

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 60.

AUGUST, 1946

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

THE QUEENSLAND MEAT STRIKE	J. C. Henry	227
REACTION BEATS ITS WAR DRUMS	William Z. Foster	234
SPEECHES TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING	(L. L. Sharkey	238
	(T. Wright	239
	(R. Gibson	240
	(E. Ross	240
BRITISH COMMUNISTS CHALLENGE BEVINISM ..	C.P.G.B.	241
THE VATICAN'S WAR ON PEACE	V. J. Jerome	243
ARTS AND SCIENCES AND THE WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE	J. D. Blake	247
TEACHERS AGAINST REACTION	W. E. Gollan, B.A.	250
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	251
BOOK REVIEW	(Dr. G. P. O'Day	252
	(S. Moston	254
DUSTS	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	255

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

THE QUEENSLAND MEAT STRIKE

J. C. HENRY

THE Queensland Meat Strike was the greatest industrial struggle in the history of the northern State. Commencing in a relatively unimportant bacon factory in Brisbane on 8th March it extended into a state-wide strike of meat workers, coal miners and waterside workers, with sections of many other unions directly involved. Railways and trams were reduced to a skeleton service, the city and country towns to semi-darkness. Trade was paralysed and industry tottering to a complete halt before the strike terminated on 10th-11th July.

Starting as a struggle of 120 meat workers against the employers in a single factory, the strike developed into a struggle between the workers in the meat industry and the meat bosses, and from there to a struggle between the workers as a class and the capitalists as a class and those instruments of the capitalist class, the Government, Arbitration Court, the daily press and weaklings in the trade unions.

In 18 weeks of glorious struggle the working class, fighting under the leadership of the Trades and Labor Council, defied all the power of the ruling class, its ghost stories about court orders, enforced secret ballots, etc., and wrote a new page in the history of the Australian labor movement.

The strike commenced on the question of seniority in employment, was fought and supported on that issue.

Owing to weaknesses of certain of the A.M.I.E.U. Southern District officials many bacon factory workers scabbed before the strike ended. These same weaklings, supported by an element on the State leadership of the A.M.I.E.U., finally opened the workers' front for the Government to get out of the debacle of its secret ballot and issue an order to return to work at the very time victory was at hand because of the solidarity action of the miners and watersiders. The Government order represented a partial victory but was in many respects unsatisfactory.

The split in the A.M.I.E.U. leadership threatened to do what the ruling class had failed to do in 18 weeks of the bitterest struggle, split and destroy the A.M.I.E.U. from within.

The Disputes Committee, aided by the fighting leaders of the A.M.I.E.U., was forced to seek such additional assurances as the strength of the watersiders and miners could gain and recommend a general resumption of work.

To understand the points at issue and the development of the struggle it is necessary to explain the meat industry set-up.

There are three main sections in the Queensland meat industry—namely, the Export, Bacon Factory and Retail Sections.

The workers in the Retail Section are spread in hundreds of small shops over the State, many of

which are semi-family concerns, and have no real fighting strength.

The Export Section covers the big meat factories owned by Borthwicks, Swifts and Vesteys which are linked to the British-American meat cartels, and the Brisbane Abattoirs, a semi-governmental concern, constitutes the basis of the organisational and numerical strength of the powerful Australian Meat Employers' Industrial Union. Here the Union supplies the labor. No meat workers can start work without a permit from the union office. The union is organised on the job. The job organisation is based on the departments in the factory, with the Board of Control representing the workers in the factory as a whole the governing authority. In battles extending over thirty years the union has enforced seniority because it exercises job control. But the employers refused to recognise seniority though it was established in practice.

The Bacon Factory section has developed and during the war had greatly strengthened its organisation and fighting strength compared with past years. The organisational form approximates that of the export section but the factories are relatively small. But here the labor is picked up by the boss at the gate. During the war the union was able to enforce seniority to a fairly high degree.

Before the war ended, but particularly since then, the meat bosses have been attacking the vital union principle of seniority in both the export and bacon factory sections in different parts of the State. The union had defeated these attacks in a series of struggles which were confined to the particular factories concerned.

On the 27th February four men dismissed from the Brisbane Abattoirs were reinstated after a two-day strike called on a Secret Ballot vote of 716 for, 61 against, and the Queensland Meat Board entered into a written agreement with the A.M.I.E.U. recognising seniority.

The decision of the Meat Board to give written recognition to the principle of seniority caused the meat bosses considerable alarm and they decided to launch an offensive. The meat bosses aimed to prevent the establishment of seniority in the Bacon Factory section and to destroy the power of the union to continue to enforce it in the export section by smashing its control of labor. The meat bosses also wanted to head off the demands being raised by the union on holiday and sick pay, the inclusion of the war loadings in the wage rate, etc.

The attack was launched at the Murarrie Bacon Factory. Four men with 15 to 20 years' service were dismissed while men with only 3 months' service were kept on. The general manager said, "We maintain that we have the right to pick our

An index of the 1945 issues of the Communist Review is now available. Copies may be obtained by sending a stamped and addressed envelope to Review Management, 695 George Street, Sydney.

100 bound copies of the Communist Review for 1946 will be available early next year. Orders for these will be accepted now and should be sent to the above address.

own labor, and to dispense with it as we think fit, and we intend to stand on that attitude."

The members of the union in the factory ceased work.

The Union Executive ordered the men back to work and reported the matter to the Industrial Court. The Court ordered a compulsory conference of the parties. The conference, which took place on 7th March, proved abortive.

The members of the A.M.I.E.U. at the factory decided by 112 votes to 7 in a secret ballot to strike. The union decided to take up the bosses' challenge and demanded the reinstatement of the 4 men, which meant, in effect, the enforcement of the principle of seniority in the factory concerned. This constituted a direct test for the bacon factory section and indirectly for the industry as a whole.

The Bacon Factory Association approached the Industrial Court for an order directing the men at Murarrie to return to work. The representative of the employers' federation lined up with the bacon factory manager on the question of hire and fire. The Court did not grant the order directing the men back to work. The strike continued.

On 13th March the employers fired the second shot in their attack when 6 girls with years of seniority were sacked from the Oxley Bacon Factory. A.M.I.E.U. members at Oxley, in a secret ballot, decided by 141 votes to 15 not to return to work till the girls were re-instated and seniority recognised.

On 15th March a special correspondent, expressing the views of the Employers' Federation, writing in the "Courier Mail" said "that the employers as a body were disturbed by the Meat Board's decision on 26th February to accept the principle of seniority. The Meat Board was a state instrumentality but private operators saw the danger in ceding the principle of seniority might be felt throughout the meat trade, and probably beyond."

At this stage meat bosses of both Bacon and Export Sections were united and they were supported by the Queensland Employers' Federation. They were out to prevent the recognition of seniority and to smash the A.M.I.E.U.

Realising the position, the A.M.I.E.U. leaders considered it impossible to defeat the employers unaided or by engaging them in the bacon factory alone. The A.M.I.E.U. approached the Queensland Trades and Labor Council's Disputes Committee for assistance on 13th March. The Disputes Committee pledged full support to the meat workers and placed a black ban on the Murarrie Bacon Factory as from Saturday, 16th March.

On 18th March, at the request of the A.M.I.E.U., the Disputes Committee, with representatives of all unions immediately affected, declared the Oxley factory black. All unions were requested to instruct members not to handle any goods from the black factories.

On 19th March a 1-day stop work meeting of all members of the A.M.I.E.U. in the Southern

District was held. (There are three Districts in the A.M.I.E.U. in Queensland — Southern, Central and Northern.) This largely attended meeting decided to cease work in 7 days if the dismissed members were not re-engaged and seniority recognised. It was also decided that, if this course became necessary, the State Executive should recommend an extension of the dispute to the central and northern districts.

This meeting expressed appreciation of the actions of the T.L.C. Disputes Committee and asked that the A.C.T.U. be notified that the dispute was in furtherance of the policy of the A.C.T.U. on the question of seniority.

On 25th March the employers announced that they would immediately proceed to work the "black" Murarrie factory and that former employees could apply for re-employment. The Country Party supported the call for scabs at Murarrie.

A compulsory conference called by the Court broke down. Mr. Hanlon, the State Premier, then invited the parties to a conference with himself and Mr. Gair, Minister for Mines. The union proposed that the basis of settlement be the Abattoirs agreement on seniority. The representative of the employers would not accept this. No agreement was reached.

On 28th March a compulsory conference was called by the Arbitration Court. The Court proposed a basis for settlement and the union submitted a counter proposal based on its policy. The employers' representative made it clear that he would not move from the right to hire and fire. This conference also broke down.

At a meeting of the State Executive and Southern District Council of the A.M.I.E.U. it was decided to extend the strike and 6,000 meat workers were called out on 29th March.

The State Cabinet attacked the T.L.C. Disputes Committee, blaming it for calling out the meat workers. The Cabinet commenced to line up with the employers. It had a serious rail struggle on its hands as a result of its own attack on railwaymen's conditions in the workshops. The "Courier Mail" reported that one Government member, speaking of the railway position, said, "We are all in this. If a fight has to come it may as well be now."

The Meat Board, which controls the Abattoirs and the export companies, decided to cancel all agreements and understandings with the A.M.I.E.U. This included the seniority agreement. The Employers' Federation and the capitalist press commenced an anti-Communist attack upon the meat workers, the Disputes Committee and the working class.

On 3rd April the Arbitration Court cancelled preference to the A.M.I.E.U. under the Bacon Manufacturing Award. The unions then declared "black" all bacon factories in the Southern District and the Redbank and Maxam Meat Processing

plants. In addition to members of the A.E.U., F.E.D. & F.A., E.T.U. and Road Transport Workers, Railwaymen now became involved because of the application of black bans.

Hanlon told the Secretary of the Meat Union that the Government could do nothing further in the matter.

On 5th April a mass meeting of meatworkers in Brisbane expressed confidence in the Disputes Committee and called upon the Government to amend the Arbitration Act to provide recognition of length of service based on a fair average standard of efficiency for all workers.

At this stage the T.L.C. Executive re-affirmed the full support of the trade union movement to the meat workers and decided that all unions should immediately commence to raise finance and to launch an interstate campaign for finance for the meat workers and other unionists involved in the struggle.

On 12th April the employers reported that some scabs had responded to their call for labor in the Toowoomba, Dobby bacon factories and that farmers had commenced to work Murarrie. A few members of the A.M.I.E.U. scabbed at Toowoomba and Dobby.

The Queensland Colliery Employees' Union decided not to supply coal to any works involved in the dispute. The State Executive of the Meat Union asked the Federal body to recommend complete active support in all states in support of the Queensland strike.

It was now clear that only federal intervention could bring a settlement and avoid a protracted strike which would ultimately involve other industries. The State Government, Arbitration Court and the employers bitterly opposed Federal intervention.

On 2nd April, 2,300 railway workshops employees at Ipswich had ceased work.

During this period a very intense struggle was proceeding in the railways for united action throughout the whole service on the workshops issue. Mass meetings of rail men, while giving a majority for strike action, reflected confusion in many depots. Rail leaders were negotiating, procrastinating and altering the deadline for strike action. As the railways are the nerve centre of Queensland industry this struggle distracted attention from the meat strike, threw added work on to union leaders and weakened attention to the measures necessary to strengthen the meat strike. The final deadline was fixed for Tuesday, 16th April, but the dispute was settled without a general strike of railmen.

On 17th April the Disputes Committee said it had endeavored to restrict the strike to the meat industry, but by introducing scab labor the employers had made it impossible to continue that limitation. The unions withdrew members from factories employing scabs. The railway black bans to and from all meat establishments were

strengthened. Waterside workers refused to handle meat works material in or out of ports.

Picket lines were at last established at the Abattoirs, Borthwick's and the bacon factories in the Brisbane area, and had a powerful effect in building morale and deterring scabs.

On 24th April the Arbitration Court, on the application of the employers, cancelled the Abattoirs and Export awards giving preference to members of the A.M.I.E.U. The Court indulged in its usual slander of trade union leaders, accusing them of having pulled the members out on strike.

On 30th April the Arbitration Court took action on its own accord to get a resumption of work at the Abattoirs. The aim of the court was to split the meatworkers by getting their main strength in the southern district back to work and also prevent the union from getting solidarity support from other industries. The union would not agree.

The Court ordered the meat workers in the abattoirs, export sections and bacon factories throughout Queensland to resume work not later than 15th May on the existing awards. When the union secretary asked permission to make a statement he was refused. Justice Matthews said, "We are not interested in the merits of the matter at all. All we are interested in is the date of resumption of work."

On 3rd May the mass meeting of meatworkers rejected the court's order. Mr. Neuman accused the court of a partisan attitude. Mr. Harvey, President of the T.L.C., said, "There should be no resumption unless at least pre-strike conditions are guaranteed." Had the Court's order been accepted the A.M.I.E.U. would have received a crushing defeat, as many of its conditions, including those which enable it to enforce seniority in the export factories, are not included in awards.

Seizing on the Court Order and presenting the question as one of Arbitration and peaceful methods or violence and revolution, the daily press, assisted by all kinds of reaction, led the most distorted and vicious anti-strike, anti-working class and anti-Communist campaign. Understanding the cowardice and fears of some on the leading body of the meat workers, reaction exerted itself to split the union leadership, divide the A.M.I.E.U. from the T.L.C., shatter the rank and file and annihilate the meat union.

On the 9th and 10th May the Premier held a series of conferences with the employers and the disputing committee. These conferences failed because the best offered the men was to return on the Court's order.

The reason given for holding these conferences was that the Federal Minister for Commerce had expressed concern about the duration of the strike and its effects on meat for Britain. Actually they were little more than part of the general campaign of reaction to raise hopes of a settlement and split the meat workers' leadership.

On 16th May the Disputes Committee decided to seek Federal intervention in an effort to bring about a settlement and Mr. Neuman of the A.M.I.E.U. and Mr. Macdonald of the Disputes Committee went to Melbourne.

The Industrial Court gave the A.M.I.E.U. one week to resume work or the union would be de-registered. In a long typewritten statement, obviously prepared before the case was heard, the Court attacked the strike, the A.M.I.E.U. and the Disputes Committee.

It was clear that the State Government was preventing the federal government from assisting a settlement of the dispute.

The miners' union asked its federal body to demand Federal intervention and asked Hanlon to co-operate with the Federal authorities to bring about a resumption on pre-strike conditions.

Both the A.M.I.E.U. and Federal Minister Holloway asked the court to give a stay of proceedings on the deregistration of the A.M.I.E.U. The court refused and the union was de-registered on 22nd May. The haste was to make Federal intervention more difficult, open the way for police action against picketing, and to intimidate the meat workers.

With Mr. Neuman still in Melbourne, the weak men on the A.M.I.E.U. leadership recommended to the Disputes Committee that a mass meeting be held to consider a resumption. As the representatives in Melbourne reported progress in the direction of Federal action the Disputes Committee decided no good purpose would be served by such a meeting while negotiations were still proceeding.

After hearing reports from their representatives on the negotiation with the Federal authorities the Disputes Committee decided that a deputation wait on the Premier in a final effort to reach a satisfactory settlement. No satisfaction was gained.

As soon as the deregistration took place Hanlon's police broke up the picket lines and further scabs, including many members of the bacon factory section of the A.M.I.E.U., went into four bacon factories in the Southern District. Kearney, organiser of the Bacon Factory Section, and Dixon, Southern District Secretary A.M.I.E.U., contributed to the weakening of members in this section.

In view of the line-up of the whole employing class, the court and the Government against the strike, the Disputes Committee decided to call a conference with waterside workers, coal miners and rail unions for the purpose of extending the strike and preventing the defeat of the A.M.I.E.U. by forcing a settlement.

F.E.D. & F.A. men working at the New Farm Power House turned down a proposal to strike against supplying power to scab factories.

