fact of tremendous importance. His action aroused tremendous enthusiasm among the left elements in the Party and his legal and underground campaign against the war rapidly extended and caused considerable alarm to the authorities.

\* \* \*

In January, 1915, Liebknecht made a speech at a Party meeting in Neukalln, Berlin, which was afterwards circulated illegally in pamphlet form. In this speech he showed a considerable advance on his Reichstag declaration; the title, "Class War Against War," indicated the theme.

Early in February, 1915, he was mobilised for the Army and notified that he must cease all political activity except that connected with his position as Reichstag deputy. On February 18, Rosa Luxemburg was arrested for her work with Liebknecht in the Spartacus movement. Liebknecht continued his illegal activities with all the greater energy, and the Spartacus movement developed rapidly.

On March 18, 1915, the Social Democratic Fraction in the Reichstag once more had to consider its

attitude to the new war credits asked for by the government. Liebknecht once again fought like a lion against the majority. By this time the minority had increased to 23, but only one other besides Liebknecht voted against the credits in the Reichstag; the others walked out before the vote was taken.

Liebknecht continued his anti-war activity while on service. He sought to rally the soldiers and workers around the slogans: "Put an end to the murder of the peoples!" "The main enemy is in our own country."

On September 5, 1915, the first international Socialist conference of opponents of the war opened at Zimmerwald. Liebknecht was on service on the Russian front and Rosa Luxemburg was in gaol.

Their supporters who were able to attend the conference were far from having reached revolutionary clearness in their views, some even voting with the Centrests against the theses put forward by Lenin.

Liebknecht and Luxemburg, however, sent letters to the conference. Liebknecht's letter showed the full development of his revolutionary thought.

"Dear comrades," he wrote, "Forgive me for writing in haste. I am a prisoner in the paws of the militarists. I am not able to come to you. But with my whole heart, my whole mind, my whole being, I am with you.

"Two serious tasks confront you. The first is imposed on you by stern duty. The second, by a sacred enthusiasm, a burning hope.

"Judgement, merciless judgement on those who have run away, on the deserters, who have abandoned the standard of the International in Germany, England, France and other countries!

"But those who have remained faithful to our standard, who have not given way one inch to imperialism, who have made up their minds to fight to the end, hesitating before no sacrifice—these can discuss with each, other, encourage and inspire each other for new battles. You will be able to establish complete order in the ranks of those who have decided to stand with both feet on the ground of International Socialism.

"Not civil peace but civil war! International proletarian solidarity against pseudo-national, pseudo-patriotic 'class-harmony.' International class war for peace, for the Socialist revolution! . . .

"Proletarians of all lands unite anew!"

On January 12, 1916, Karl Liebknecht was formally expelled from the Social Democratic Party and the way was thus prepared for his arrest by the government.

On April 18, Liebknecht attempted to speak in the Reichstag against the war but was howled down. He then decided to organise a great demonstration on May 1, in Potsdam Square. Posters were printed illegally bearing the words: "All to the May Day Demonstration." Leaflets were also distributed calling on "All who are against the war" to "Come to Potsdam Square on May 1."

On the evening of May 1, 1916, a crowd of ten thousand workers assembled in Potsdam Square, in spite of the masses of foot and mounted police surrounding it. At 8 o'clock Liebknecht, in his soldier's uniform, appeared in the middle of the demonstration and tried to speak, but he was only able to shout "Down with the war! Down with the government!" before he was arrested.

After his arrest, his immunity as a deputy was withdrawn and he was sentenced to four years' imprisonment. In July, Rosa Luxemburg was again imprisoned, and a few weeks later Franz Mehring suffered the same fate.

\* \* \*

The news of the March, 1917, revolution in Russia reached both Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in prison, and they were still in prison when the November, 1917, Revolution took place.

In the summer and early autumn of 1918 the discontent of the German workers was rapidly rising and insistent demands for the release of Liebknecht were made on the government.

On October 21, 1918, he was released from prison, having served only half of his four years' sentence. Addressing the thousands of workers who came to greet him, he spoke of the revolution in Russia, of the hope it gave to the international proletariat, of the need for the German workers to act quickly in their own country.

On November 9, 1918, Liebknecht led a small group of sailors to the

Berlin Palace, occupied it, and proclaimed the Revolution.

On November 11, the Berlin Soviet of workers and soldiers' deputies met. The masses were still confused and rejected Liebknecht's urgings that Ebert and Scheidemann be removed from responsible posts.

The First All-German Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates met in Berlin on December 16, 1918. It was entirely in the hands of the Social Democratic leaders. Liebknecht and Luxemburg were excluded from the Congress.

