

2/31 Monthly



Sixpence

COMMUNIST ★ REVIEW ★

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

020470084
A VITAL DISCOVERY

1335.4
C13R
By J. N. Rawling



PREPARE FOR ELECTIONS

By John Fisher



LODGING THE LENINS

By Kammerer

JULY

1939

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

EDITOR: R. DIXON

Associate Editors: E. W. Campbell, G. Baracchi.

Room 2, 193 Hay Street, Sydney.

Vol. VI, No. 7

Sydney, July, 1939

Sixpence

Contents

THE NEWS REVIEWED	E. W. Campbell	385
LODGING THE LENINS (Reminiscences)	391
MESSAGE FROM SPAIN (Verse)	Tadg Mor	392
THE ANGLO-SOVIET PEACE ALLIANCE	L. Sharkey	393
LABOR REFORMISM AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT	R. Dixon	397
SESQUI-CENTENARY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	J. N. Rawling	401
J. N. RAWLING'S DISCOVERY (Manifesto Of Victorian Section of First International)	405
PAGES FROM THE PAST	410
FURTHER AND DEEPER (Cartoon)	416
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT & CIVILIAN DEFENCE	W. F. Burns	417
PRICE OF MILK IN N.S.W. (II)	"Economists"	422
"HOW AUSTRALIA IS GOVERNED"	424
MILESTONES IN HISTORY (A Colony Revolts)	425
N.Z. NEWS LETTER (Defence Leagues Versus Defence)	Gordon Watson	426
CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM	"Lawyer"	429
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	431
CANBERRA COMMENT (Prepare for the Federal Election!)	John Fisher	436
TROTSKYITES AND THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR MOVEMENT	J. D. Blake	439
CONCISE HISTORY OF BOLSHEVISM (II.)	E. Yaroslavsky	443
NEW BOOKS OF INTEREST	E. W. C.	447

THE NEWS REVIEWED

IT'S NOW UP TO US

EARLY last month, when Britain advanced counter proposals to those of the Soviet for a Peace Pact, a certain Sydney paper ran an editorial entitled "It's Now Up to Stalin."

Other papers did not put it so bluntly, nevertheless most of their editorials echoed the same tone—that the onus for concluding or rejecting the Pact rested with the Soviet government.

The sincerity of the British government was accepted without question whilst every opportunity was taken to cast doubts upon the good faith of the Soviet.

All along the line the efforts of news commentators have been directed towards bolstering up the prestige of Chamberlain and Co. and discrediting the Soviet Union.

In some cases the Soviet government is openly held responsible for the delay in concluding a Pact, in others the same picture is painted by inference.

Some writers attribute the hitch to "psychological causes." The Soviet government, they state, mistrusts British motives, and then they proceed to waste much ink trying to prove that these alleged suspicions are without foundation.

According to them all that is necessary is for the Soviet Union to

accept the British terms, sign a Pact and leave the "details" till later.

It all sounds very nice in theory, but if it was put into practice we are afraid it would do nothing to advance the cause of world peace and may do much to endanger the peace of the Soviet Union.

Last month we reviewed the earlier stages in the negotiations, pointing out how the Soviet government had proposed a Peace Pact based upon complete reciprocity, and how, after much delay, Britain had rejected this plan and advanced counter proposals which, if accepted, would leave the Soviet Union in a position of inequality.

Needless to say such counter proposals were unacceptable to the Soviet government, which re-iterated its original claim that any agreement arrived at must be on the basis of complete equality and mutual assistance.

In the course of further discussions this view was accepted in principle by the British government. It was then that the Note was forwarded which formed the subject of the "It's Now Up to Stalin" articles.

However, whilst agreeing in theory to the principle of mutual assistance, the British government is still reluctant to put this into prac-

tice. This fact is reflected in the content of the new proposals to the Soviet.

The new British proposals (at the end of May) provide for assistance by the Soviet Union to those four countries that have already received guarantees, Poland, Rumania, Greece and Turkey, but say nothing regarding the three countries bordering on the U.S.S.R. in the North West (Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia).