Watersiders decided that all products treated at meat and bacon factories not agreed to by the A.M.I.E.U. would not be handled. Seamen at the monthly stop-work meetings decided not to man ships in which there were any scab products.

The railway was the weakest position as far as the workers' front was concerned. All the force of the capitalist press and of the reaction within the labor movement from the right wing in the Cabinet and the leaders of the smaller rail unions concentrated their full blast to prevent railmen from taking action.

At a State-wide mass meeting of miners, railway men and waterside workers held on Wednesday, 12th June, the two decisive rail unions, the A.R.U. and the A.F.U.L.E., decided for strike as from midnight on Monday, 17th June. The Waterside decision was similar to that of the railway workers. The Miners, by a three to one majority, decided to cease work immediately, which they did.

The Executive of the Railway Unions decided, on the recommendation of the A.R.U. leadership, to postpone their strike till midnight on Wednesday, 19th May. As Monday was a holiday the court would not have been able to hear the injunction had the date not been put back two days.

The Maintenance Union, Guards and Shunters, Salaried Officers and Station Masters came out openly to break the rail strike. They approached the Arbitration Court for an injunction restraining the A.R.U. and A.F.U.L.E. from calling the strike.

The line-up of unions in the Court on Wednesday, 19th, was very interesting. Those supporting the injunction represented approximately 25 per cent. of rail workers. The unions opposing the injunction represented 75 per cent. of railway men. The decision of the Court was a foregone conclusion. It ordered the railmen not to strike, made a political attack upon the meat workers, the Disputes Committee, and Communists, and in effect said that the bosses were right in sacking the 4 meat workers though the Court had never heard the case. Unlike the meat workers' case where the Court read its lengthy typewritten judgment immediately, on this occasion the Court adjourned for lunch before reading the typewritten judgment.

The leadership of the A.F.U.L.E. and A.R.U. now had to decide whether to give effect to the decisions of the mass meeting of their members or to give effect to the anti-working class order of the court.

The sustained attacks of reaction certainly put fear into the hearts of a number of executive members of the A.F.U.L.E. and A.R.U. Inspired telegrams came into the A.F.U.L.E. Executive meeting which was proceeding on Wednesday afternoon and it was decided to make a last-minute appeal to the Premier to lift the fines on railway men. The deputation was accompanied by two State officers of the A.R.U. This show of weakness naturally caused the Premier and Mr. Walsh, Minister for Railways, to adopt a firm stand. When the A.F.U.L.E. Executive re-assembled more inspired telegrams had accumulated. A majority took greater fright and decided to call the strike off. By air and phone the A.R.U. executive advised

mass meetings of members held that night not to proceed with the strike.

The mass meetings of A.R.U. members, which had the best attendances for years, confirmed the estimate that the rank and file of railway men were prepared for struggle. The great majority of rail men felt shame and humiliation. This was worse a little later when the government paid off thousands of rail men and put the remainder on short time as a result of the action of the miners.

The struggle in the railways had distracted considerable attention from other aspects of the meat strike for the second time.

The waterside workers ceased work in all Queensland meat ports at midnight on Wednesday, 19th, as agreed. On Thursday morning bosses' men and politicians' puppets, assisted by C.A. reactionaries, made an attempt to stampede the Brisbane watersiders to work at the pick-up shed at starting time. The press joined the battle to break the watersiders, but unionism won the day. 'A very big meeting of members on Friday, 21st June, decided without dissent to continue the struggle with the miners in support of the meat workers.

The action of the watersiders gave the working class new heart after the failure of railway action. They felt confident of victory, though it would take longer for the action of miners and watersiders to exert the necessary pressure on industry to force a settlement.

On 20th June meat workers at Auburn and Riverstone plants in N.S.W. decided for a 24 hour stoppage to consider action in support of the Queensland Branch. A mass meeting at Homebush was against a stoppage and the N.S.W. executive refused to agree to a stop work meeting. This prevented the extension of the dispute on a Federal basis.

The coal strike was now becoming effective. On the 22nd the Government cut all Sunday and excursion trains and forecast a 5 per cent. cut in electricity and gas. Next day a state of emergency was declared under section 22 of the State Transport Act, a piece of semi-fascist legislation enacted in 1938 by the Forgan Smith regime.

Over this week-end a conference called by the Federal Meat Controller took place with the employers on the 4th floor and unions on the second floor, with Tonkin acting as liaison. This conference got nowhere.

On the 25th the Prime Minister's office officially stated that the Federal Government would not intervene in the dispute. The Queensland Chamber of Manufacturers applied to the Court for a general order to stand down employees without pay in case of emergency. This was granted.

Next day drastic cuts in electricity and gas were made. These cut the manufacture of gas and electricity, closed the hotels and picture houses and threw thousands out of work. The aim to arouse hostility to the strike failed. The workers saw each new cut as a step nearer victory.

On 27th June the Cabinet meeting late used

its emergency powers to order a Secret Ballot of meat workers. Hanlon said that the union would conduct the ballot which would be taken as soon as practicable. Next morning at opening time the police raided the union office in the Trades Hall, Brisbane, and seized the union records. No receipts or assurances about their return were given, though asked for. Similar raids took place at the same time at the offices of the Central District at Rockhampton and the Northern District at Townsville. Hanlon lied to the press to deceive the union, then conducted a raid on the union unprecedented in Australian history.

A mass meeting of strikers held the same day condemned the action of the Government and marched to demonstrate before the Executive Building, while a deputation went in to interview Hanlon. The unions demanded that he call off the ballot and use the emergency powers to order the meat bosses to re-open the factories on the terms of the unions. He undertook to submit the proposals to Cabinet.

Cabinet met and used the emergency powers to call the employers and the unions into conference. The conference adjourned after eight hours' session and broke down next morning.

A mass meeting of meat workers taking place at the same time as the conference expressed concern at the newspaper statements indicating that a settlement might be reached on terms other than those decided at mass meeting and instructed delegates to accept nothing less than the full terms of the unions. The meeting also adopted a policy on the secret ballot being conducted by the Industrial Registrar. This condemned the Government for interfering in the internal affairs of the union, called for a 'NO' vote, stated that the conduct of the ballot was undemocratic and open to fraud and called upon the Disputes Committee to call mass meetings, after the ballot was declared, at which the conditions of any return to work would be made. Mass meetings of meat workers in all centres carried similar resolutions.

The ballot was proceeded with as a postal ballot conducted by the Industrial Registrar assisted by Government servants. The union was excluded. The ballot was attacked openly and in unauthorised leaflets from one end of the State to the other.

Evidence soon came to light that people in no way connected with the A.M.I.E.U. were receiving ballot papers and that many meat workers received two papers, and one case of a man receiving three ballot papers was reported. It looked like a real A.L.P. plebiscite with all affiliated unions in on it. To crown the lot, the Industrial Registrar let slip to the press, which published it, that he had already issued 10,300 odd ballot papers and was still busy, while all people in trade union circles knew that the total membership of the A.M.I.E.U. was less than 8,000. The press dropped all mention of it after this.

The Government-forced-and-conducted secret ballot proved the greatest fiasco in the history of the

The working class were enraged. The State. The working class were enraged. The Government had received a terrible blow. It could not stand up to calling it off unless the strike could be ended. The day had to be saved and all the forces opposed to the workers conspired behind the scenes with the worst elements within the labor movement to save the day against the power of the unions.

The day for the declaration of the ballot was 10th July. It couldn't be declared, but the Government could not stand up to calling it off unless the strike could be ended. The day had to be saved and all the forces opposed to the workers conspired behind the scenes with the worst elements within the labor movement to save the day against the power of the unions.

On the morning of Thursday, 4th July, sound-outs were made to a militant leader in the Trades Hall from interstate on minimum terms and it was suggested that, if asked, Hanlon would issue an order for resumption under the emergency law. In reply the union leader approached stated the full terms of the union.

The Brisbane "Telegraph" came out with full headlines that the Reds were going to drop the meat strike, wash it up, and concentrate on the coal industry.

That evening the State Executive of the A.M.I.E.U., plus the paid officials and chairman of the Southern District, the body that conducted the affairs of the strike for the meat union, met. At this meeting Kearney, organiser of the bacon factory section, moved a resolution which subsequent events proved had been inspired if not written by Government circles. This resolution recommended that the Disputes Committee request the Government to issue an order under the emergency powers to end the meat strike. This was carried by 4 votes to 2. It is easy to work out that those for it were Kearney, Dixon, Thornton and Mansfield, and those against Neuman, Cottam and Ridsdale, with President Fields having no vote. Loder, another Southern organiser, was in the South at this time. The plan was clear. The Disputes Committee was to meet on Friday morning, the Queensland Central Executive of the A.L.P. in the afternoon, and the Cabinet at night. The aim was to have all these bodies ask the Government to act on the majority resolution of the meat leadership. The weaklings would sell the strike and the press would blame the "reds."

This plan misfired. The Disputes Committee did not meet till the afternoon and no decision was reached till night. The decision rejected the recommendation of the majority of one in the meat leadership because it violated the decisions of the rank and file of the meat workers, expressed in mass meetings a few days before, and of the trade union movement. The Q.C.E. meeting could not take place and the Cabinet was left in the position of having to make a decision without backing from the labor movement. In the early hours of Saturday morning the Cabinet issued an order under its emergency power directing the meat companies to open the

factories and the union to supply labor in accordance with past practice; disagreements on past practices of supplying labor to be referred to an industrial magistrate; a conference to be held within 14 days, matters not agreed upon in conference to be referred into court. The same order cancelled the secret ballot.

The strike leadership was now faced with an entirely new situation. The order was a big improvement on the Arbitration Court's order of 2nd May and the terms offered by the employers. The key point for the export section and Abattoirs and the foundation stone of the union's power had been conceded.

The split in the A.M.I.E.U. leadership was serious and while it would be easy to defeat these weaklings in the meat workers' mass meetings throughout the State, they would split a section away in the Southern District. The meat workers had had 18 weeks of struggle and a split at that stage could wreck the union. In any case it would be hard to straighten out the bacon factory section in the Southern District as a majority of scabs in several factories were union members. The weak leader of the A.M.I.E.U. wanted to stampede on Monday morning, but wiser counsel prevailed.

A mass meeting of meat workers was called in Brisbane on Wednesday afternoon and for northern centres on Thursday. Miners and Watersiders said that their attitude would be decided by the Disputes Committee on the basis of the meat workers' wishes. The Disputes Committee met, but made no decisions. A deputation went to see the Premier and obtained a number of assurances. In the afternoon the miners' leaders saw the Premier, discussed the meat order, obtained an assurance that restrictions on gas and light for domestic use would be lifted at the earliest possible moment, and arranged some conferences on mining matters.

On Wednesday morning, 10th July, the Disputes Committee met and, after discussion, a resolution recommending to the meatworkers, watersiders and miners that, in view of the circumstances, they should return to work on the basis of the conditions and assurances given re the meat workers and the miners, was carried. The resolution thanked by name all unions that had participated and called for preparedness against further attacks and to advance the trade union programme. This recommendation was unanimous and the first indication of the attitude of the Disputes Committee.

The meat workers' mass meeting which followed right after carried the recommendation of the Disputes Committee without opposition. The speakers were Neuman (Meat Union secretary), Macdonald (Disputes Committee), Millar (Miners), Grayham (Watersiders). They concentrated their remarks on the resolution and on preserving unity at the time the meat workers needed it most. They did not attack those who had split the meat leadership.

Dixon and Kearney, speaking last in an effort to cover their own betrayal of the meatworkers and

make out that it was their efforts that saved the day, attacked the Disputes Committee and the Communists. This move had been worked out with the press and with Catholic Action which, because of so many being out of work from all industries and the fact that meat workers never check tickets to enter a mass meeting, had been able to organise a group of about 300 round the platform. These hoodlums, mainly consisting of C.A. youth who did not know one union leader from another, taking their cue from Kearney, applauded the attacks loudly and howled down Wells when he attempted to reply. This confused many meat workers, who were disgusted.

The bosses' agents certainly did their utmost to split and confuse the meat workers and not without some success. The press featured this as a great revolt against Communism and lauded the position of Dixon and Kearney, with photographs of the "victors," etc.

The Central and Northern meat workers in orderly meetings accepted the recommendation of the Disputes Committee, even though with reluctance.

Some effort made by a small section to disrupt the waterside meeting failed. The C.A. outside group could not gain admittance. The miners' meetings were orderly and confident of their strength. The watersiders and the miners throughout the State returned to work on the recommendation of the Disputes Committee after it had been endorsed by the meat workers.

The employers won their point in the Bacon Factory section and dealt the union a severe temporary blow at this point, but the trade union movement successfully defended the position of the A.M.I.E.U. in the Export Section, its decisive point of strength, and preserved it as a powerful industrial union, thus defeating the first great assault launched by big capital on the Queensland working class in the post-war period.

Their own writers estimate that the struggle cost the employing class 6 million pounds, a heavy cost to defeat 750 bacon factory workers. They do not say how much was spent on the labor spy and bribery racket. But in any case the money aspect is the least of their losses.

SOME CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM THE STRIKE.

(1) The strike showed the willingness of the working class to struggle—the solidarity of the meat workers and members of the A.E.U., F.E.D. & F.A., Clerks, E.T.U., and Transport Union involved in and around the meat factories over such a long period, the decision of the miners and watersiders who came out purely in support of the meat workers, the action of those railwaymen who incurred heavy

penalties for applying black bans, and the support of the working class generally.

(2) The strike showed that firm and decisive leadership inspires the workers and consolidates them in the course of the struggle. This is proved by the way the miners and watersiders consolidated and became stronger in the struggle; also by the strength of the meat workers in the export section and by the weakness of the meat workers in the bacon factory section, where the weakness and cowardice of Dixon and Kearney were reflected by those who scabbed.

(3) The strike showed the power of the working class and that bosses, Arbitration Courts, the Press and the Government are rendered impotent while the main body of the working class stand united under courageous leadership.

(4) The strike showed that a semblance of unity in which treachery hides its policy from the rank and file is a very dangerous thing. Weak elements in the leadership of a union embarking on a serious struggle should be forced out into the open before the rank and file early in the struggle and their rotten policy completely exposed.

(5) Number (4) and the failure to obtain sufficient support in other States to force Federal intervention and the tendency to be side-tracked from the main tasks in hand by conferences that could not be successful, were the three outstanding weaknesses in the struggle.

(6) There are many other conclusions too numerous to go into here, that the working class must draw from this struggle—the employers' drive against the working class, the sharpening of the class struggle and class line-up, and many questions of strategy and tactics flowing from this and on finance, propaganda, etc.

(7) The seniority question placed so sharply in the foreground should now be pressed home by the Queensland Trades Union movement and the government forced to enact legislation giving this degree of security in employment.

(8) The whole question of getting rid of at least the most obnoxious aspects of the Queensland Arbitration system should be placed sharply to the fore.

(9) The working class must be put on guard against the Industrial Peace snare that the capitalists are pushing so hard in an endeavor to shackle the strikers to acceptance of lower living standards, to enable the Australian capitalists to compete in the new trade set-up that will arise on the conditions of the U.S.A. loan to Britain.

The working class gained a great deal of political and industrial experience in this strike. If the workers study and apply these lessons as well as they fought in the struggle, the Australian labor movement will indeed be the stronger for this rich experience.

REACTION BEATS ITS WAR DRUMS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, Chairman, C.P.U.S.A.

THROUGHOUT the United States powerful reactionary and pro-fascist forces, violating the most vital interests of the American people, are advocating war against the Soviet Union. Their war-like clamor is widespread in the press, on the radio, in Congress, and elsewhere. World War II is not yet officially over; our soldiers are only partly returned from the battlefields; tens of thousands of civilians, still unburied, lie under the smoking ruins of many devastated cities; Europe is war-ravaged from end to end, and millions of people are in dire starvation as a result of the war just ended—yet the warmongers would plunge the world into a new blood-bath incomparably worse than the one we are now emerging from.