However, a deputation from the masses of workers assembled outside Congress, forced its way inside and put forward the Spartacus programme of "All Power to the Soviets." Thanks to Ebert, Schieffemann and Hilferding this was rejected.

The Social Democrats, led by Ebert, formed a new government, and set about organising the counter-revolution.

On the morning of January 15, the "Vorwärts," official organ of the Social Democratic Party, published a "poem," practically calling for the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg:

*"Five hundred corpses in a row—  
Liebknecht, Rosa, Radek & Co.,  
Are they not there also?"*

On the 16th, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were discovered by "civil guards" and arrested. They were taken to the Hotel Eden, which was then occupied by the staff of the Guards Cavalry Division.

Under the pretext of taking them to Moabit Prison, the officers put the prisoners in two separate closed cars and drove away with several officers in each car.

Before they drove away, however, a trooper was ordered to strike each of the prisoners on the head with the butt of his rifle. They sank down unconscious.

On the way through the Tiergarten the officers in the car with Liebknecht drew their revolver and fired several shots through his head and chest; his body was then taken to the offices of the zoological gardens, as the "corpse of an unknown man." Rosa Luxemburg was murdered with a shot through her temple; a stone was then tied to her body and it was thrown into a canal; it was not found until March.

On the 17th, the official wireless station of the Ebert-Schiedemann government reported the death of Liebknecht, stating, in anticipation of the Hitler technique, that he had been "shot while attempting to escape." \* \* \*

Liebknecht was a giant among pigmies. He fought consistently for international Socialism, for the world revolution, and he died at the hands of the class enemies of the proletariat.

In spite of his theoretical weaknesses, which Lenin criticised, he remains one of the heroes and martyrs of the international revolutionary movement, whose life and work has many valuable lessons for us today in the midst of the second imperialist war and the new rise of the revolution.

## CEYLON PEARL OF THE ORIENT

John Fisher

*"CEYLON! The island shaped like a great pearl; the land of opalescent light and of deep forest, of high mountains and great valleys, of luscious paddy-fields and giant patnas. A fairy place of legend and story, it has been the Kingdom of mighty Kings and the Colony of great Empires. . . ."*

SO said my guide-book, issued gratis by the Orient Co. as the liner *Orford* moved to its moorings in the harbor of Colombo. Though *The Times*, of London, had stated that half a million of Ceylon's five million people were still badly

affected by the recent malaria epidemic, we were all anxious to visit this beautiful island, pearl of the Orient—the land where, as a great churchman and writer of hymns has set on record, "every prospect pleases. . . ."

But Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe, solitary Socialist member of the Ceylon State Council, was not so much concerned with the pleasantness of the prospects, as with the vileness of the men who marred it.

One of these men, in the guise of a harbor policeman, had unwittingly put me on the trail of the Doctor. It was March, 1935. Egon Erwin Kisch, Czechoslovak author had toured Australia to point the danger of Hitlerism—the Nazi threat to Czechoslovakia and other countries. The Lyons-Menzies Government had branded this as the worst type of subversive and Bolshevik propaganda, and had used every legal and illegal means at their disposal to gaol and deport him. Kisch had won through, and was wending his way triumphantly homeward. With true-blue sportsmanship, he was refused permission to land at Colombo. He did me the honor of asking me to do what I could about it.

All roads, for those in confinement on the sea, seemed to lead to Dr. Wickremasinghe. After a few hours spent in finding him, and getting back on to the ship, and arguing with the harbor police, it was agreed on all sides that it would save a lot of trouble if Kisch were allowed ashore.

In the course of all this, we learnt a good deal about Ceylon from one of its most patriotic citizens.

The peoples of Ceylon, the Doctor said, realised that they had an important part to play in the scheme of Empire defence, as a base for the British India Squadron. But, he added, with gloomy humor, those

white men with their all-important investments in the island had failed to realise the great truth that rice and other foods, though less profitable to cultivate than rubber or tea, were more digestible and sustaining for the native stomach—and more capable of preventing the widespread malnutrition that opened the door to malaria.

"A drought in the island left a network of shallow pools and stagnant water, to breed the anopheles mosquito," he said, "For economy's sake, the pools were not sprayed. Badly under-nourished, half a million people were too weak to resist the scourge of malaria. Whole villages were wiped out because no relief came. . . ."

"The plight of our children is terrible, terrible. The infant mortality in what you call the good old days—that is, before the epidemic—was 157 per thousand, with hook-worm and round-worm competing with malaria as our best baby-killer. The maternal mortality was over 200 per thousand. So you can see that our people were not in a good condition to stand up against an epidemic. . . ."