The attitude of the Soviet Union is that unless a simultaneous guarantee is given to the three states last mentioned it cannot extend any guarantee to the first four.

This uncompromising stand does not arise from any spirit of obstinacy or perversity, or desire to enhance national prestige, as some capitalist writers claim.

It is in keeping with the consistent peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union, it arises from the sincere and unselfish desire of the Soviet government to witness the creation of a really effective peace bloc.

The Soviet Union is a socialist country. It is free from the contradictions of capitalism. Within its borders there is no exploitation, no class or national oppression.

The Soviet Union is free from economic crises. It has no colonies and no need for colonies. It does not want war and will do all that is possible to safeguard peace.

At the same time it is well able and prepared to defend its own frontiers against aggression, no matter from which quarter the threat may arise.

The Soviet Union has no need of any alliances in order to defend its own territory.

Its willingness to conclude a pact with Britain and France arises from the unselfish desire to serve the cause of world peace, to save the world if possible from another 1914-18.

Great Britain, on the contrary, is an imperialist power, moreover an imperialist power possessing the greatest colonial empire in the world.

Britain has not pursued a policy of peace at all. The requirements of struggle for preservation of its colonial hegemony, against revolution and against national liberation movements have been the fundamental mainspring of British foreign policy.

In pursuing this policy British imperialism has given support and encouragement to reaction in every quarter of the globe.

This has been carried out under the cloak of non-intervention and appeasement.

It has been the undying hope of the sponsors of this reactionary policy that it would result in turning fascist aggression away from the Empire towards the Soviet Union.

Munich marked a culminating point in these plans. Czechoslovakia was conceded Hitler in the hope that he would continue his eastward march against the Soviet Ukraine.

But the fascists have shown no great inclination to test themselves against the mighty defensive power of the Soviet Union.

Instead it has become more obvious that aggression is directed against the major European democratic states.

Hence the turn of the British government towards negotiations with the Soviet Union.

If there is any cause to distrust and suspect motives in these talks then surely it is the Soviet and not the British government which has every reason for doubts.

The British proposals as they stand limit aggression only in certain regions, those regions where British interests are menaced, but they leave the way wide open in other regions, where the Soviet borders are threatened.

Has not the Soviet Union every justification for demanding that the gateway to aggression in the whole of Europe be tightly shut and barred?

This is how matters stand at the time of writing. The Soviet Union, which is well able to defend itself

without aid, is offering to place its mighty resources at the disposal of the forces seeking world peace. But only on conditions that a real barrier is raised against fascist aggression.

Great Britain, on the other hand, has so far failed to demonstrate any sincere desire to give up the policy of non-intervention, any wish to create a really effective bulwark against war in Europe.

Her sole efforts to date have been directed towards restraining aggression in those quarters where her own interests are menaced whilst at the same time avoiding any measures which offered a chance of checking aggression entirely.

The fate of the Anglo-Soviet Pact cannot be left in the hands of Chamberlain and Co. The interests of the British and Australian people, the cause of world peace demands that this government be driven from office.

It is now up to us!

● CHINA'S SECOND ROUND ●

SINCE the middle of April Chinese forces numbering three million have been carrying out a general offensive against the Japanese.

The launching of this campaign indicates that the war in China has entered a new period.

Chinese strategists have maintained that the war against Japan must take place in three periods; the defensive period, the offensive period, and the period when Japan

is exhausted and China claims victory.

The first, or defensive period itself falls into two phases: 1) from the beginning of hostilities to the fall of Shanghai and Nanking; 2) from then until the fall of Canton and Hankow.

Throughout the first phase China was unprepared either from the military, political or economic point of view to wage the war imposed

on her by Japan.

At Shanghai the Chinese Army, which had no heavy artillery and very few aeroplanes, was attacked from three sides by the Japanese army and navy. Nevertheless it resisted for three months and thereby won universal admiration.