So far has their war agitation gone in this country that Winston Churchill dared to come here and propose an Anglo-American war alliance directed against the U.S.S.R. (an alliance which is already coming into existence); the Truman Administration is proceeding to develop a huge post-war military machine based on an offensive strategy; our manufacture of atomic bombs is going ahead day and night, so that now we have on hand more than 1,500 of these super-deadly weapons; exposures have been made in the daily press, almost in a routine way, to the effect that actual plans have been worked out for the atom-bombing of Russian cities; hostile British radio broadcasts, aimed to drive a wedge between the Soviet people and their government, are now being beamed at the U.S.S.R.; and diplomatic crises in the U.N., all of our making, follow one another with deadly regularity, each more threatening than the previous one, and the latest of which is the deliberately provoked crisis over Iran.

Behind this dangerous warmongering stand the big trusts and monopolies of the United States, with their reactionary, pro-fascist hangers-on, including Social-Democrats and Trotskyites. The policies of the Truman Administration, especially in the realm of foreign relations, departing from the co-operative policies of the late President Roosevelt, fit in with those of the profit-hungry imperialist expansionists. The general aim of all these warmongers is to establish American capitalist domination over the war-wrecked world. The greatest obstacle to this plan they find in the U.S.S.R.

The American and British masses developed a deep respect and friendship for the Soviet people during the war. For one thing, the people of Britain know (even if their leaders do hide the fact) that it was Hitler's fear of an attack by the Red Army in his Balkan rear (and not the heroic defence by the R.A.F. in the so-called Battle of Britain) that saved their country from falling before the Nazis' conquering armies. And the people of the United States also know that it was the

tremendous struggle of the Red Army, at a terrific cost in lives to the Soviet people, that smashed the Wehrmacht while we organised (with a year's needless delay) the second front in Europe.

So, to break down these friendly feelings of the peoples toward the U.S.S.R., the warmongers have had to develop a maze of great lies against the Soviet Union, in order to prepare for an anti-Soviet war. They shout that the cause of the Soviet political tension in the world is Soviet "imperialist expansionism;" that the U.S.S.R. is trying to dominate the world even at the cost of war; that the Anglo-American bloc is fighting to defend world democracy against Soviet reaction; that an American-Soviet war is inevitable, and that such a war, in view of America's vast strength, would be easily won by our country and its allies.

The sinister danger in all this warmongering is that, so far, there is so little opposition to it. Our people, like the British masses, do not want war, but the trouble is they are not yet making their voices heard or their will felt. Numerous courageous and clear-sighted men, like Senators Pepper, Kilgore, Mitchell and Taylor, have spoken grave words of warning against the needless and folly of an anti-Soviet war, as have various newspapers. But the great democratic masses of the people, especially those in the trade unions, are still largely unaware of the grave danger now confronting the peace of our country and the world. It is, therefore, very needful that we consider some of the major arguments of the warmongers.

Is there a Soviet imperialism? The answer to this reckless charge, which is made on every side by warmongers, is an emphatic NO! The U.S.S.R. is a Socialist country, one in which the industries and the land are owned by the people. Hence, lacking profit-grabbing capitalists, it cannot be an imperialist power. The so-called expansionism with which it is being charged, specifically the inclusion within its borders of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Besarabia and Eastern Poland, is only the restoration to Russia, with the consent of the peoples concerned, of territories that were torn away from it after World War I. Regarding the Balkans also, the U.S.S.R. is not seeking to absorb the several countries, as the warmongers allege, but is simply insisting on the right of these lands, formerly all fascist-controlled, to have truly democratic governments. And so far as Iran and Manchuria, present bones of contention in U.N. circles, are concerned, the U.S.S.R. is trying to arrange normal trading and diplomatic relations with them on a democratic basis. Thus the so-called Soviet imperialism is a myth, an invention of the warmongers to provide a pretext for anti-Soviet antagonism and eventually war.

In reality, the imperialist expansion is on the side of the Anglo-American bloc, especially on the part of the monopolists of the United States. The United States went into the war a power limited almost exclusively to the Western Hemisphere. Its navy was smaller than that of Great Britain and, it was often stated, of Japan also. Its air force was negligible, and so was its army. But the United States came out of the war a world power of the first magnitude. Its navy is now bigger than all the rest of the navies in the world combined and it dominates both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Its air force is also as large as all others put together and, with American bases scattered halfway round the globe, from Iceland to China, it is in a position to atom-bomb any city in the world. Besides this, its army is now holding forth in 56 countries all over the earth. In view of this tremendous American imperialist expansion it takes a lot of assurances by the Soviet-haters to accuse the U.S.S.R. of expansionism when it has only reunited the territories properly belonging to it and is but seeking to establish normal and friendly working relations with its neighbours.

British imperialism especially displays a cynical disregard of realities, as well as of world opinion, when it shouts loud protests because Soviet troops did not evacuate Iran as quickly as the British ruling class would like. For are not British troops occupying Greece, Egypt, Indonesia, Palestine and many other countries, including unhappy India, against the wishes of the inhabitants thereof? These British situations are, of course, with the help of the United States delegates, kept out of the proceedings of the U.N.

The warmongers yell the charge from the housetops that the U.S.S.R. is striving to conquer the world. But this is a deliberate lie—a big lie of the Hitler type. The policy of the Soviet government is one of peaceful collaboration with its world neighbour states, in conformity with the Socialist character of its economic and political system. It wants an opportunity to rebuild its war-ravaged country. We Americans cannot grasp the extent of the war ruin suffered by the U.S.S.R., with some 15,000,000 of its people dead, 70,000 villages and 1,700 cities and towns destroyed, and one-third of its industry wiped out. It is simply absurd to suppose that a country so devastated by war should be embarked upon a policy of world domination, and could face the prospect of a war that such a policy would surely provoke.

On the contrary, it is the Anglo-American powers which, disregarding the will of their peoples, are vying for world domination. Their violent charges of expansionism against the U.S.S.R. are designed as a smokescreen to cover their own inordinate imperialist ambitions. The monopolists in the United States, especially, viewing the tremendous military, industrial and financial powers of this country, are convinced that now, with the rest of the world pros-

trated, is the golden opportunity to establish their world hegemony.

World policies of the United States government, with Great Britain going along as a sort of junior partner, bear out this assertion. Aggressive American foreign policy is in evidence on all international fronts—the attempt to reduce China to an economic and political dependency of the United States; the unilateral control of Japan, aimed at making that country dependent upon our own; the more active policy of economic and political domination throughout Latin America; the efforts to dominate the new democratic governments in the Balkans; the newly aggressive policy in the Near and Middle East; the constant whittling away of the Potsdam, Yalta and other wartime agreements, the attempts to control the economic life of various countries by means of politically conditional loans; the manipulation of food supplies, under control of the notorious Hoover, to favor reactionary political groups in Europe. And, especially, there is the so-called get-tough-policy with the U.S.S.R., the purpose of which is to eliminate the greatest of all obstacles in the path of the American and British imperialists, the vast Socialist republic of workers and peasants, the friend of all downtrodden peoples, and the mainstay of world democracy.

The world domination policies of our government are clearly to be seen in the current sessions of the Security Council of the U.N. Mr. Byrnes is dictating the whole proceedings in the most high-handed manner. He has already built up a controlling anti-Soviet bloc. The other capitalist countries, almost without exception, are under the thumb of the United States. Chiang Kai-Shek in China is dependent upon American bayonets and finance; France, devastated by the war, sent a delegation here seeking a huge loan; Australia, whose country was saved from Japanese invasion by American armed forces, is falling more and more under our control; Holland, if it is to once more rebuild its shattered empire in the East Indies, must have American help; and Great Britain herself can only hope to hold together her ramshackle empire and restore its broken economic system with American military, political and financial assistance. And nearly all of these countries are also knocking on the doors of the United States asking for its surplus food supplies to feed their starving populations.

So Mr. Byrnes, taking advantage of the favorable situation of the United States, and supported by Mr. Truman and the great trusts of this country, has whipped all these dependent and semi-dependent countries together into a working bloc that controls the U.N. With this bloc he is trying to coerce the Soviet Union into submission, even with the threat of war.

Never in the history of the late unlamented League of Nations was there such a bold-faced example of imperialist arrogance as Mr. Byrnes' refusal to grant an extension of two weeks' time to the U.S.S.R. in which to complete its negotiations with Iran. Mr. Byrnes, evidently afraid that the U.S.S.R.

would secure a friendly adjustment with Iran, insisted that the Iranian matter must be heard immediately and that our war ally, the U.S.S.R., should, in fact, be put on a trial before the world. And when the U.S.S.R., refusing to submit to this outrageous proceeding, declined to participate in the discussion in the press and on the radio, set the stage for an international crisis. The Anglo-American big business warmongers attacked the Soviet Union in fullness of cry, which was exactly what Mr. Byrnes and his fellow-imperialists expected and wanted. Nor will Mr. Byrnes, with the help of the Attlees and Bevins of Great Britain, hesitate to create another world crisis in the U.N. over some new trumped-up issue if and when the Iranian crisis is overcome.

The warmongers are crying out with all the propaganda means at their disposal that war with the U.S.S.R. is inevitable and that we may as well get the job over with. But this, too, is a great lie. It is the Hitler theory all over again, to the effect that the capitalist world must unite to destroy the Socialist Soviet Union. Contrary to all this pro-fascist propaganda, war between these two great social systems is not at all inevitable. It all depends upon whether or not the peoples fight against the projected war. There is every good reason why they can and should live in peace and harmony together. But to do this requires that the peoples of the United States and Great Britain find the means to curb the great monopolists who are dominating the foreign policies of their countries. Otherwise, they are following a course which, if unchecked, will lead straight to another great war.

The basic cause of modern war is capitalist imperialism, that is, the fierce struggles between the big capitalist states to sell their surplus commodities in the world market, to monopolise the world's economic resources, to occupy international strategic military positions, and to exploit colonial and semi-colonial peoples. World War I was a military collision between the British-Japanese-French-Russian-American bloc and its bitter imperialist rival, the German-Austrian bloc, for world control. Likewise, World War II was caused by the drive of German-Japanese-Italian imperialism to establish world dominion. And the danger of a World War III originates precisely in the present determined push of American imperialism, with the help of Great Britain, to set up a world control for itself.

As for the Soviet Union, it presents no danger of war. On the contrary, its Socialist character, coupled with its great strength, makes it the main buttress of world peace. Because the Soviet industries and land are owned by the people, and because the Government is in the hands of the workers and peasants, the U.S.S.R. is naturally wedded to a policy of peace. With its production automatically absorbed in raising the living standards of its own people, it has no great artificial surpluses to be dumped on the world markets in fierce competition against other powers. With vast natural resources of its own, it has no need or impulse to struggle for

control of world raw material supplies. And its whole Socialist structure and spirit are fundamentally opposed to the exploitation of other peoples. Hence it is utterly absurd to speak of "Soviet imperialism" and of a U.S.S.R. drive to war.

The peaceful character of the U.S.S.R. is no final guarantee, however, for the maintenance of world peace. The democratic masses in the United States and Great Britain must also lend a hand. The monopolists who dominate the great capitalist powers, the United States and Great Britain, are on a rampage, driving for world control. They especially direct their attacks against the U.S.S.R., because they hate it as a Socialist country and because it is the unwavering friend of the oppressed of the earth. This is why they lose no occasion to create ill-will toward the U.S.S.R. and to provoke acute international diplomatic crises, as in the case of Iran. The whole Iranian matter could have been disposed of in a friendly spirit and thus every semblance of crisis avoided had Mr. Byrnes and the big monopolists who stand behind him desired it.

Such imperialist warmakers must be restrained, otherwise they will provoke war. And the American and British peoples can defeat their war plottings if they will but exert their irresistible power to hold their countries, through the United Nations, to a policy of peaceful collaboration with the U.S.S.R. and all other peace-loving lands. This is the price of peace and it must be paid. The very worst mistake that the peoples of the United States and Great Britain could make would be to fall victims of the warmongers' lie that war with the U.S.S.R. is inevitable. Then indeed, we would be rushed into a new world war willy nilly, with all of its frightful horror and devastation.

One of the most sinister aspects of the war propaganda that is now going on openly in our country is the common allegation that an armed conflict against the U.S.S.R. would be a democratic war; a sort of completion of the World War II task of wiping out world tyranny. This, of course, is also a monstrous lie; a part of the Hitler propaganda that saturates all the arguments of the warmongers. In reality, an anti-Soviet war would be an ultra-reactionary war and would threaten the world with fascism.

As a Socialist country the U.S.S.R. is on a higher social level than any capitalist country, however rich or powerful. Its industries, owned by the people and dedicated to their welfare, constitute incomparably a more democratic system than the capitalist system of private ownership, with its resultant handful of millionaires and billionaires on one side and vast armies of poverty-stricken people on the other. The Soviet's whole political system, corresponding to its thoroughly democratic industrial base, likewise represents the highest form yet achieved anywhere by mankind. Similarly, its broad mass educational movement; its system of complete equality among the many peoples that make up the Soviet Nation, and many other features of Soviet life, are on quite a higher plane of democracy than

exists in any capitalist land. But the ruling capitalists in other countries are desperately anxious that the peoples of their respective lands do not get to know these facts about Soviet democracy. So they have, ever since the birth of the Soviet Union in 1917, by the most astounding propaganda campaign of misrepresentation in all history, largely succeeded in keeping this knowledge from their people.

The democratic character of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, however, has been made unmistakably clear during the recent war and in the present postwar situation. No country has been so clear-headed and determined as the U.S.S.R. in its fight to destroy fascism root and branch. Wherever we look, in Germany, Japan, the former fascist satellite countries of Europe, or in the great colonial lands, the force of Soviet diplomacy is steadily and consistently being exerted to eliminate the vestiges of fascism and to strengthen world democracy.

Unfortunately, however, the same cannot be said about the policy of the American and British governments. For despite the strongly anti-fascist and pro-democratic convictions of the American and British peoples, it is a deplorable reality that throughout the world the influence of their two Governments is anything but militantly democratic. In Germany and Japan they are compromising with the defeated fascists; in the former fascist states bordering upon the U.S.S.R., they are supporting reactionaries of various sorts, and are using them as imperialist tools against the progressive new European democracies. Our State Department still recognises the defunct fascist governments of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. Similarly, our representatives' influence in China and other colonial and semi-colonial lands is anything but truly democratic. In the war-torn countries the United States and British officials are always to be found on the Right, with every reactionary and fascist element looking hopefully to them for succour; while the U.S.S.R. is uniformly on the Left, the solid defender of local and international democracy, and an object of the bitter hatred of every fascist.

A war against the U.S.S.R., which our warmongers are now so boldly advocating, would be a war against world democracy. It would be directed not only against the Soviet Union, but also the liberation struggles of the colonial peoples, the new democracies in Europe, and the aspirations of the workers all over the world. It would be an anti-democratic, pro-fascist war. That is why reactionaries and fascists of every stripe are so eager for it. They know that the U.S.S.R. is the world's main bulwark against fascism, and that if it could be overthrown the road would be open for the victory of reaction in its worst forms.

In the eagerness of the warmongers to mobilise the American people for a war against the Soviet Union they are picturing such a war as being a simple and easy matter. Their argument runs about like this: "Russia is very weak after the war, while we are very strong. Moreover, we have the atom bomb. Let us, therefore, get on with the war. It

will be a cinch, and the sooner we begin it, the better. Delay can be very dangerous for us, inasmuch as Russia admittedly has tremendous recuperative powers and, then, who knows when she may evolve the atom bomb herself!" The Hearst-McCormick-Paterson Axis press especially reeks with this type of warmongering, which is echoed widely on the radio and also has much influence in political circles.