"There are exactly 811 qualified doctors in the whole of Ceylon. This works out at one for every 6000 inhabitants. But, as the 9000 white people enjoy a better average than this, the average for our people is somewhat smaller. And, unfortunately, there is a great deal of unemployment among these 811 doctors, because so few people have money to pay for their services. They find it cheaper to die."

The Doctor spoke bitterly. A

slim handsome figure in native robes, he showed signs of the malaria that had laid him low while working in the stricken villages. As we drove in his car towards one of the bush hospitals hastily improvised under his care, he gave further statistics to show how this part of the Empire had been ruled.

"Between 30 and 38 per cent. of children in the comparatively healthy Colombo and coastal districts," he said, "show definite diseases due to malnutrition. London experts tell me that this indicates that at least 90 per cent. malnutrition exists in these areas. . . ."

We were speeding along jungle roads lined with tall graceful palms like cathedral arches. And my guide-book told me, "perhaps, for many, the greatest pleasure of all in Ceylon will be found in the roadside scenes, where glimpses are caught of the everyday life of the people. The cadjan huts with the housewife cooking the rice; beautiful golden-hued babies being tubbed in a basin; a wedding house decorated with fine blooms. . . ."

A living skeleton in rags, clutching a shivering bundle to her hideous breasts, glared at us from the roadside as we hurtled past, and I was glad to turn aside again to the Doctor and his gloomy statistics.

"Take, for example," he was saying to Kisch, who was putting it down in jerky shorthand, with an overworked pencil-stub, "the case of a typical 'well-placed' government employee, Mrs. A. Podinona, widow with five children, employed at the General Hospital in Colombo as an

experienced attendant. This lucky woman gets a monthly salary of 19 rupees or a little less—about 30/- in English money. She pays half of this in rent for a tenement consisting of one room and a kitchen, and the rest she spends in bringing up her family—when she gets time. She starts work at 6.30 a.m., and works 12 hours a day seven days a week. About once a month, if lucky, she gets a Sunday off, and she is entitled to 14 days' sick pay. But she represents the aristocracy of labor; she is a government employee. And the government, some of the planters will tell you, are a gang of professional philanthropists. Daily-paid workers in private industry are not treated so handsomely. . . ."

"... a village procession going to a neighboring temple, the women carrying flowers, the children holding banners, and a few tom-toms beating; devil dancers performing the rites for some afflicted person; a young bridegroom and his bride, off to visit friends, and dressed in all their finery, the admiration of the whole village. . . ."

But the Ceylon of the guide-book pipe-dream is dispelled by the voice of the Doctor, who speaks bitterly of tens of thousands of children, British subjects one and all, sold into "adoption" and virtual slavery to families of higher caste; thousands of girls, inarticulate and suffering from the same grinding poverty that afflicts the desperate parents of the hapless slave-children—abducted to fill the city brothels under the eyes of high officials. . . .

(To be Concluded Next Month.)

# THE REAL ISSUE OF THE WAR

R. Dixon

ON September 3, 1939, Australia became a participant in the imperialist war that had broken out in Europe. The government made no pretence at consulting the Australian people before taking this terrible decision. Mr. Menzies, although insecure in his position as Prime Minister, declared war on Germany after the announcement of the British declaration of war.

The governments of Britain, South Africa, Canada, etc., did consult Parliament, if not the people, before declaring war. Not so Mr. Menzies. Like Hitler he made the decision himself, or with the small coterie surrounding him. Parliament was convened on September 6, three days later, and fronted with a *fait accompli*. And yet we are blandly informed that this is a war for democracy against fascism! Well might we ask: Where is the democracy?

Mr. Menzies claims that legally Australia was at war with Germany from the moment Britain declared war.

The law can always be relied upon to supply arguments to justify the infamous and reactionary aims of the capitalist class, especially when slick lawyers have anything to do with it.

According to Mr. Menzies Australia can be dragged, willy-nilly, behind the predatory aims and policies of the British Conservatives.

Those who know British history know that it is crowded with wars of conquest which are abhorrent to us.

And is this war any different?

Is there any justification for Australian participation in this war?

Before going on to answer that question, it might be as well to draw attention to one aspect of the last war.

Everyone knows that the last war brought practically every country participating in it to the verge of bankruptcy and has left a burden of debt which persists to this day. But, strange as it may seem, in spite of this enormous debt and seeming impoverishment every capitalist country produced a new crop of millionaires. Poverty and distress spread to 99 per cent. of the people but 1 per cent. thrived on the war as they had never thrived before. And that 1 per cent. has continued to thrive, for the payments off the so-called debt of the last war are still flowing into their pockets.

We were told that the last war was waged to "make the world safe for democracy," that it was a "war to end war," to "defend the rights of small nations" and to "make the world fit for heroes to live in," etc.