So widespread is such propaganda that numerous prominent spokesmen have found it necessary to warn the American people not to be deluded by the arguments that an anti-Soviet war would be a sort of vacation tour to Moscow. In the N.Y. Herald Tribune, February 21, 1946, Walter Lippmann, in discussing the naive thought that the Soviet Union could be defeated by a sudden, well-placed shower of atom bombs, points out that if a war were to be directed against that country, the Red Army, in response, would overrun most if not all of Europe, and would also hold England at its mercy. He says we must "realise that the atomic bomb could not guarantee a victory, and does not even promise a victory." From which he concludes:

"Where does all this lead? It leads to the inexorable conclusion that if we examine the problem of military security, we cannot help seeing that there is no real alternative to political agreement."

General Eisenhower, on March 15, was even sharper in his warning against prevalent anti-Soviet war talk, showing that such a war could only lead to disaster for us:

"Our people do not want a war which could have no end but the destruction of the greater part of the world. Atom bombs or no, war still means knocking out the opposing armies. . . We saw what happened to the finest armies the world ever saw. If we tried to conquer Russia, there's no telling when we could establish ourselves on her soil. But once we did, we'd face years of sloggery through Siberia. We have nothing to gain to start, and would have nothing left at the end."

Blatant advocates of a Soviet war, in seeking to make the whole thing look very easy, hide the fact that inasmuch as the rest of the capitalist nations, including Great Britain, are either very weary and unfit to fight or virtually ruined by the recent war, the United States, outside of fragmentary fascist support, would have to fight the proposed anti-Soviet war almost alone. Our country emerged from the two great world wars with comparatively light casualties and without any war devastation; but a World War III waged against the Soviet Union would surely cost the ruin of our cities from atom bombs, bring about the end of it would bring us to a futile stalemate if not an actual military defeat. To such a catastrophe the warmongers are trying to lead our nation, with their glib talk about a war against the U.S.S.R.

The alternative to the holocaust of a new world war is a peaceful agreement with the Soviet Union.

Unity between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. is the only possible foundation for world peace and a strong United Nations. And such a Soviet-American agreement can be achieved if the American people will beat back the imperialists in our midst and insist upon our Government following a genuine peace policy in the tradition of Roosevelt.

Organised labor must especially rise to its obligations in this situation. It must reject and protest against the dangerous course of the Truman Administration in foreign affairs. It must realize that it has to fight in the realm of international policy against the same sinister forces, the big monopolies, that it struggles against on the home front. The union-smashers, Jew-baiters, Negro-haters, and enemies of progress generally in this country, are the principal warmongers and most rampant imperialists in the sphere of foreign affairs.

All the trade unions of the United States, not only those in the C.I.O., should affiliate with the World Federation of Trade Unions and heartily support its peace programme; they should combat every manifestation of militarism and imperialism

SPEECHES TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING, MAY 31-JUNE 2, 1946

L. L. SHARKEY.

COMRADES, I agree with the report that was delivered by Comrade Dixon. Much has been said by various speakers on the question of the danger of war, and there cannot be any doubt that every indication we can have from Anglo-American imperialism must confirm the view that as far as they are concerned, if they can beat back the mass resistance, they would set their course for war with the Soviet Union.

Every day we have some statement, particularly from the United States, indicating some new weapon, some new development in military, naval or aviation preparations for war, together with their repudiation of Potsdam in relation to the rebuilding of Germany. The obvious intention is to construct their area of Germany as a base for war with the Soviet Union. You know the position in Japan and what has taken place there, with MacArthur's intention to rebuild a reactionary Japan as part of the encirclement of the Soviet Union. The seizure of the Danube boats and the British Labor Government's declaration that Spain cannot be considered a menace to world peace all fit into the picture. Everywhere they are building up the forces of reaction, coming to agreement with fascism, and developing their weapons with this end in view. So we ask ourselves: why do they want war with the Soviet Union? What are the reasons for this apparent change from Teheran, Crimea, Potsdam, the period of the war?

The Anglo-American imperialists know very well, just as Churchill admitted in his Fulton speech and Evatt pointed out in Parliament, that the Soviet

on the part of the Truman Administration; they should be the sharpest opponents of Anti-Soviet propaganda; they should clean up many reactionaries as possible out of Congress in the coming Congressional elections; they should be the most alert champions of Big Three and United Nations solidarity; they should be the leaders of the whole American people in the fight for peace.

Throughout the world the various Communist Parties, with many millions of their respective peoples rallied behind their lead, form a great bastion of international peace. They are inveterate enemies of fascists, imperialists and warmongers. They are the best defenders of their people's interests, which are opposed, all over the world, to those of the monopolists. The United States, the most powerful capitalist country and the leading imperialist power in the world, also needs a powerful Communist Party, for this would enormously strengthen the people's fight for peace and for progress on all fronts. Now is the time to build the Communist Party. The fight against the warmongers must be won.

Union does not want war. They admit that this is true, but yet they carry on openly their preparations not only of a propaganda character, but of a much more serious nature. The Yanks are building up their bases from one end of the world to the other and they sent a Note to Rumania which I suppose is about the very last word in hypocrisy; they complained about the unfair use of the press and radio against the reactionaries in Rumania. Why not send a Note to the McCormick, Hearst, Beaverbrook or Warwick Fairfax press about the unfair use of the press?

This is one example of the extreme provocation to which these people are prepared to resort. They fear the advance of the socialist revolution in all these countries, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Finland and so on, hence they are very anxious to break down the so-called "iron curtain" and they threaten they will go to war over these issues.

As comrades have pointed out, they are extremely afraid and they have good reason to be afraid. None of the capitalist countries, neither Britain nor the U.S.A. nor Australia, in the twelve months since the war, have made any progress worth mentioning towards establishing economic or political stability of the capitalist system in their own country. As you know, the position worsens for them all the time, all the gorgeous plans for rehabilitation on paper have failed to materialise, and the general crisis of capitalism has been so accentuated by the war that they feel the weakness of capitalism more than ever. So that is another fac-

tor, their own instability, their fear that in a few years' time they will be faced with the greatest of all economic crises, and when we look at this "iron curtain," comrades, there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt that it is a very terrifying thing for the bourgeoisie.

How to solve their problem? They believe, as Mr. Churchill said, that the time is short and very soon democratic power will become overwhelming. Their time is short, they have the atom bomb, they have various other weapons at their disposal at the moment, which they believe Soviet Russia does not yet possess. Well, I cannot say definitely, of course, what weapons Soviet Russia possesses at the present time, they have not indicated the nature of whatever weapons they may have. We know that they are quite confident of their strength, that Soviet scientists have indicated that they expect to have atomic energy, not only for bombs but applied to Soviet industry, during the period of the forthcoming Five Year Plan.

The atom bomb has played a very important role in the development of the world situation. Mr. Byrnes openly stated, when asked why today they oppose Potsdam and Crimea, that too many concessions were made to the Soviet Union, that the concessions were made because then "we did not know we had the atom bomb." With the aid of the atom bomb they hope to be able to reverse all present progressive trends, to recapture for imperialism the countries behind the so-called "Iron Curtain" and even to destroy the Soviet Union. In other words, Anglo-American imperialism today believes itself to be the last bastion holding up the advance of world Socialist revolution, and if we analyse it from that standpoint and ask ourselves what type of war is this that

"our" imperialists plot, there is only one answer—this is a continuation of Hitler's war, the worst form of reactionary, counter-revolutionary war.

The responsibility for the future of humanity in connection with this whole world situation and the preparation for war more than ever depends on the Communist Parties in the English-speaking countries, because here is the main centre of war preparation, in the British Empire and in the U.S.A. It was not for nothing that Churchill, in the course of his Fulton speech, said that in the English-speaking countries alone the Communist movement was still in its infancy, and Churchill drew the most important conclusion from that also that they must act while the Communist movement in the English-speaking world was still not strong enough, in his opinion, to defeat the plans of the bourgeoisie. I think you need no further urging than that conclusion drawn by Churchill. That was one of the factors that he took into consideration—the comparative weakness of the Communist Parties in the English-speaking countries, as one of the factors that gives an opportunity to the Anglo-American imperialists to launch an attack against the Soviet Union and suppress world independence. That puts us on our mettle to rectify this position which Churchill counts as one of the main factors making for a new world war, so that Churchill will not be able to say that they can strike while the Communist movement in the English-speaking countries is still an "infant." That indicates to us our responsibility. That is, taken as a group, the American, British, Canadian and Australian Parties have a main responsibility in checking the war plans and struggling against the imperialist, anti-democratic war being planned against the Soviet Union and the democratic and potential Socialist States of Europe.

T. WRIGHT.

I agree entirely with the report and the supplementary reports; the draft of the letter to the A.L.P. is a very good one. I take it that this will become a document to be printed and distributed particularly to A.L.P. workers. But the report and discussions have impressed me that we could not let a document of this kind go without some few lines about the war dangers. It is based almost entirely on national questions and I think we should make some reference to the danger of Australia being drawn into a war by British and American imperialism.

Some references have been made to the referendum and I want to refer to the importance of this for the Trade Union movement and the need for us, to the extent that we can do it through the trade unions, to conduct a big campaign in support of the referendum. When I say that I am not thinking simply that we should point out to the workers that if the referendum is carried it will give the Federal Government the constitutional powers needed to legislate for shorter hours and increased wages, because after all I do not think we should have any

illusions that the Federal Government is going a long way on these lines if the referendum is carried. In the next few months the Federal Government might introduce legislation giving improved conditions, but what I have in mind is something different from that. The present position in regard to wages and conditions holds back the growth of the Trade Union movement.

There are many Unions which are supposed to be Federal Unions, but in reality they are more or less a loose linking of State Unions—the Meat Industry is another very similar to my own—and the reason is that they developed as State Unions in the first place and while they have a certain amount of interest in common in regard to Federal Arbitration they still have a great deal of interest in State courts and the centre of gravity remains in State branches and State activity. We want to see the development of the Trade Unions on a national basis speeded up and, in my opinion, if the referendum is carried it will give us a tremendous amount of assistance in stimulating and improving organisation of the trade union movement

on a national basis. The reason is that if the referendum is carried Federal jurisdiction will override State jurisdiction because it will be possible to get decisions on wages and conditions in such a way as to become common rule applying all over the Commonwealth.

At present in Queensland, Western Australia and other States there is resistance amongst the working class themselves to having a Federal juris-

R. GIBSON.

Comrade Dixon last night made it very clear how the monopolists are gathering their forces for great attacks on the labor movement. From all we have heard in Victoria the Chamber of Manufacturers are very closely linked in a conspiracy with the Liberal and Country Parties and the Melbourne and Sydney press in order to provoke a showdown with the working class to prepare the way for victory in the Federal elections. In the last days of the double dumping dispute the Chamber of Manufacturers met and made a decision to try and force the Labor Government to take some action in the matter.

Even if the immediate mining crisis is past it may be that next week or the week after we may find ourselves with great industrial trouble on our hands on which the future of the Unions or the Federal elections may depend.

In these circumstances our united front work becomes of crucial importance and it was a good thing that the Political Committee acted promptly in order to correct wrong developments of our tactics in Victoria.

There are three things that stand out about the Labor Party situation in Victoria. One is that despite 40 years of John Wren intrigue and 10 years of organised Catholic Action intrigue still thousands of Labor Party members and followers in Victorian factories are ready to co-operate with us when we go about it in the right way. In the Henty by-election it proved possible to get good co-operation between Communists and most of the A.L.P. branches and members.

Secondly, there were 400 resolutions on the Labor Party agenda paper most of which were pro-

E. ROSS

Going through the files of "Common Cause" during the week to build an article on our consistent drive for control of the industry, as usual I got browsing over other matters and came across one particularly interesting report of the Labor Council in August, 1937, and since I have not very many things to say I think I will take time reading this, as I think it will interest members of the Central Committee and also bear some lessons for us in the light of the remarks of Comrades Jeffrey, Docker and others on the situation on the Labor Council.

This is a resolution carried by the Labor Council, practically unanimously, in August, 1937:

dition and they consider may be of value to them. The carrying of the referendum would lead to the position that whether they liked it or not they would be compelled to strengthen their organisation on a national basis, and the fact that Federal decisions will bring about the common rule will bring about that linking up of interests and unity of decisions that will give a broad basis for further strengthening the trade unions.

gressive, and there is quite an important cleavage in the leadership of the Labor Party in Victoria. The better elements are keen to build the Labor Party and are trying to limit the anti-Communist heresy hunt and have differences with the Catholic Action group.

Thirdly, the Cain Government is in general following a right-wing policy. The Government retreats from many vital points of their programme and uses the Legislative Council vote with great skill to justify relative inactivity. We have to reverse this policy on the part of the Government, to convince Cain that these attacks on the Communists do not pay and get united action with the best elements for the Communist and Labor Party programme.

On the matter of taxation it seems to me that a very sharp campaign has to be waged if we are going to get substantial relief on the lower incomes. Cain has made the announcement that there will be only slight tax reductions on lower incomes in the future. Some indication was given by Scullin last week to a deputation. He indicated that he had made certain recommendations about the Federal budget. He argued against the A.C.T.U. demands for reduction on lower incomes. He developed the old social democratic doctrines about evening out poverty among the poor. He said that the removal of taxes on incomes up to £300 would mean scaling down on middle incomes; to put the A.C.T.U. demand into effect would cost £38,000,000 and he implied that he considered that impossible. The whole reply was of a kind to indicate that we would have to redouble the campaign on this question if we are going to get any results.

"That this Labor Council deploras the action of Labor leaders in adopting the attitude of retreating before the red bogey. Instead of attempting to disrupt the ranks of the workers by themselves attacking the Communists we call upon Labor speakers to concentrate their efforts on an effective exposure of the anti-working class activities of the Lyons-Page Government, explaining the Labor Party's programme and uniting the workers for a Labor victory on October 23rd."

R. A. King was the mover. In moving the motion Mr. King said — "in using the red bogey Labor leaders have made a retrograde step which

will react against the interests of the workers, it is going back to the days of George Reid and the Socialist Tiger. All that the Labor Party leaders are doing is splitting the workers. Will that help to secure the return of the Labor Party? Emphatically it will not. On the contrary this policy is likely to lead to our defeat and perhaps some of the politicians are already preparing an excuse to blame it on the Communists."

Supporting, A. S. McAlpine said — "Beasley must recognise that he is paving the way for the suppression of such organisations (Communist Party, F.O.S.U.) and that the trade union movement will follow as it has in other countries." Mr. McAlpine said "that the Labor Party as a result of their stupid and treacherous red-baiting policy had been placed on the defensive." He appealed for unity against the U.A.P.

In reply Mr. King said "one of the main troubles is that the political section has been allowed to dominate industrial movements. But that day is coming to an end and when the Labor Government is returned the A.C.T.U. and Labor Councils will be on the doorstep, insisting upon the passage of working class legislation."

BRITISH COMMUNISTS CHALLENGE BEVINISM

(Statement adopted by the enlarged meeting of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain, June 16.)

THE rejection of the Communist Party's application for affiliation by the Labor Party Conference at Bournemouth took place after a campaign of calumny, misrepresentation and distortion such as has never before been known in the history of the Labor movement. The decision can encourage only the enemies of Labor, who now feel themselves stronger to prevent the working-class from achieving its demands, and who are bent on world domination, even though this policy may mean a new war. It is for this reason that the rejection of affiliation has been hailed by Churchill, the Tory press and the bitterest enemies of the common people all over the world.

The Conference, in spite of its congratulatory stocktaking of the progressive achievements of the Labor Government — nationalisation, the Health Service, the repeal of the Trade Union Act, etc. — could not dispel the deep concern of the rank and file regarding many aspects of its domestic policy, but above all of the disastrous foreign policy.

The foreign policy of the Labor Government has brought the country to the stage where there is a serious danger of a complete collapse of Allied unity. This is the plight to which the unconcealed antagonism of the Labor leaders to the Soviet Union, the new democratic Europe, and to Communism has brought the British people.

This policy is making a reality of the Anglo-American bloc, first proposed by Churchill, which

The resolution was carried amidst enthusiasm, only a handful being in opposition.

We are in the position today of having both the Federal and State Governments, after trying to get out of the coal industry and saying they were determined to get out of it, both trying to bring forward some concrete propositions to bring security to those employed by the industry and those dependent on it and we intend to keep them there until we see the colour of their money, as one may say. And so I say we have the initiative and it looks as though we may be getting somewhere and the position on that front is more favorable than for some considerable time.

After screaming "rationing," after devious threats of general strike and slating the miners all over the place the press have been caught on the wrong leg and have been forced to pull in their horns, go quiet and their tone suggests they do not know what it is all about.

I agree with the material put forward in reference to the united front. Undoubtedly there is the basis today, with the Labor Party Executives forced into the position of supporting the major demands of the workers, for the real united front work.

necessarily involves the breakdown of the United Nations Organisation and, in place of international co-operation, the economic dependence of Britain upon American capitalism, which can result in mass unemployment at the end of the present trade boom, and a new world war.

The widespread uneasiness of the Labor movement over the composition of the Nationalisation Boards, over the appeal for the "best brains" from the capitalists instead of working-class representation and control, over the excessive compensation contemplated, is equalled only by the alarm of the workers over rising prices, fares, rents and the continued delay in providing houses, combined with the inactivity of the Government in ending luxury feeding and the Black Market in the midst of the food crisis.

The Bournemouth Conference did not seriously discuss these grave questions. Nevertheless they must be discussed, for on their solution depends the success of the workers' demands. The lack of an over-all economic plan to meet Britain's serious position was covered over by Morrison's complacent panegyric on reconversion. The vicious anti-Communism of the Labor leaders can only bring increasing co-operation with capitalism at home and abroad at the expense of the working-class, and the hints and suggestions of the Tories regarding coalition with Labor on foreign affairs are but its logical expression.

The Communist Party warns the entire Labor movement of the danger which now confronts the British people as a consequence of this policy. It can only result in a betrayal of the programme for which the country voted at the General Election and a strengthening of Tory reaction.

The Communist Party will work as never before for an end to the present reactionary foreign policy. For peace and friendship with the Soviet Union and democratic Europe, and against the exclusive Anglo-American alliance with its danger of new wars. This is the only basis on which the unity of Britain, the Soviet Union and America and real international co-operation can be built, the problem of Germany solved and world peace assured.

We will fight for the carrying out of the Potsdam Agreement, which means denazification, the removal of the Junkers and big industrialists by the breaking up of the great estates and industries as has already been done in the Soviet zone. British labor must refuse support for Byrnes' effort to wreck the economy of the Danubian States by the penetration of American capital and the holding up of the Danube shipping as a means of securing this aim. The Twenty Years Treaty with the Soviet Union must be made a reality through real co-operation with the Soviet Union and the new, progressive Governments of Europe, thus avoiding Britain's dependence on ruthless American monopoly capitalism and isolation from every democratic force in Europe.

We will fight for the withdrawal of British troops from India and for independence for the Indian people. For the withdrawal of troops from Indonesia and Greece. For an end to concessions to Big Business. We will demand that Labor uses its power to make nationalisation successful and secures the increased production the nation needs by the co-operation and promotion of workers to key positions of control and responsibility. We demand that it uses its emergency powers to proclaim an economic plan and to direct industry to former distressed areas.

We demand that the Government ends luxury feeding. Gouls the black marketeers. Organises increased production of crops for human food.

Fully and speedily operates the Education Act and gives equal opportunity to all children. Halts rising prices by vigorous control and action against employers' profits. Adopts a policy of higher wages and equal pay for equal work. Increases taxation on the rich and reduces it on the poor. Stops the increase in fares.

Speeds up the housing drive by smashing the building ring, by ending black market building and repairs and by reducing building costs and providing adequate housing subsidies. Rents must not be increased.

Fascist activity and propaganda must be stamped out.

The Communist Party calls for a nation-wide campaign of meetings, demonstrations and mass activity to rally the working-class to achieve these demands. It expresses its readiness to work in unity with all sections of the Labor movement to fight for this policy, and in every daily struggle against capitalism.

Despite Bournemouth, unity of the working class is still the supreme issue—unity against all employers' attacks in the workshops, the Tories and world reaction. It expresses its full confidence that this unity will triumph in spite of the opposition of the Labor leaders, who seem to be more concerned with preserving capitalism than fighting for Socialism.

In the months that lie ahead the Communist Party will devote the time, energy and fighting ability of every member and Party organisation to achieve these aims. We call on every supporter to join the Party now, to strengthen its influence in every factory, depot, pit, shipyard, town and village. We shall redouble our efforts to build stronger trade union, factory and co-operative organisations, with full protection for the shop stewards to face the big struggles ahead.

We shall undertake the most extensive preparation to achieve the maximum number of candidates in the coming November Municipal elections so that every important local authority can be strengthened with a group of Communist Councillors fighting for the people.

The Bournemouth Conference has not ended the fight. The deep desire of the working class for a united Labor movement has received a temporary set-back. We shall go forward with new determination and resolve to build and strengthen the Communist Party to continue this fight until the unity of the working class is finally established. We call upon the workers in the factories, town and countryside to join the Communist Party on the basis of its fighting policy against capitalism and for Socialism, the only final solution of every problem before us today.

June 17, 1946.

THE VATICANS WAR ON PEACE

V. J. JEROME

(From "Political Affairs," April, 1946.)

(Continued from last issue.)

MOST outstanding in the new appointments is the unprecedentedly large quota for the Western Hemisphere—fourteen cardinals, allotted in equal number to North America and Latin America.

Canada, formerly with a Cardinal only for Catholic French-speaking Quebec, is now doubly secured to the Holy See through the promotion of the Archbishop of Toronto. Thus, we see the Vatican penetration of English-speaking Canada. Canada's role of pawn in the anti-Soviet game of British and American imperialism cannot be considered apart from this new Papal honor.

The appointments for Latin America will give added strength to U.S. imperialism for consolidating a hemisphere bloc in the UNO to further monopoly's expansionist and anti-Soviet designs. Light is shed on the choice of cardinals for Latin America by the revelation in the *Spanish News Letter* of London, as quoted in the issue of *Izvestia* already cited, that the list of Spanish Cardinals-designate was drawn up by an agreement between the Vatican and Franco in 1941.

Of particular significance is the appointment, for the first time, of two cardinals to Brazil. Basically, the intent of this move can only be to hold back the democratic advance of the people, to reinforce the State and second greatest Power in the hemisphere, and to prepare the country for a leading pro-fascist role in Latin America. The alarm of reaction is particularly great in view of the significant showing made by the newly legalised Brazilian Communist Party in the 1945 Presidential election.

The wholesale appointments of cardinals on both sides of the Rio Grande are designed to tighten the "spiritual arm" in the joint pressure of foreign finance capital and the Vatican on the people's forces in the Latin-American countries. Spain is a golden apple in the Papal orchard. It also emits Falangist rays upon the political, ideological, and cultural life of the countries of Latin America. This was unmistakably seen at the celebration, last October, of the 50th anniversary of the Coronation of the Virgin of Guadalupe, which was turned into a mass political mobilisation of Mexican Catholicism for Church and Franco. The significance of that gathering is especially attested by the fact that the celebration was opened with a special radio address by Pope Pius XII.

On that occasion, the Archbishop of Mexico declared:

"Our Virgin asks more than a temple in Mexico. She wants as her temple the whole American continent. This we did not understand until now."

Quoted by J. A. Del Vayo in *The Nation*, December 15, 1945.

Among the Hierarchical participants that day was the Archbishop of Quebec, Cardinal Villeneuve, who spoke as the Legate of the Pope. Criticising the opponents of the corporative system, the Cardinal said:

"Such people do not understand the true corporativism sponsored by the Church. Pius XI held that the reign of justice and charity may be achieved in economic and social relations by setting up professional or inter-professional groups or corporations, founded on genuinely Christian bases. Each corporation would be the legally constituted association of all members of the profession; and their activities, within it, would converge in search of the common welfare of all members of society. Thus, corporate professions would produce a triple benefit, that is, economic, professional, and social. Politics, in the electoral sense of the word, would be excluded."

Quoted by O. I. Roche in *The Protestant*, November-December, 1945.

Symbolically, the arrows of the Spanish Falange were placed beside the Mexican flag on that occasion.

The character of the Vatican aspirations is more clearly indicated by the considerable Catholic support enjoyed by the fascist Sinarchist movement, which was launched in Mexico in 1934, with direct Nazi co-operation, as a terrorist subversive organisation directed at the Republic. According to an Allied Labor News dispatch of February 25 from Mexico City, this camp is financially supported by the Spanish Falange in Mexico, by employer organisations, by foreign investment companies, and through frequent donations, by the National Catholic Welfare Conference in the United States, on the grounds that the Sinarchists favor "Catholicism." Claiming to have a membership of nearly half a million, the National Sinarchist Union announced in February its intention of participating as a political party in the national elections to be held in July. The "Union" is known to have the blessing of the Rome Hierarchy, and, to no little advantage, the protecting friendship of U.S. Ambassador George Messersmith.

No doubt the Vatican hopes, by these Western Hemisphere appointments, to take greater advantage of the deep-seated Anglo-U.S. imperialist rivalry in Latin America, the focus of which is the Argentine. In the main, with the Vatican's decided orientation toward the most powerful imperialist country, the United States, it can be assumed that the weight of the Church will be behind the U.S. imperialist interests, which are determined to eliminate Britain as an economic power and a political influence from the Latin-American sphere. However, the Vatican well knows how to give itself

ample elbow-room for manoeuvre and intrigue, and its policy therefore may not be identical in every Latin-American country.

Let us now turn to the appointments to the United States.

It is significant that three of the four new cardinals were selected from the Middle West—Archbishops John J. Glennon (now deceased) of St. Louis, Samuel A. Stritch of Chicago, and Edward A. Mooney of Detroit. Viewed politically, the reason for these selections is not difficult to trace. By this gravitation to the Middle West, the Vatican broadens out its base beyond its previous main concentration on the Irish Catholic communities of the Eastern seaboard States. With this shift, too, the Vatican connects itself with the centre of "isolationist" America. The Middle West is the terrain of the clerico-fascist offensive in the country. It is the spawning-ground of Father Coughlin and Gerald K. Smith, of pseudo-Christian hate-publications and hoodlum formations; the hatchery of the reactionary Association of Catholic Trade Unionists; and a main field of anti-Soviet concentration among national groups by Vatican-directed agencies.

The "temporal" interests underlying these appointments come to light when, for instance, we view at close range the choice of the Archbishop of Detroit. The elevation of Archbishop Mooney is noteworthy. It is an appointment in the main centre of the United Automobile Workers' Union, largest single trade union in the world, in one of the key strongholds of basic industry—the kingdom of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler; in the city where there are hundreds of thousands of solidly organised militant workers.

Archbishop, now Cardinal, Mooney was and is Charles E. Coughlin's superior, directly and fully responsible for that fascist priest's activities, which was a long time in improving with a slap on the wrist, when they were most embarrassing to the Church. Even more significant is Mooney's role in inspiring the labor-splitting reactionary A.C.T.U. This clerico-fascist "labor" outfit has now insinuated itself, with some harmful effect, locally or nationally, into a number of unions, among them the steel, auto, shipyard, rubber, textile and electrical workers' unions (all, significantly, C.I.O.). Its Chaplain is Rev. Raymond S. Clancy, appointed by Mooney as Director of Social Action in his archdiocese. Mooney's own newspaper, *The Michigan Catholic*, constantly quotes from *The Wage Earner*, official paper of the A.C.T.U.

Significantly, the "liberal" Catholic weekly, *Commonweal*, in commenting on the new cardinals, said editorially (Jan. 4, 1946):

"Archbishop Mooney . . . has been especially notable in his support of Catholic concern for the labor movement."

The most outstanding and spectacular elevation of all, in the Americas or elsewhere, is that of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, "Military Vicar of the United States," and "Pope Pius XII's right hand man," whose See, New York, is the most powerful,

in economic strength and political influence, in the world today.

The special significance of Spellman's appointment is summed up, almost in programmatic form, by *Time* (Feb. 25, 1946), as follows:

"The Church . . . looks to the U.S. as an example of the form of government which today promises the most for the Church's survival. It looks to the U.S. as an idealistic people who have at last chosen, or been forced, to take their place in international affairs. And it looks to Francis Cardinal Spellman as the practical idealistic American who can best advise and guide its efforts to utilise these forces in its favor."

Spellman is even spoken of as the possible successor to Pius XII. (Not without meaning perhaps is the news item that the emblematic red hat conferred on Cardinal Spellman at his elevation happens to be Pius' own, which he received on becoming Cardinal Pacelli.) And if Spellman is not given the Secretaryship of State in Vatican City, it is because, informed Vatican officials are reported to have said, the Pope considers him at present more valuable in the United States.

The value of Spellman's services as New World pillar of the Church of Rome was made evident in the past by his liaison role which was instrumental in Roosevelt's appointment, in December, 1939, of a "personal representative" at the Vatican. That step was, of course, in complete violation of the Constitutional principle of separation of Church and State. Not long afterward, American finance capital, with its Administration, was aligned in the general imperialist anti-Soviet front which was preparing to "switch the war."

In Spellman the Vatican has continuously had an active agent for its policy of "selling" Franco to the American people. The political essence of his role was clearly reflected in his statement, made in 1943, when, after visiting Franco-Spain, he wrote in *Colliers*:

"Whatever criticism has been made of General Franco (and it has been considerable), I cannot doubt that he is a man loyal to his God, devoted to his country's welfare, and definitely willing to sacrifice himself in any capacity and to any extent for Spain."

It was quite consistent for Spellman's diocesan organ, the *Catholic News* (August 11, 1945), in Franco: "He was fighting on the side of the angels. The angels—whose earthly shapes the whole world saw, in black shirts and brown."

Spellman's friendship for fascism, if single instances were further needed, was most blatantly displayed in February of this year by his attendance at a banquet at Franco's embassy in Rome. This tion of ten Spanish anti-fascists—an act that outraged all progressive mankind, Catholics and non-Catholics, and aroused wide-scale demands on both sides of the Atlantic for an end to fascist tyranny

in Spain. By his presence, Cardinal Spellman lent the aura of the Catholic Church to a celebration of the enslavement of Spain.

It was this same Cardinal Spellman, fresh from fascist banquets, that the New York City Council greeted upon his return in a resolution expressing "a great deal of satisfaction and pride" in his elevation, and offering "congratulations to the Catholic Church." This homage paralleled the civic honors soon thereafter heaped upon Churchill, fresh from his Fulton, Missouri, speech.

The anti-fascist people of America, regardless of church or denomination, whether Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, have reason to honor the two Communist members of the New York City Council for their courageous stand against the resolution introduced on March 5 to extend the city's official welcome to this lover of fascism. History will record that the votes of Davis and Cacchione alone on that day were on the side of the people.

In shifting its main base of support to the United States, the Vatican is in reality consolidating a base that is already established and that has in recent years become increasingly important to it.

In the '20s it was still possible for a historian to write: "The Catholic Church is . . . a thing apart in the heart of the American body politics." Today no anatomy of America's political life can fail to reveal the Catholic Church fastened upon its heart. There is not a sphere of the nation's life in which the Catholic Church, and through it, the Vatican (directly or indirectly), does not intervene. It is an irony of history that the most powerful Protestant capitalist State in the world, the U.S.A., is today the greatest source of power of the Roman Catholic Church.