This present war is being waged under slogans somewhat similar to the last slogans which hide the real character of the war.

The fact is that this war is a reactionary imperialist war, a war being waged by the great imperialist powers, Britain, France and Germany, for markets, sources of raw materials and for colonies.

The British capitalist class enslave 480,000,000 peoples in the colonies, the French capitalists 70,000,000. Today they are waging war against German imperialism, to maintain their world domination and their right to go on exploiting and oppressing the colonial peoples in India, Africa and other parts of the world.

In order to understand the downright reactionary character of the war some consideration of the race of the great financial interests and munitions manufacturers is necessary.

The war of 1914-18 provided an international sensation when it was revealed that British, Australian and French soldiers had been shot down by guns and shells provided by British and French armaments firms. Supplying their own country was not sufficiently profitable for the munitions manufacturer.

Since the last war there has been a very far-reaching linking up, or internationalisation, of the great armament firms and the British and French capitalists have considerable finance invested in the German munitions industry. More than this. The British financiers, the richest and most unscrupulous in the world, backed German rearmament, they provided the credit and the finance which made Hitler's vast war machine possible.

The British imperialists were planning for a war between German Fascism and Soviet Russia—hence their support for Hitler. Germany, it should be understood, was on the verge of bankruptcy and would have been quite unable to remilitarise without British help.

In the October number of the English "Labor Monthly" R. Palme Dutt gives some interesting figures on the exports of raw materials from Britain and France to Germany, raw materials from which munitions are manufactured, and for which the British bankers provided credit. He showed that in the year 1938 Germany received from the British and French Empires: 26 per cent. of her supplies of iron ore, 33 per cent. of lead, 50 per cent. of chromium, 62 per cent. of copper, 61 per cent. of manganese, 94 per cent. of nickel, 60 per cent. of zinc and 52 per cent. of rubber.

"Without those supplies," wrote Dutt, "Germany could not have made war."

Right up to within two days of the Nazi invasion of Poland, British firms were supplying war materials to Germany. The nearer the approach to war, the more feverishly did the Germans buy and the British capitalists supply.

On August 19, thirteen days before the outbreak of war, the London paper, "News Chronicle" wrote:

"Huge German orders for rubber and copper were executed in London yesterday regardless of cost. The buying of nearly 3000 tons of

copper sent the price rocketing 18/9 to £44/18/9 a ton."

The soldiers of Britain and France are going to be mown down in this war in far greater numbers than in the last war by war materials supplied by British and French capitalists. And the British and Australian ruling classes, especially the super-patriots engaged in the very profitable production of war munitions, demand that workers shall become soldiers and sacrifice their lives in the sacred cause of profit-making at 2/- per day in Britain and 5/- in Australia. At the time of writing the Menzies Government is bitterly resisting proposals that the allowance to soldiers (5/- per day, 3/- for wife, 1/- for each child), which is absurdly inadequate, should be raised.

The lot of the workers in the factories is little better than that of the soldiers and their families, especially in Europe. Whether in Germany or the allied countries the most brutal exploitation and oppression has accompanied the war. Let us first take Germany.

Recently a special correspondent of the "New York Times" in Essen, described the conditions of the German workers in the Ruhr industries as follows:

"The standard eight-hour day has been extended to 10 hours and in some occupations, to 12 or 14 hours. Simultaneously production costs have been lowered by substantial wage cuts. . . . Overtime bonuses and paid vacations have been abolished."

And what of the workers in the allied countries?

In France, the 40-hour week has been abolished; in the factories a ten and twelve-hour day prevails and in some occupations a 15-hour day. In addition to this the French workers have lost their democratic rights and are subjected to the brutal role of a military dictatorship.

In Britain and Australia the capitalists have not dared to go as far as in Germany and France. As a result of the depredations of profiteers and the so-called governmental control of prices to "check profiteering," a control which has proved merely a blind to officially sanction price increases, there has been, since the beginning of the war, an all round rise in prices, and a consequent lowering of the real wages of the workers.

Thus, from whatever angle one may look at this war it becomes ever more apparent that the great financial interests have everything to gain for the war will make them richer and more dominant than ever. On the other hand the working class, the farmers and the middle class, the vast majority of the population, have everything to lose from the war, inasmuch as they will provide the cannon fodder and in the factories and fields will be more brutally exploited and oppressed by the capitalist class.

It is, therefore, true to say that this is a war between the ruling classes of Germany and the allied powers to determine which group of

imperialist slave drivers are to dominate the world.

A victory for either side in this war, the British and French no less than the German imperialists, will only result in the more complete enslavement of the working class than ever before.

To this war the working class can only have one attitude—that of resolute determination to seize upon every opportunity to hasten the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of Socialism.