It is all the more ironical in that Rome has traditionally viewed the United States with misgivings since our country gained its independence. The Jeffersonian democratic principles, with their philosophic background in XVIII Century French materialism, expressed in the Constitutional separation of Church and State, caused the United States to be regarded by the Vatican as an erring nation. Thus, the English Catholic author, Hilaire Belloc wrote:

"The culture of the U.S. is, from its original religion and by its momentum and whole tradition, opposed to the Catholic Church."

Today the same Vatican which rushed to make its Concordats with the corporative States of fascism and which struggles to perpetuate feudal-landlord tyranny in Poland, the Balkans, Spain, and Latin America—the same Vatican professes to look to the United States, in the words of *Time* (Feb. 25, 1946), as: "the world's greatest embodiment of the form of government which offers the Church its best milieu for survival—democracy!" What it really courts is American imperialism (still to quote *Time*): "the world's most effective counterweight to the newly emergent power of Russia."

Politically and diplomatically the Vatican was able to make considerable inroads in the United States during the struggle for collective security.

Roosevelt's "quarantine the aggressor" slogan, which was in response to the needs and desires of the people, met with well-organised opposition from the reactionary and directly pro-fascist forces, who, in conjunction with the Vatican, waged the fiercest fight to keep up the tragic farce of "non-intervention" in Spain. Roosevelt's concession upon concession to the Vatican led inevitably to the betrayal of Spain, which touched off World War II.

The Administration's part in that betrayal was directly connected with its policy of accommodating clerical reaction. Clerico-fascism increasingly came to permeate the State Department, its Washington personnel, its ambassadors, and its silent envoys, such as Jefferson Caffery, Joseph P. Kennedy, Carleton Hayes, Robert Murphy, and Admiral Leahy, behind-the-scenes instigator of many an infamy. Munichism, pro-Vichyism, and Darlanism became the pattern of the State Department's policies.

And we, with our Browderite tail-ending, and with our Browderite expediency-mindedness, were all too ready to find excuses for the Administration's policy of yielding to the pressures of the reactionary Hierarchy. Thus, we saw "necessity" in each act of capitulation—because of Catholic Boss Flynn of New York . . . because of Catholic Boss Kelly of Chicago . . .

The Vatican's westward expansion of its spiritual domain cannot but help to increase the worldly riches it has long derived from the United States. In view of Europe's dwindling Peter's pence, apart from all political considerations, the shift of the Papal centre of gravity to the great wealth and economic power of the Catholic Church in the United States has become a materialist necessity.

While the Catholic Church is careful not to disclose the extent of its fabulous wealth in real estate (tax exempt), investments, and various holdings, its economic strength can be seen in such available data as the following, relative to church expenditures and the value of church edifices:

STATISTICS FOR 1936				
Number of Churches	Value of Church Edifices		Expenditures during Year	
	Reporting	Amount	Reporting	Amount
All Churches	372,734	\$3,431,375,407	149,709	\$236,952,371
W. Catholic Churches	15,681	787,681,207	13,720	139,073,324

(Statistical Abstract, 1945, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.)

It can thus be seen that, while Catholic churches represented only 9 per cent. of the total reporting, the proportionate value of their edifices was 23 per cent., and, while they constituted only 8.3 per cent. of the total reporting, their expenditures were 27 per cent.

The power of this wealth is reflected in the marked increase in Catholic publications and readers. According to the 1945 *Catholic Press Directory*, the number of Catholic publications in the United States has in the past three years increased by 35 to a total of 367, with a combined circulation of 10,600,000, representing a gain of over a million and a half readers, or 14.4 per cent. since 1942.

It is obviously not possible to point directly to subsidies by monopolies to the Catholic Church or to political pressures on their part in its behalf. Such undoubted practices are, needless to say, facilitated by the fact that key captains of industry and finance are members of the Catholic Church. But they are increasingly adopted by non-Catholic industrialists and financiers as monopoly reaction, seeking more anxiously direct and open political support in all churches and denominations, sees in the political role of the Vatican a major weapon. Thus, a high representative of the House of Morgan is known to have expressed himself recently: "We're playing ball with the Vatican."

The desperation with which the Vatican is working to keep firm the imperialist base of its own existence impels it more and more to reveal the political essence hidden beneath the spiritual guise. None but the politically innocent can look upon the Vatican as not being designedly and to the full extent of its influence a political power.

The claim to the Vatican's right of political interference was officially made by Pope Pius himself in his declaration of March 16, 1946, in which, *New York Times*, he "defended the right of a parish priest to counsel his flock in matters of politics—which a new Italian election law would make a punishable offence." The Pope stated: "It is the moral duties which explain to the faithful their What the Vatican conceives these 'moral duties' to be was made clear in an A.P. Rome dispatch of February 23 which reported the 'recommendation by the Italian Consultative Assembly for a Law to penalise clergymen who try to influence Italian voters to a Fascist rule.'" (*New York Times*, February 24, 1945.)

True, whenever the Vatican finds itself trapped politically, we shall continue to witness the old attempt at refuge in religion. Thus, the *Vatican City daily, Osservatore Romano*, sought to explain away *Izvestia's* expose of the reactionary appointees to the College of Cardinals by complaining: "As usual, *Izvestia* confuses religious moves with political ones." But the religious pretext is by now worn so threadbare as to be more embarrassing than protective. This dilemma brought Archbishop James H. Ryan of Omaha to write, in a letter to the *New York Times* (May 12, 1940): "Though conscious Catholic Church, we have chosen to remain blind to the political power of the Pope, head of the religion, is it the part of wisdom not to recognise the Papacy for what it is. . . . ?"

Of course, words like Archbishop Ryan's are not uttered as a criticism of the Vatican's meddling in politics, but rather as a suggested means of avoiding the repeated embarrassments of such criticism by removing its basis. Those words are, in effect, a declaration: It is now safe to admit openly that we are in politics; it will give us more freedom to operate.

The Vatican must be exposed and fought as a political power. Not the religion of the Church of Rome is at issue, but its political role. We Communists base ourselves on the principles of Marxism, on dialectical materialism and its application to history. At the same time—indeed, on the very basis of these scientific principles—every Communist defends freedom of religious belief and practice as a democratic right. But religion used to cloak political reaction challenges every democratic right. When, in the guise of moral force, the Hierarchy cries out for "justice" to the small nations in the U.N.O., we must expose its reactionary design of securing a pro-Vatican balance of power with a bloc of small Catholic States like Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and the countries of Latin America. The Vatican cannot commit political crimes against the democratic interests of the peoples and against the peace of the world, and escape arraignment by pleading "religious" motives before the court of world opinion.

By presenting the issue as Christianity v. Communism, the Vatican seeks to win the Protestant masses also to its side. We should be nurturing illusions if we held that this policy cannot and may not score successes. The Protestants in the United States noticeably resent the encroachments of the Catholic Church. Yet, despite "straws in the wind," it does not necessarily follow that there will be a strong and effective Protestant counter-action. Even the current epidemic of conversions among notables (which only the superficial will ascribe to Father Sheen's "talented persuasion") requires to be seen in this light. Vandenberg and the Vatican are playing subtle Vatican-inspired propaganda designed to make the Pope appear today the spokesman of all "Christendom."

This propaganda is clearly traceable, for instance, in the Luce-controlled *Time's* interpretation of the Pope's turn to the United States as "the greatest reorientation in Church policy since the Council of Trent" (cited issue). The full significance of the statement is brought home to us when we remember that the Council of Trent (1545-1563), which the Protestants refused to attend, marked the decisive doctrinal and organisational split between Protestantism and Catholicism. The current "reorientation" propaganda is manifestly designed to neutralise Protestant American opposition to the Vatican and its policies, to give the impression that the fundamental cleavage registered at the historic Council of Trent is healed, and that all Americans may now combine on the political platform of the Church of Rome.

The orientation of the Vatican to the United States puts greater responsibility on us in the struggle against fascism and its clerico-fascist arm.

The struggle must be waged so as to drive a wedge between the reactionary Hierarchy and the workers in the Church. The bulk of the Catholic workers in the United States are in the trade unions. The masses of Catholic workers in the C.I.O. are

supporting the general line of this great progressive trade union centre. In this country the attempt to organise clerical trade unions is more assailable than perhaps anywhere else. For here clerical trade unionism goes against the very grain of labor tradition. Here there is the strong and healthy tradition of the One Union and unified struggle. Organised labor can build firmly on this tradition and launch a powerful appeal and counter-drive against the divisive and destructive attempts of clerical reaction. And in this struggle, Catholic workers will take their place in the forefront.

We must avoid our error of the past in which we told ourselves that we were extending the "outstretched hand," where clerical reaction was offering us a mailed fist. The outstretched-hand policy, as we applied it, was not a policy of alienating the Catholic masses from the reactionary Hierarchy as a means of winning them for the anti-fascist struggle; rather, it amounted to a gesture of friendship to the Hierarchy, in which, illusorily, we saw a "progressive wing." Much of the confusion surrounding our outstretched-hand policy proceeded from an outlook that the Church would, if not play a progressive part in world affairs, at least be neutralised by the "progressives" among the Hierarchy. That illusion was part of the Browderite roseate prospect of the progressive postwar role of "enlightened imperialism."

Certainly, as Marxists, we must constantly remember that our programme calls for the unification of all sections of the people's forces that can be rallied round the banner of progress. As Marxists, therefore, we should know that we must always seek ways to unite with the Catholic masses, wherever possible, on issues however moderate—and always with sensitive regard for their deep-going

religious feelings—in order to win them against the Hierarchy and for democratic advance. In this sense, the policy of the outstretched-hand, far from being abandoned, must be vigorously re-directed. We must bring the Catholic masses to understand that ours is not an anti-clerical position, but a position against clerical reaction. We must bring them to see that the issue is not Communism v. Catholicism; as the Vatican would have it appear, but the united democratic forces of the people—including Catholics and Communists—against reaction wherever it manifests itself, in the Church and outside.

We can succeed in this task only when we connect the struggle against the Vatican's policy with the general struggle against fascism, reaction, and imperialism, and only when we find the proper approaches to achieve unity of action with the broad Catholic masses.

The issue is the struggle against the Vatican's war on peace. The issue is the struggle against imperialism's drive for a third world war. The issue is the continuing struggle for the total destruction of fascism.

On the one side is the camp of finance capital with its material forces and ideological and "spiritual" defenders. On the other side is the camp of the peoples with their social resources in the democratic masses, primarily the working class, with its organised movement and Communist vanguard; in the independence movements of the colonial peoples; in the newly formed peoples' democracies of Europe; in the Socialist Soviet Union—in whose existence, power, and world role increasing millions throughout the capitalist and colonial world have come to recognise their own fortress of strength as they advance in the struggle for world peace and social progress.

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND THE WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE

J. D. BLAKE

(From the speech of J. D. Blake to Victorian Arts and Sciences Conference, 16th June, 1946.)

The situation of artistic and scientific workers must today, as in the case of all other workers, be seen against the background of what is happening in the world.

Day after day the capitalist press contains gloating reports about the atomic bomb, the so-called "Devil's Dust" and bacteriological warfare. Reactionary forces in various capitalist countries talk with satanic glee about how entire populations of great cities could be wiped out with one blow. They speak of how the discoveries of science could ruin the crops and bring starvation to whole countries. They gloat over the prospect of water supplies fouled by disease bacteria, and they paint gleeful pictures of millions of people retching out their hearts from having drunk the waters of the earth.

Undoubtedly some of this is the speculation of distorted inhuman minds, but the important thing is

the revelation of the monstrous fashion in which monopoly capital proposes to use the products of scientific thought and work.

The other side of this picture is the millions of people in capitalist and colonial lands who are consciously and actively fighting to put an end to the rule of these savages—fighting for the emancipation of mankind.

This mighty array of social forces creates gigantic tensions in our present day world which inevitably exert tremendous pressure upon intellectual workers.

In face of this there are some who try to find ways of escape from a reality which seems so awful to them; but the issues facing us are inescapable: men of science, art and culture generally, have to make their decision.

The creation of various associations of scientists to fight the monopoly of the atomic bomb, and the

monopoly frustration of science generally, indicates that the best of the world's men of science are already beginning to take the correct stand.

Our own scientific workers have not been unaffected by these happenings and are increasingly acting parallel with, or in concert with, the main forces of social progress.

A primary duty of Communist scientific workers is to lead the struggle for improved salaries and conditions for scientific workers. To this end the association of scientific workers in various fields must be still further strengthened and improved, and the ties between these associations and the trade unions and the labor movement as a whole need to be made much stronger than at the moment.

At the same time our Communists must strive to develop a class approach on scientific matters. Just as there is a class approach to the problems of the atomic bomb and atomic energy, so also is there such an approach in other spheres of scientific work.

We should aim to reveal the effects of monopoly capitalism on various fields of scientific work. To contribute scientific knowledge to the struggles of the labor movement; which, by the way, is the only correct path to overcome the monopolist frustration of scientific work, and the unsatisfactory conditions of scientific workers.

Our scientific workers can contribute much more to the struggle for decent housing by investigation of the problems of building materials, building methods, types of houses, flats and so on.

The conscious lowering of the quality of manufactured goods, consumer goods, food and proprietary medicines which is connected with profit making and living standards of the masses, the suppression and misuse of scientific achievements and related matters, provide a wide field for this class approach to scientific subjects.

The problems of the control and exploitation of natural resources, as for example brown coal and its relation to decentralisation of industry; the Snowy River development, soil conservation, siltation of rivers, water supplies and reforestation, which come within the general sphere of what is known as regional development, all provide avenues through which our scientific workers can make an important contribution to the struggles of the working class.

The vast and little explored field of industrial health, the fight against disease (tuberculosis for example), medical research, expansion of hospitals and clinics, the more efficient organisation of medical service, with better conditions and security for medical and hospital workers, together with the liberation of patients from financial worry—all these problems merge with the general struggle of the working class for higher wage levels and for better working and living conditions.

Communists working in the various fields of science and the professions must widen and deepen their knowledge of their own field of endeavour. A

Communist scientific worker must aim to become a master in his own field so that he is looked upon by the men in his own profession, and by the masses, as a man of great learning, mastery and professional skill.

In the various fields of artistic endeavour our work has moved ahead since we last assembled. The creation of a new executive for the overall direction of work in all art fields, including the various schools of painting, commercial artists and so on marked a great step forward.

New life has come into the Victorian Artists Society which promises to become one of the most viable organisations of painters in Victoria.

The expanding work of the realist film unit, the writers' group and the theatre makes a valuable contribution to the developing struggles of the labor movement.

It is necessary to remind Communists who are members of artistic and cultural associations that it is essential to avoid any narrow, doctrinaire approach in their work.

The Communist Party in its general political work among the masses—among non-Party and Labor Party workers—maintains the utmost firmness of principle, and at the same time strives to avoid any doctrinaire, sectarian or narrow approach.

Without capitulating to backwardness, the Communist Party takes the workers as they are. It seeks the common ground on which united struggles can be organised. Communists organise the practical experience of the masses in struggle, so that in the process of struggle the masses learn to adopt the Communist standpoint.

With variations for the particular field, our Communists in the various fields of art work should learn well these precepts of Communist work.

In these momentous days, when mankind stands at the crossroads of history, workers in the fields of art and culture generally feel a growing need to examine the problems of world outlook in relation to art and culture.

For a brief period in human history the bourgeois world outlook inspired great works of art. That was the period when the bourgeoisie was conducting a struggle against feudalism.

Today the social decay of bourgeois society is far advanced, and connected with that fact there is a condition of extreme decay in the field of bourgeois culture.

Nowadays it is rather obvious that the bourgeois world outlook is no longer capable of inspiring a Beethoven, a Shakespeare or a Rembrandt. Spiritual decay and degeneration is a feature of present-day bourgeois society.

Because bourgeois society is historically transitory, bourgeois realism in art could only reach its apex for a brief historical moment. Even then it could only be a limited kind of realism for the simple reason that the bourgeoisie has no future.

In the period of its decline bourgeois realism sometimes assumes the form of naturalism, often even to showing how bad bourgeois society is, but it cannot reveal the new and the good growing out of the old.

In fact this situation inevitably leads to a break from realism in the bourgeois school and two paths open before the artistic worker:

(1) The domination of pessimism, mysticism, complete abstraction and escape from reality. The retreat into the irrational world and the field of the unconscious—into the mystical other world.

This is the path taken by the dominant group among the Melbourne contemporaries.

(2) The real effort to attach oneself to the new—to the class forces which are moving forward—to the world outlook of the harbingers and architects of the new society—the impressive grandeur of vast millions awakening and making history.

This second path is the path which has been taken by our socialist realist group of painters headed by comrades Counihan, Bergner, and O'Connor. Their contribution to Australian art lies in the fact that they have led a clear artistic break from the dominant corrupt and decaying trend among the contemporaries. They have boldly taken the initiative in developing a socialist realist trend in Australian art. In my view they are on the right road.

At the same time I think it should be understood that this body of artists are still in the process of becoming socialist realists. The weight of emphasis in their work is still on the critique of the old, and as we know that could still belong in a category of true bourgeois realism. Fully mature socialist realism in various art forms—the ability to discern the new in the midst of the old—the growing future within the old, is bound up with a thorough mastery of Marxist theory.

What do we understand by socialist realism? Do we understand it to be a simple copying or photographing of the reality? Such art forms could still remain varieties of bourgeois realism. Presentation of the reality as something static, as an unchanging, frozen thing, does not accord with the Marxist view of reality.

Marxism is the theoretical foundation of socialist realism, and dialectical materialism is the Marxist theory of knowledge.

Dialectical materialism teaches us that reality is moving matter; in the reality there is a unity of opposites, and a conflict of opposites, within the one unit and within the whole. For example in the one man, one society, and, as our physicists would tell us, in the one atom.

We have to deal with a many-sided reality in which the many sides interact one upon the other—nothing stands still, everything is passing away and becoming.

In other words reality itself is dialectical, and socialist realism must therefore, by its very nature, be filled with dialectical life.

Art which presents man and nature as static and unchanging does not accord with dialectical reality.

Socialist realism has to do more than merely freeze into art forms the results of visual and aural images. The defeats and victories, the sufferings, misery, and the joys of people, as seen by the artist, become fused in the crucible of his creative imagination—his fantasy as it were—to produce the socialist realist work of art.

For the Marxist imagination is itself part of reality, provided it arises from the Marxist dialectical concept of reality. In the artist such creative imagination can, and should, illuminate the truth of life—of reality. People viewing the resultant work of art—painting, novel, film, etc.—should sense a feeling of great revelation of truth, and be able to say—

"That is the truth—that is how life is—there is the promise of the future. The artist has revealed to me the truth of life in a way I have not been able to do for myself."

In other words, from the artist's creative imagination the emerging image which is the work of art should be something more than a copy of visual and aural images.

Fully developed, mature, socialist realist works of art and literature can only come from mastery of Marxist theory.

Only Marxism permits profound insight into the many-sided, dialectical reality. Only Marxist theory can prevent our imagination overrunning the bounds of reality—away from the real world into the mystical and the unreal.

Only Marxist theory gives us that essential inflexible faith in people, in the future. Only Marxism allows us to see through all the human misery and suffering, through all the hypocrisy and avarice of the present-day capitalist world—through all this the inevitable forward march of human progress.

Marxism provides the key to understanding the social forces—the class forces—which, sometimes gropingly, sometimes in great rushes—at times in defeat, at others with great victories, are steadily pressing forward to the emancipation of mankind.

That is the man of today, the exploited and oppressed man, who is straightening his shoulders and pressing forward. He is frequently hampered by eyes filled with the smoke of deception and the mire of a decaying social system clutching at his feet.

But he is going forward.

He has a simple dignity for he has to perform the most dignified of all tasks in human history—the ending of the exploitation of man by man.

That is the reality, and that is the real man, that our socialist realists will fully know, and fully understand, with the aid of the brilliant searchlight of Marxist-Leninist theory.

TEACHERS AGAINST REACTION

W. E. GOLLAN, B.A.

DESPITE fundamental and basic deficiencies in the N.S.W. education system (Alan Short drew pointed attention to one of them in June "Review"), it is yet true to say that important progressive trends have appeared in the last ten years. These have affected not only the courses of study and mechanics of teaching, but the whole community attitude towards education and the social and educational outlook of teachers.

It appears that N.S.W. is somewhat more advanced than other States in these respects, but there can be no doubt that developments here are bound to stimulate educational advance in other States. Consequently, these trends are of national importance. They indicate in sum total the beginning of a shift in the centre of gravity of the whole educational process. In a word, education is becoming a little more democratic and is beginning to affect the thinking and activity of very many of those concerned in the education process—child, parent, teacher and even Education Department officials.

No doubt, world events have largely contributed to this end; and certainly the presence of a Labor Government since 1941 has been a contributing factor, but the principal compelling and directing force has undoubtedly been the Teachers' Federation, which has grown consistently in stature and influence until it is today, beyond question, the major educational influence in N.S.W.

The whole process that has been going on and is still continuing is one of broadening education, of beginning to fit it to meet the needs of preparation for citizenship and of strengthening the links between the education system and the community at large.

The syllabus has been made less narrowly academic; it has become more diversified to meet the requirements of different kinds of abilities and to provide more varied forms of training. A good deal of the lumber carried over from the mediaeval forms of education has been abandoned. More conscious and deliberate thought is being given to providing the child with a minimum of exact knowledge and to development of the capacity to think about the real world. In this respect, the course known as "Social Studies" is of fundamental importance, providing, as it does, for some opportunity for scientific method in the study of human affairs and reducing the misleading propaganda and special pleading that defaces the older courses in history and civics.

Parallel with these changes has gone a broadening of the experience and activity of teachers. The affiliation with the Labor Council and the A.C.T.U. has enabled the Federation to put forward before the unions a progressive educational policy and provided links with the great body of trade unionists

whose children are educated in the public schools and who are vitally interested in the kind of education they receive.

More important still, it has linked the teaching body in an organised way with the mass movement of the people. In the educational field, this process has been developed still further by effective co-operation with the Parents and Citizens' organisation and by holding, in collaboration with the Education Department, a series of Regional Educational Conferences that have done much to draw wide masses of the people into active participation in educational reform. Simultaneously the status of teachers has been considerably raised. Not only have substantial salary increases been gained by direct negotiation with the employer, but teachers have won Departmental recognition of their position as skilled craftsmen by the award of a Teacher's Certificate.

Much remains to be done. The Teachers' Federation programme of educational advance which, in substance, is also that of the Parents and Citizens' and the A.C.T.U., outlines the reforms needed to raise the educational system to a minimum state of efficiency. The reforms are legion.

However, there can be little doubt that with its powerful allies in the people's movement, and through its own efficiency and strength, the Teachers' Federation will lead the way in making the educational system here one of the most democratic and efficient in the world.

It is not surprising, in view of this progress, that the forces of conservatism and reaction both within and without the union have carried on a campaign of bitter opposition and disruption, culminating recently in a calculated attempt by some of its own members to defeat the Federation campaign for increased salaries for teachers. Fortunately their treachery was unavailing, and they have succeeded only in progressively isolating themselves from their fellow unionists. An analysis of the methods used by the reaction reveals the usual pro-fascist pattern of thought and activity.

Resistance to the broadening activity and the increase of democratic thought amongst teachers took, originally, the form of a narrow craft isolationism. Within the Union the catch-cries were raised, "Let us mind our own business," as a means of preventing the achievement of reforms that could be won only by effective collaboration with other bodies also concerned with educational advance. This was buttressed externally by a persistent press campaign of slander and misrepresentation, in which the "S.M.H." played the leading part. The affiliation of the teachers to the trade union movement, representing as it did the first major shift of professional workers out of the

camp of privilege and wealth into that of the people, provoked a frenzy of dismay which this organ of monopoly capital made no pretence of concealing.

More recently the "S.M.H.", and, to some extent, the rest of the monopoly press, has followed the policy of a persistent smear campaign directed against the Federation Executive and Council, opening their columns to every enemy and traitor within the teachers' ranks, expurgating the replies of Federation officials, and resorting to such deliberate distortion in its reports that Federation Council decided recently by an overwhelming majority to exclude the press from its meetings.

During the early period of the struggle for a progressive educational policy, the main ideological exponents of a reactionary, mediaeval, abstract type of education were a group of Trotskyite followers and Professor Anderson, several of whom are now conspicuous in the ranks of Catholic Action. Their leader, one H. Eddy, has found a more congenial field for his activities in befuddling the minds of members of the W.E.A. With the eclipse of the Trotskyites the leadership of the reaction passed to Catholic Action. This group have been far more openly reactionary than their predecessors, and, naturally, more mischievous, in that they have quite unscrupulously used and are still using churchly loyalty to carry out their policy. Their pattern of work is identical with that of the Catholic Action in other unions and draws heavily upon the Fascist technique. In a printed slander-sheet, which they have ample funds to disseminate widely amongst teachers, they classify all Federation progressives as "communists," call for the dismissal of Communists from the teaching service, indulge in anti-semitism, and use threats of organised violence to prevent discussion of their activities. (Such threats

were made against the writer of this article by one of the group, G. Stanton of Redhead Public School.)

During the campaign for salary increases, members of this group conveyed to "Century" confidential information which was published by that journal, doing grave harm to the campaign; and in numerous other ways attempts at sabotage were made. For this group it was more important that the union leadership should be discredited than that salary increases should be won. The Catholic Action and their associates have consistently fought every progressive educational move; they were fiercely opposed to the Social Studies Syllabus, they resist the growth of democracy, while simultaneously raising the cry of "more democracy within the union," hoping by such moves as plebiscites on all matters of policy to disrupt the Federation by carrying faction fighting throughout its ranks and so creating the chaos of anarchy.

At the 1945 Annual Conference, the intrigues of this body were thoroughly exposed. As a result of this, they are temporarily quiescent, but it is not without significance that one of their close associates, C. P. Ryan, recently moved for the secession of the Headmasters' Association from the Teachers' Federation. Mr. Ryan was evidently charting the new course. However, the move was overwhelmingly defeated. It seems clear that a basic change is taking place amongst wide strata of teachers' opinion. Very many teachers who, ten or five years ago, would have been classified as conservatives, are progressive today, in union and educational matters.

The struggle ahead for a New Deal for Education, together with correct leadership in co-operation with the people's movements which ally themselves to this New Deal, should consolidate this loose progressivism into specific forward-looking socialist opinion.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Why do the Soviet authorities attach so much importance to having only one candidate in the election, when it is a fruitful source of misunderstanding, and is moreover difficult to explain to those accustomed to our parliamentary methods?—H.M.L.

The question can be boiled down to: Are the Soviet elections democratic? Are they free?

To assess the worth and meaning of the election method of a given country, the first and by far the most important thing to do is to examine its political set-up. In no other way would it be possible to compare elections in Soviet democracy with elections elsewhere, for example in bourgeois democratic States, or in some of the areas in western Germany controlled by the Anglo-American military, or with the "elections" in fascist-ridden Portugal.

To approach the question merely by comparing the electoral machinery of the different countries would constitute a bad case of formalism in thought

and investigation. We must seek the real content, the essence.

Compare, for example, a factory operating in Socialism with one under capitalist rule. Outwardly, they appear to be the same, and with similar categories of "workers," "wages," "management," and so on. But there is a world of difference nevertheless. In capitalism, the worker's labor-power is just one commodity among other commodities; the capitalist buys more, or less, of it just as he does with fuel, machinery or lubricating oil. In the Soviet Union, however, the workers collectively own and control all the industries; they are real partners of, sharers in, the products of their labor. Similarly with courts of justice, art institutions and a thousand other aspects of social life.

The fundamental difference derives from the fact that one society is exploitative, the other co-operative; one is riven by class struggle, the other presents a new civilisation free of social anarchy and

waste. When this is understood, the differences in election details no longer bear special importance, and can be explained in spite of the distortions and lies of capitalist anti-Sovieteering.

Even if one didn't know all the details of Soviet election methods, one should still be able to say with full confidence: "The form, or procedure, in Soviet elections differs from capitalist countries, but that is unimportant. I know that a people who fought three revolutions in the past 40 years, who created the miracle of Socialism in the face of a world of enemies, who produced the Red Army, who buy Shakespeare in millions of copies—I can surely know that such a people can easily and quite satisfactorily handle the minor details of how to elect the best representatives to their parliament!"

Democracy in capitalism is extremely circumscribed for the toilers. Even the secret ballot has been largely illusory for the reason that capitalist control of the means of production, and also of education and publicity, determine in advance that the voter could only "choose" between "one or other member of the ruling class to misrepresent him in parliament" (Marx).

Now for the few main details.

The important part of Soviet elections occurs before final nomination. The various organisations in the given electorate submit nominations. A lively, healthy campaigning begins—what one may expect among an emancipated citizenry. And they have to choose, as happens in hundreds of electorates, between workers with outstanding industrial records, Red Army heroes, novelists, scientists, etc., and never between a successful businessman, a political adventurer, or a real estate agent labelling himself "labor."

BOOK REVIEW

The Road to Serfdom (Professor Hayek)

Dr. G. P. O'DAY.

THIS book, written by a Professor of Economics in the University of London, is apparently considered by the conservatives to be an adequate refutation of Socialism. It is well therefore to say at once that it does not contain a critical examination of the Marxian economic, political, historical and philosophical theories of the October revolution and the subsequent economic and political development of the USSR. Professor Hayek's criticism is indeed not concerned with Communist theory and practice. Let us explain what exactly he is criticising.

Socialism is defined by Hayek as "the abolition of private enterprise, of private ownership of the means of production, and the creation of a system of planned economy in which the entrepreneur working for profit is replaced by a central planning body." This definition is false for it is perfectly

One candidate is eventually selected to stand. If there are "withdrawals by direction," they are by direction of the particular section of the voters who made the first nomination. There is nothing wrong with that, any more than with the right of recall available to electors if the candidate turns out unsatisfactory after election.

The final test comes on polling day. The candidate must secure at least 75 per cent. of the total on the roll; if he fails, a new election is ordered.

What is of special interest is that, without compulsory voting, the actual voting hits the 99 per cent. mark in most electorates.

Of greatest historical significance is the bloc of Communist Party and non-Party candidates. Hear Stalin on the matter: "The non-Party people are united with the Communists in one, common, collective body of Soviet people. . . . The only difference between them is that some belong to the Party and some don't. But this difference is only a formal one. The important thing is that all are engaged in one common cause. That is why the Communist and non-Party bloc is a natural and vital thing."

This bloc does in fact presage the eventual "liquidation" of the Communist Party. In the Communist society to come, even the formal distinction between Party and non-Party will have disappeared. The Communist Party will have fulfilled its historical task of leading the masses from capitalism to Socialism, and then to the higher stage of Communism.

(References: How the Soviet State is Run by Pat Sloan; The Constitution of the U.S.S.R.; the final section of Stalin's Report to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

applicable to a complete State Capitalism. Socialism is defined by Marxists as "the collective ownership of the means of production and payment according to work done." By Hayek's definition, Fascism, Communism, and the economy of all States in which Capitalism is regulated are species of collectivism and the same general conclusions apply to all. So, according to Hayek, Germany before the first world war was largely Socialist, Sweden is Socialist, Hitler Germany was Socialist, etc., etc. In support of this, he quotes Max Eastman, W. H. Chamberlain, F. A. Voigt and Walter Lippmann; some deserters from Communism, all its enemies.