The war of 1914-18 saw the establishment of working-class rule over one-sixth of the earth's surface.

The present war had not been in progress a month before Soviet Russia snatched 13 million former Soviet citizens of Eastern Poland from the greedy maw of capitalism. As I write the capitalists of the whole world are furiously attacking Soviet Russia for the measures it is employing to deal with the Finnish capitalists who are notorious for their brutal treatment of the working class of Finland.

The fact of the matter is that Soviet Russia is unhesitatingly advancing the cause of socialism throughout the world much to the horror of the capitalists.

The distress of the capitalists is only equalled by that of certain Labor Party leaders and reformist trade union officials. These well paid flunkies of imperialism are doing all in their power to spread hatred of Soviet Russia and to win the working class to support the imperialist war.

In Britain the Sir Walter Citrines, Atles and Greenwood, in France the Jouhoux and Blums have come out unreservedly on the side of their own imperialists in the war. In France it was Blum who most bitterly denounced the Communists and provided Daladier with the excuse to declare the Communist Party illegal and gaol thousands of its leaders.

In Australia the Langs, Caldwells, Forgan Smiths and others, all of whom support the war are demanding that the government should suppress the Communist Party. The betrayal of the working class by certain of the Labor Party leaders and reformist trade union officials is as complete and far-reaching as during the last war.

On Monday, November 20, Mr. Curtin, Federal Labor Party leader, in a speech in the Town Hall, Sydney, on the war, said:

"Australian Labor was unequivocally behind Britain in her struggle for the preservation of the British Commonwealth of Nations." The use of the deceptive phrase "British Commonwealth of Nations" is an attempt to mislead the working class. The fact is that this British Empire is a slave pen for 480,000,000 colonial peoples.

Apart from this, however, is the declaration of "unequivocal support" for British imperialism. The munitions manufacturers, the big financiers could ask for nothing better from the reformist leaders. In the same speech Mr. Curtin also disclosed the readiness of the Labor

Party to co-operate with the Menzies Government in the prosecution of the war. He said: "While Labor was prepared to co-operate with the present government to bring the war to a successful termination, it would jealously guard the liberties of the Australian people." In connection with his latter point, he failed to mention, of course, that leading members of his own party are the loudest in demanding the suppression of the Communist Party.

After stating Labor's war policy Mr. Curtin appealed for unity in the labor movement.

Briefly, the position of Curtin is as follows: To wholeheartedly support the British imperialists in the war and co-operate with the Menzies Government to help "bring the war to a successful termination."

This is a policy of betrayal of the working class. Nevertheless, Curtin unhesitatingly demands that the working class unite its forces on the basis of this policy.

On October 19, in an article in the "Daily News," Mr. Curtin referring to the last war, wrote:

Labor movements, disintegrated during the war, were not equal to winning the peace for the workers."

Why did they disintegrate? Because the leaders of Labor treacherously lined up with their own capi-

talist class in the prosecution of the war. The split in the ranks of the working class during the last war arose directly out of the reactionary policy of the Labor imperialists. The Curtins, Langs and Forgan Smiths are doing the same in this war — betraying the cause of the working class and splitting its ranks.

The issues before the working class today are:

For the imperialist war or against it; for capitalism or socialism.

It would seem that even the word "Socialism" has been eliminated from Mr. Curtin's vocabulary. And like other cheap flunkys of capitalism, he has joined in the chorus of hate against Soviet Russia. How completely are the Labor Party and reformist traitors united with the capitalists against Soviet Russia and Socialism!

In spite of the mistakes that were made in the first days of the war, the working-class movement is now rapidly swinging into action against the imperialists, is taking a stand against the war.

This process is creating panic in the ranks of the labor warmongers. It spells annihilation for them. Working class unity must be established on the basis of opposing the war and fighting against the capitalist class.

## THE LIFE OF STALIN

*December 20, 1939, was the 60th Birthday of comrade Stalin, the great leader of the international labor movement. For the people of the Soviet Union and the toilers of all lands this was a day of great rejoicing. Fervent greetings were sent to Stalin from all quarters of the U.S.S.R. and from every part of the world. Passages from the life story of this outstanding character are related in this article.*

### I.

#### Introduction

**J**OSEPH Vissarionovich Stalin (Djugashvili), Georgian by nationality, was born in 1879, in the town of Gori, Tiflis Province. His father, of peasant origin from the Didi-Lilo Village, Tiflis Province, was a worker in the Adelkhanov boot factory in Tiflis.

In 1893, Stalin finished the Gori Church School, and in the same year entered the Tiflis Orthodox Theological College. The College at that time was a hotbed of all kinds of liberal ideas among the youth of Tiflis, both Narodnik-nationalist and Marxist-internationalist. The College swarmed with study circles of all kinds. In 1897 Stalin began to lead a Marxist circle in the College. In the same year he established contact with illegal Social-Democratic organisations in Tiflis, was given illegal literature, took part in illegal workers' meetings in the Tiflis railway workshops etc.

In 1898, Stalin formally joined the Tiflis branch of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. At that time he conducted propagandist work in workers' circles in the rail-

way and workshop centres of Tiflis. In the College, where spies were well organised on the look-out for "suspicious characters," Stalin soon became suspected of illegal work, and expelled from the College as "politically undesirable."

The years 1899-1900 were spent by Stalin in intense propaganda work in workers' circles. In 1900, the Tiflis Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party was founded. Stalin became a member of the Tiflis committee and one of its prominent leaders. At that time the working-class movement in Tiflis was beginning to break through the old framework of purely propagandist work, conducted with the help only of the "more prominent" of the workers. Agitation among the masses on current events, through leaflets, pamphlets and political demonstrations against Tsarism, became the order of the day. There was much argument between the "old guard," supporters of the old methods of purely propagandist work, and the "young generation," supporters of "street" agitation. Stalin was with the "young generation." Here it is worth while mentioning in passing,

the prominent role played by Comrade Kurnatovsky, a close assistant of Lenin and the first promoter of Leninist ideas in Trans-Caucasia, in the introduction of new working methods for old, and also in connection with the revolutionary education of Comrade Stalin.

A wave of economic strikes throughout Tiflis in 1900-1901 and the famous political demonstrations in May in the centre of Tiflis, resulted in the break-up of the Tiflis Committee. The raid on Stalin's rooms in 1901, and the knowledge that a warrant was out for his arrest, forced him to go into hiding. From this time onwards Stalin became a professional "underground" revolutionary worker, and remained on underground work right up to the February Revolution in 1917, working under various revolutionary nicknames: "David," "Koba," "Nizheradze," "Chizhikov," "Ivanovich," "Stalin."

Towards the end of 1901, Stalin moved to Batum, formed there the Batum Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., led the strikes in the Rothschild and Mantashev workshops, and organised the famous political workers' demonstrations in February, 1902. In March 1902, Stalin was arrested in Batum, imprisoned till the end of 1903, and then exiled for three years to the Novaia Uda village, Balagansk District, Irkutsk province, Eastern Siberia.

A month after arriving at his destination (January 1904) Stalin escaped from exile, returned to Tiflis, and began to work as a member of the Trans-Caucasian organisa-

tion then known as the Trans-Caucasian Unity Committee. During the period 1904-1905, Stalin concentrated his whole work on the relentless struggle against Menshevism.

Stalin made a systematic tour of various parts of Trans-Caucasia (Batumi, Chiatura, Kutais, Tiflis, Baku), carrying on a campaign both orally and in the press against the Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, anarchists and Georgian-nationalists. As early as 1903, while in prison, hearing from comrades arriving from the Second Party Congress of the serious differences between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, Stalin had taken a firm stand on the side of the Bolsheviks. On his return from exile, when the struggle between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks became more violent, Stalin took his stand at the head of the Trans-Caucasian Bolsheviks, took charge of the Bolshevik illegal organ "Proletarian Struggle" (1905), and took a most active part in the organisational work for the Third Bolshevik Congress. The "October Manifesto" in 1905 found Stalin in Tiflis in the thick of the struggle for Bolshevik revolutionary slogans. Stalin's pamphlet, "Briefly Concerning Party Differences," written in Georgian, belongs to this period. At the end of 1905, Stalin went as delegate from the Trans-Caucasian Bolsheviks to the All-Russian Bolshevik Conference in Tammerfors (Finland), where he first came into direct contact with Lenin.

The year 1906 saw the complete destruction of the 1905 revolution;

it was the period of elections to the "new" Duma and preparations for The Stockholm Party Congress. The Bolsheviks were for boycotting the Duma. The struggle between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks flared up with renewed ardour. Anarcho-syndicalist elements appeared on the scene. They made most noise in Tiflis. Stalin worked in the very heart of the struggle against all these anti-proletarian tendencies in Trans-Caucasia. The legal Bolshevik daily newspaper "Dro" ("Times") was issued in Tiflis at this period under Stalin's guidance. To this period also belongs a series of substantial articles by Stalin in the Georgian language on "Anarchism and Socialism." At the Stockholm Congress (1906) Stalin figured as a delegate from the Bolshevik section of the Tiflis organisation, and used the assumed name "Ivanovich."