Thus the Professor lays an unsound basis for his argument. This argument is then that Socialist ideas have taken us away from Liberalism and are now conducting us to servitude. Hayek says that the

growth of Liberalism and increased freedom, liberation from feudal shackles, was accompanied by the growth of commerce. The Marxists say that the democratic revolution brought increased freedom and Liberalism. What Hayek cannot or will not see is that the development of capitalism into monopoly capitalism, its last stage, has developed contradiction at its highest point, the monopoly capitalists moving to repression, the working class to the final struggle for freedom. His proposition is that the world should go back to Liberalism, that is to the individualistic capitalism of seventy years ago. He is able to propose such an absurdity with confidence only because in his opinion history knows no laws and therefore we can make the world what we will. In this connection it is worth noting that the Catholic Hierarchy travel further on this road than Hayek. They denounce Socialism and Capitalism, Communism and Liberalism. They regard Socialism as the child of Capitalism and Communism as the child of Liberalism, and outdo Hayek by proposing a return to Guilds and peasant farming.

However, Hayek resembles these clerics in his childlike faith in Capitalism. He announces that there is no reason why a remedy for crises should not be found, perhaps by monetary control, and equally no reason why the capitalist government should not control monopolies. The Government and the law are, in Hayek's conception, above monopolies and certainly not controlled by them. Sainly professional innocence! He has no conception of the true nature of the State, so correctly described by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Professor Hayek draws our attention to the part Socialists, i.e., those whom we term Social Imperialists, Social Chauvinists, Social Fascists, have played in the genesis of the Fascist States, and it is certainly well that we should not forget it. We share his horror of those regimented States and agree that Liberalism would certainly be preferable, if it were possible. As it is not, we fight today for a new democracy, a wide democracy, the essential preliminary to revolution. Here Hayek expresses a very common reaction of the modern petty bourgeois whose genuine and reasonable objection to Fascism is directed by cunning reactionaries against the Communist movement. Monopoly Capitalism is the Fascist State; the Fascist State sets up a sets up a Fascist State; the Fascist State sets up a planned economy; Communists want also a planned economy; deduction, the Communists are the main enemy, although it is exceedingly obvious that the Communists are the main enemy of Monopoly Capitalism. Surely the monopoly capitalists must laugh.

Here also are a couple of sentences that should tickle them: "The tendency towards monopoly and planning is not the result of any 'objective' opinions beyond our control, but the product of opinions fostered and propagated for half a century till they have come to dominate all our policy" (p. 46), and "It is largely due to the influence of German Socialist theoreticians, particularly Sombart, generalising

from his experience of their country, that the inevitable development of the competitive system into 'monopoly capitalism' became widely accepted" (p. 49). So there you have it. Socialist ideas are the true origin and fount of monopoly capitalism. Can today turvey go further?

From the foregoing you will have gathered that Hayek's criticism is in reality directed against State regulation of capitalism, against "planned" capitalism, and against the Fascist State. That is, against that planning which, in Lenin's words, makes the country a paradise for the capitalist and a prison house for the workers. The pity about his criticism is that it is superficial, it does not reach to the root, which is the inevitably predatory, reactionary, oppressive monopoly capitalism. We must, however, acknowledge the justice of some of his observations on Fascist propaganda. For example, he writes (p. 148) "The most effective way of making people accept the values they are to serve, is to persuade them that they are really the same as those which they, or at least the best among them, have always held, but which were not properly understood or recognised before." "The most efficient technique is to use the old words but change their meaning. Few traits of totalitarian regimes are at the same time so confusing to the superficial observer and yet so characteristic of language, the change as the complete perversion of language, the change of meaning of the words by which the ideals of the new regimes are expressed." Socialism, Culture, as used by Hitler, springs at once to the mind. And Hayek is also right when he notes that "gradually the whole language becomes spoiled, words become empty shells deprived of any definite meaning, as capable of denoting one thing as its opposite and used solely for the emotional associations which still adhere to them." Here in Australia, the process is as obvious as anywhere. Politicians of a right wing, Labor and Liberal, use words today as a rule not for their meaning but for their emotional tinge. Cf. Menzies' "British Race" and "British Language" and the well-known cliché "Social Justice."

Having paid this tribute to Professor Hayek, we must now turn to what is the main thesis of his book, viz., that a planned economy means destruction of freedom. What does Hayek mean by freedom? He adopts the statement of Kant, "Man is free if he needs to obey no person but solely admit that multi- this definition even Hayek must admit that multi- tudes, all those that own no means of production, have no freedom under capitalism for they must have no freedom to earn. He is also correct in that find a master or starve. He is also correct in that under Fascist dictatorship and the Fascists planned economy freedom is rare, for the masters are few and their power unlimited. With Socialism, however, with the collective ownership of the means of production, the laws are made by the whole people and therefore man is free, for he is his own master. As Engels pointed out, in the end the

administration of persons is replaced by the administration of things.

Moreover, under capitalism, man is subject to the immanent laws of capitalism, to blind natural law, and therefore his freedom is an illusion. In Socialism, man understands and uses economic laws for his purposes and therefore acquires real freedom, is no longer subject to unemployment, bankruptcy, and crises. In the words of the Soviet constitution he has the right to work, to rest and to recreation guaranteed by a material basis, the collective ownership of the means of production.

Hayek raises also other objections to planning. He conceives it impossible to plan for all as the tastes of man are so diverse. The experience of the Soviet Union effectively answers this objection. Planning by democratic centralism is planning by a central elected authority on the basis of information and decisions made by local elected bodies; plans not only general but also local plans independent of the central authority; these adequately provide for all possible variations of taste and needs. He also objects that plans take a long time to execute, while governments often change. This is simply not realising that in Socialism as classes have disappeared and there is therefore no clash of class interests, governments become far more stable and, as the Soviet Union has demonstrated, the consistent execution of a long time plan becomes perfectly possible.

Marxist Glossary (L. H. Gould)

S. MOSTON.

L. H. GOULD compiled in 1943 a Glossary of Marxist Terms. This publication proved extremely popular and was quickly sold out. Inspired, no doubt, by this interest, L. H. Gould has now completed a Marxist Glossary, a considerable extension on the original Glossary of Marxist Terms.

The previous modest pamphlet of thirty pages has grown almost fourfold with a commensurate increase in the number of terms defined. The political value of the new work, however, has expanded in geometrical progression. This is partly the result of many suggestions by workers since the earlier publication, but the greater space available in the new work allows for a much more adequate treatment of many subjects.

For example, in the original edition Dialectics was defined as "the science of the general laws of motion, both of the external world and human thought" (Engels). To this brilliant, concise formulation has been appended an excellent explanation of the principal features of dialectics including the "unity of opposites" and the "negation of the negation." In this explanation the finer points of difference between various formulations are clearly revealed. For many students "unity and struggle," "contradiction and antagonism" of opposites have

However, we must not overlook the fact that Socialist planning must be preceded by a complete change of the economic structure, by a social revolution. We Communists clearly recognise that capitalism, State regulated capitalism, and the Fascist State are all enemies to freedom and lead to regimentation. That is why we fight always for democratic control against State control; why we want democratic Rural Boards, why we demand that the miners should have a say in the control of the mines, why when we demand nationalisation of monopolies, we always add the condition that this nationalisation be supported and largely controlled by powerful organisations of the workers independent of the State; when we demand nationalisation of medicine, we also demand local democratic control and freedom for the doctor, the nurse, and hospital employees and effective share of control by their local and national organisations. Always building the power of the workers for the day when the capitalist State must disappear, always fighting the bureaucracy which capitalism is constantly generating. Planning will increase liberty, but not any planning, only socialist planning.

We conclude then that Hayek's book is founded on confusion, on confusing Fascism and Communism. This being today the favorite method of attack on Communism, it is well that we should study it thoroughly and combat it everywhere we can. It is not enough to treat it with contempt.

been more or less interchangeable phrases, but the new Glossary shows the real significance of each.

"Unity and struggle of opposites, refers to inherent contradictions within all things and phenomena of nature."

"All contradictions are not antagonistic. In capitalism, the contradictions of the basic classes are antagonistic and are resolved in antagonistic forms. Contrast this, however, with the contradiction between the proletariat and the peasantry in Soviet Russia from the period of the October Revolution up to the triumph of collectivisation in 1932; the former was Socialist in regard to mode of production, the latter individualist. But the contradiction was expressed, not in antagonism, but in friendly co-operation between the two classes, and finally resolved (or, the contradiction was destroyed) by the successful extension of Socialist production to agriculture."

Many more illustrations are given of the dialectics of nature and society. The new Glossary is not just an elaboration of the previous one. The many terms that have been added are of equal importance with the old, and receive an adequate treatment. Important questions as ground rent (both differential and absolute) are concisely defined, e.g. "Differential Rent — the difference between the highest

price of production and the individual price of production. This difference is appropriated by the landowner."

Following this brief statement is an explanation of the origin of differential rent and the character of absolute rent.

Such definition undoubtedly has great value for the student in fixing in his (or her) mind the essentials of the subject, the further explanation giving some detail, aids towards more concrete understanding.

Nowhere in the Glossary does conciseness degenerate into dogma or narrowness. Definition, explanation and illustration are sufficiently flexible to avoid such cardinal errors.

The central theme of the Glossary, from which all the terms radiate, is the labor movement. This

is the heart of the work vitalising all its limbs. Every phrase is well-chosen to enhance the spirit of the labor movement.

The creative role of Marxist theory is infused into this list of words and explanations. Agitation, class struggle, revolution, class consciousness and a host of other terms are transformed from what is "only too often inert, dead letter jargon into active guides to action."

Whether the student seeks knowledge on Materialism or Dictatorship, Democracy or Empiricism, he may be sure the Glossary will provide him with accurate information of practical value.

Mr. L. H. Gould has done a great service to the labor movement in compiling his Marxist Glossary. The Glossary will undoubtedly save students much time and ease many theoretical difficulties.

DUSTS

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

THE Ministry of Health is at present engaged in two poster campaigns.

One urges us to hold a handkerchief in front of our face when we cough or sneeze. The other urges us to avoid venereal diseases, though it does not tell us how to do so. On the contrary, public money is being spent on propagating a lie, and a dangerous one. "Clean living," we are told, "is the only safeguard." If "clean living" means avoidance of sexual intercourse with people to whom one is not married, this is nonsense. After the war thousands of returning soldiers, sailors, and airmen will infect their wives, or be infected by them. The correct use of antiseptics is also a safeguard. Men will infect their wives, and conversely, because they did not use them.

However, I am not going to deal with this question, but to point out that the Ministry of Health gives no warning against a danger which kills more people, and causes more sickness, than coughs or sneezes or venereal diseases—namely, dust. To be more accurate, certain dusts; for some dusts seem to be harmless, and others are clearly good for health.

The evidence as to what dusts are poisonous comes from the statistics of mortality in different trades. Unfortunately, we have no figures later than 1931. But a dust which killed people in 1931 still kills them in 1945.

Let us see how we get evidence as to the harmful character of a dust. The kiln and oven men in the pottery trade—that is to say, men engaged in making earthenware, china, porcelain, terracotta and glazed tiles—have a mortality rate from phthisis above the average. Their death-rate from phthisis is 127 per cent. above the average; that from other lung diseases, 147 per cent. above the average. One naturally looks for something wrong in the air which they breathe.

If the sudden change from heat to cold and back were responsible, we should expect the kiln and oven men baking bricks and unglazed tiles to have the same high death-rate. Actually, their death-rate is 13 per cent. below the average, and their death-rate from consumption is half the average, though the sudden temperature changes may explain the fact that their death-rates from bronchitis and pneumonia are rather high.

Further, we find that the pottery workers' death-rate from "chronic interstitial pneumonia," which is the Registrar-General's pet name for silicosis, was 32 times the average. We need hardly go on to read medical reports on the lungs of dead pottery kilnmen to conclude that dust kills a lot of them, though these reports certainly drive the point home.

The dangerous mineral dusts mostly contain silica, and come from sandstone, slate, anthracite, abrasives such as emery and the sand used in sandblasting, pottery glaze, and a few other sources.

Not all mineral dusts are harmful. Limestone quarries have a total death-rate 28 per cent. below normal, and their death-rate from phthisis is less than half the average. Limestone masons and limeburners who help to make cement are also healthier than the average. This has been known for many years.

But private and public authorities go on using sandstone. One of the cathedrals at Liverpool is largely built of red sandstone. Many lives would have been saved had it been built of brick, concrete, or limestone. The decision to build it of sandstone killed a number of men just as surely—and a good deal more slowly and painfully—as if a man had been buried alive under the foundation as a human sacrifice. For sandstone masons inhale so much silica that their death-rate from phthisis is four times the average.

There is plenty of limestone in the Pennines, at no great distance; but the authorities, both clergy and lay, responsible for such a building evidently do not think in terms of human life in deciding such matters.

Asbestos dust produces effects rather like those of silica dust, but it does not kill anything like so many people. On the other hand, it is a good deal harder to detect by means of X-rays, so its victims are more likely to die, or to become invalids, without compensation, than those of silicosis.

Textile dust is pretty deadly in large quantities. Cotton blowroom workers and strippers and grinders, who inhale cotton dust, had a death-rate 45 per cent. above the average. They died not only of lung diseases, but of heart and kidney diseases.

Wool dust also affects the kidneys. Wool spinners and weavers had over twice the normal death-rate from kidney disease, though it does not seem to hurt their lungs.

No one knows how the kidneys are damaged. It seems possible that the lung cells, instead of being clogged up with wool dust as they are with silica or asbestos dust, break the wool down into substances which are carried by the blood to the kidneys. But the kidneys are damaged in the effort to excrete them.

For every pound of textile dust inhaled by textile workers, I should think housewives inhale a hundredweight, though, of course, it is spread over many more people. The vacuum cleaner, which inhales textile dust without being poisoned, probably saves a lot of lives.

Of course, a small number of workers are exposed to much more poisonous dusts.

The dangers of lead dust are fairly well known. Manganese compounds affect the parts of the brain concerned with posture, and give rise to stiffness, twitching and difficulty in walking. Later on speech is affected, and emotional control may be lost.

Hatters used to die on a large scale from inhaling mercuric nitrate dust, which is still sometimes used to loosen the rabbit fur from which felt is made. This not only rots the teeth, but causes a tremor called "hatters' shakes," and finally madness. The phrase "as mad as a hatter" is not funny.

Hatters did very frequently go mad from mercury poisoning. However, more mercury poisoning seems to be due to the vapour than to dust.

Other dusts cause dermatitis. This is particularly common with explosives, such as "tetryl," whose dust particularly affects the inside of the nose. Trinitrotoluene and mercury fulminate also attack the skin.

Readers rather frequently send me samples of dust and ask if they are poisonous. I cannot answer them, as I have not got a chemical laboratory at my disposal, and very few chemists of my acquaintance have much time to spare.

The Trades Union Congress should establish a laboratory where such tests can be made. If this is done the workers will be spared a good deal of ill-health and some deaths. Until it is done, it will too often happen that no notice is taken of the dust in some new industrial process until it has killed several people and wrecked the health of many more.

(World copyright reserved.)

New Yugoslavia

IN Yugoslavia, according to the Constitution adopted on January 31, "The means of production are either the property of the whole people, that is, property held by the State; or the property of people's co-operative associations; or the property of private persons." In fact, 82 per cent of all industry is now in the hands of the State; in metals and engineering 87 per cent, in electrical engineering 95 per cent. When the agrarian reform now in progress is completed, 95 per cent of all arable land will be held by peasants. There is a great development of village co-operatives, over 7,000 having been newly formed, with 1,200,000 members. There is still a terrible shortage of food and materials and transport; but public ownership of the main means of production, combined with the initiative of people who have fought and won their freedom, will rapidly overcome all internal difficulties.