With the year 1907 begins the Baku period of Stalin's revolutionary activities. Returning from the London Party Congress, to which he had gone as delegate from the Bolshevik section of the Tiflis organisation, Stalin left Tiflis and settled down in Baku, where he worked feverishly to rally the Baku organisation around the slogans of the London Party Congress. Here Stalin directed the illegal Bolshevik organ "Baku Worker," organised successfully the struggle to drive out the Mensheviks from the workers' districts of Baku (Balakhani, Bibi Eibat, Ghernyi Gorod, Belyi Gorod), led a big campaign for the conclusion of a collective agreement

between the workers and the oil magnates, and finally secured a complete victory for Bolshevism in the ranks of the Baku organisation. Since then Baku has been a citadel of Bolshevism.

In March, 1908, Stalin was arrested and, after eight months' imprisonment, exiled for three years to Solvychevodsk, Vologad province. A few months later he escaped and returned to Baku on illegal work.

In 1910 Stalin was again arrested and, after a few months in gaol, was exiled back to Solvychevodsk.

In 1911, Stalin again escaped from exile and by instruction of the Central Committee settled down in Petrograd. From that moment began the Petrograd period of Stalin's revolutionary activities. But not for long was Stalin to work in Petrograd. Once more he was arrested and returned to exile in Vologda.

At the end of 1911 he again escaped and returned to Petrograd where he carried on leading work in the Petrograd illegal organisation. In 1912, he became a member of the Party Central Committee, elected in his absence at the famous Prague Party Conference. Stalin toured the most important parts of Russia for the party, worked in preparation for the annual May Day demonstrations, edited the "Zvyesda" during the Lena strike days, and took a leading part in the work of founding the "Pravda."

In April 1912, Stalin was again arrested and after a few months in gaol was exiled to Narym for four years. In the summer of the same



year Stalin escaped to Petrograd, thereafter went to join Lenin in Cracow, took part in the well-known Cracow Bolshevik Conference towards the end of 1912, and returned again to Petrograd, where he took charge of the Bolshevik section of the Social Democratic fraction in the Duma, and directed the publication of the Bolshevik organs: "Zvyesda" and "Pravda." To this period belongs Stalin's pamphlet: "Marxism and the National Question."

In the spring of 1913 Stalin was again arrested and after a few months exiled to Turuhansk.

The years 1913-1916 Stalin spent in exile in Kureika village, Turuhansk.

After the 1917 February revolution, Stalin returned to Petrograd and participated in leading party work as a member of the Central Committee. At the April All-Russian Conference of Bolsheviks, when two tendencies were found to exist in the party, Stalin strongly defended the position of Lenin. In May, 1917, after the Conference, a Political Bureau of the Central Committee was formed, of which Stalin was elected a member. Since then, and up to the present day, Stalin has remained a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee. During the preparations for the November insurrection, Stalin worked in complete unison with Lenin. During the Kornilov days, during the Democratic Conference and Preliminary Parliament, during the direct organisation of the insurrection in November

1917, and finally, during the fierce arguments concerning the organisation of a "homogeneous All-Socialist Government" on the day after the Revolution—during all these periods of preparation for and consolidation of November, when the vacillations of a section of the party (Kamenev, Zinoviev) threatened to smash the revolution, Stalin remained the constant closest assistant and adherent of Lenin. During the period after the July demonstrations right up to October, when Lenin was in hiding, Stalin was actually in charge of the central organs of the party ("Worker and Soldier," "Proletarian," "The Worker," "The Workers' Path," etc.). Together with J. Sverdlov, Stalin also led the work of the semi-legal Sixth Congress of the Party which took place at that time. In the November days, Stalin was elected by the Central Committee a member of the "Piaterka" (Committee of Five for the political leadership of the insurrection) and of the "Semierka" (Committee of Seven for the organisational leadership of the insurrection).

Since 1917, Stalin has been a member of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets. From 1917-1923 he was People's Commissar for Nationalities, and from 1919-1922—People's Commissar for Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. Since 1922 Stalin has been one of the secretaries of the Central Committee of the party, which position he holds today. Since 1925 he has been a member of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.

During the civil war, Stalin spent

most of his time at the front. In 1918 (spring and summer), Stalin worked on the Tsarytsin front, organising, together with Voroshilov and Minin, the defence of Tsarytsin from Krasnov's troops. At the end of 1918, Stalin, together with Comrade Dzerzhinsky, made an inspection of the Third Army front near Perm, making every effort to assist in stopping our retreat. In the spring of 1919, Stalin worked on the Petrograd front, organising resistance to the first offensive of Yudenich on Petrograd. In the summer of 1919 Stalin worked on the western front in Smolensk, organising resistance to the Polish attack. In the winter of 1919 Stalin worked on the southern front against Denikin's troops, remaining there until the rout of Denikin and the occupation by our troops of Rostov and Odesa. In 1920 he worked on the South-west (anti-Polish) front, playing a direct and leading part in organising the breakthrough on the Polish front near Zhitomir, of freeing Kiev, and of moving our troops forward to the attack on Lvov. In the same year Stalin conducted defensive operations in Southern Ukraine against the attacks of Wrangel. From 1920-1923 Stalin was a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. He has been awarded the Order of the Red Banner for his military services. In 1923 and 1924 Stalin led the struggle of the Party against the Trotskyist opposition, then against the so-called "Leningrad" (Kamenev, Zinoviev) opposition; and finally against the

united opposition of 1925-27, exposing all the time their anti-Leninist, opportunist nature. At the Fourteenth Party Congress (1925) Stalin, developing the original ideas of Lenin, put forward the slogan of "industrialisation of the country" as the central task of the party. In the reconstruction period the Fifteenth Party Congress (1927) under Stalin's leadership, accomplished a complete turn in the direction of collectivisation of agriculture and a strong socialist attack on capitalist elements in town and village. In 1928 Stalin opportunely mobilised the party and the working class in the struggle against the Right danger (Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky), and brought about the complete defeat of the Right opposition. At every stage of the Party's fight on two fronts, Stalin with iron determination, firmness and extreme quick-sightedness, has successfully defended the Party's Leninist policy from attempts at revision and attacks, allowing no concession whatever to revisionism and opportunism either inside the party or in the ranks of the Communist International, no matter in what guise they make their appearance.

Stalin has written several books and pamphlets: "Questions of Leninism," "On the Road to October," "Concerning the Opposition" "Marxism and the National Question"—in which, in an extremely clear and comprehensive manner, he explains the most important questions of Leninism, and on the basis of Leninist theory puts forward the

concrete tasks of the proletarian dictatorship, and also unmasks the opportunist petty-bourgeois nature of Trotskyism and the Right deviation.

In these years since the death of Lenin, Stalin, the most outstanding

continuer of Lenin's work and his most orthodox disciple, the inspirer of all the principal measures taken by the party in its fight for the building of Socialism—has become the recognised leader of the Party and of the Communist International.



## A New Year Resolution

*With this issue the "Review" enters the fourth year of publication in the new and improved style.*

*The Editors have resolved to make it even better and more attractive in the New Year.*

*But a prerequisite to this is increased circulation.*

*The war has led to increased costs of production.*

*With sales at the present level the "Review" is barely paying its way.*

*Two solutions to this problem present themselves: (1) reduce costs by lowering the quality; (2) meet the increased costs by raising the circulation.*

*We think, and we know readers will agree that the second alternative is by far the best.*

*Therefore we appeal to you to make a New Year Resolution to get at least one new reader for our magazine.*

*Subscription sales are 1/6 for 3 months, 3/- for 6 months, and 6/- for a whole year.*

*Apply now for a sub. for yourself and a friend to:*

**MODERN PUBLISHERS PTY. LTD.**  
**312 RAWSON CHAMBERS,**  
**RAWSON PLACE, SYDNEY**

## Up-to-date Information On U.S.S.R.

OBTAINABLE BY SUBSCRIBING TO  
SOVIET PERIODICALS IN ENGLISH

### *Moscow News*

Illustrated weekly. Gives you a comprehensive, up-to-date and authoritative picture of the Soviet Union. News, features, interpretations of foreign events.

Twenty-four pages.

One year, price 8/-. Six months 4/-.

Single copy 2d.

### *Sovietland*

Illustrated monthly. Keeps you in touch with Soviet arts, letters and sciences. Feature articles on various phases of Soviet life. One year 8/-. six months 4/-, single copy 9d.

### *U.S.S.R. In Construction*

Richly illustrated monthly. The beautiful pictures show in a striking manner the Socialist industry, the sovkhoses and kolkhozes, the general culture, the people of the Soviet Union and their everyday life.

One year 12/-. six months 6/6, single copy 1/3.

### *International Literature*

Illustrated monthly. Devoted to Socialist culture in the U.S.S.R., to anti-fascist literature and art of all countries.

One year 8/-. six months 4/3, single copy 9d.

### Combined annual subscription rates:

MOSCOW NEWS AND SOVIETLAND	14/-
MOSCOW NEWS AND U.S.S.R. IN CONSTRUCTION	17/-
MOSCOW NEWS AND INTER- NATIONAL LITERATURE . . . .	15/-

*Orders to be placed with:*

**MODERN PUBLISHERS PTY. LTD.**  
**312 Rawson Chambers,**  
**Rawson Place, Sydney**