The Chinese forces had been drawn from all parts of China and were not yet accustomed to fighting side by side under a unified command.

Under such military conditions the fall of Shanghai caused an inevitable demoralisation in the Chinese Army and made the defence of Nanking still more difficult.

With the fall of Nanking in December 1937 the first phase of the war ended.

After the fall of Nanking there took place an historical event of tremendous importance.

This was the achievement of unity between the different Chinese political parties and the adoption of a long term "Programme of Resistance to Japanese Aggression and of National Reconstruction."

In order that the whole Chinese people could be drawn into effective participation in the national struggle a "People's Political Council" was established.

Through this national legislative body the representatives of the political parties, including the Communist Party, and the various national organisations exercise their right of initiative and control over national policy.

The immediate result of this

national unity was close co-operation between the people and the army. It is no longer only uniformed soldiers who are fighting the Japanese, it is a whole people.

Under the new regime certain of the former Ministries were reorganised into two Ministries of Communications and Economy.

The Ministry of Communications was entrusted with the very important task of linking China more closely with the outside world by land routes and so nullifying the Japanese coastal blockade.

Under its direction the construction of the railway from Hengyang to Lungchow was completed. Lungchow is the terminus of the French Railway from Tongking in Indo-China. This line is of great importance for the transport of war materials coming from abroad.

A second international route to be completed was that from Yunnanfu to Bhamo, the terminus of the Burmese railway.

The third international route, from Shensi to Sinkiang (Chinese Turkestan) has been greatly improved and is now joined up with the railway from the Soviet frontier.

Under the Ministry of Economy a tremendous amount of work has been accomplished.

One of its most gigantic achievements was to transport the plant of four hundred factories from the coastal towns into the mountainous interior.

Many new industries, including war industries, have been established.

Articles hitherto imported from abroad can now be produced at home. Mining and agriculture have been developed enormously. As regards supplies of foodstuffs, the Province of Szechwan alone can feed 2,700,000 soldiers over and above its own population.

Similar improvements in the military position can also be recorded, dating from the complete reorganisation of the Chinese Army, which took place after the retreat from Nanking.

Formerly the Chinese Army was composed of mercenaries. The greater part of these sacrificed their lives in the first battles north of Shanghai and Nanking.

In order to fill the gap an appeal to the patriotism of the youth of the nation was made.

Three months after the fall of Nanking one million had responded to the call and were sent to the Northern and Eastern fronts.

A further two to three million have been undergoing intensive training since the beginning of 1938. It is these new fresh forces which are now being thrown into the general offensive against the Japanese.

An offensive on the whole front in China, however, means something different from what is usually understood by such a phrase.

The Sino-Japanese war is not an "ordinary" war. The special nature of the conflict has imposed a special form of strategy upon the Chinese Command.

The principal aim of the Japanese Army is to break the Chinese re-

sistance with as few losses as possible. The aim of the Chinese army is to cause the Japanese army the greatest possible losses without allowing itself to be destroyed.

The following extract from the Chinese soldier's "Handbook of Military Strategy" sums up this policy:

"Yield the town but keep the district."

"Lose ground but save the population."

"Transform the enemies rear into a front line."

A town or village is defended just long enough to force the Japanese army to waste a large quantity of shells and lose many men. Then the Chinese troops and inhabitants evacuate the locality together, taking with them as much food and ammunition as they can. What they cannot cart away they destroy and the Japanese are left to occupy only ruins.

The considerable and rich experiences of the former Chinese Red Army are now being put to good advantage in the struggle against Japan.

During the period of internal strife (1927-36), when Kuomintang forces were fighting to suppress the Chinese Soviets, the Red Army evolved the very successful "mobile detachment" method of warfare.

This strategy consisted of "transforming union into units" when the enemy was strong, and "transforming units into union" when the enemy was weak.

That is to say, when government

troops with superior equipment attacked, the Red Army split up into small "units" to avoid giving pitched battle. When the government troops were not attacking, the Red Army would come together in a "union" to attack at weak points its adversaries.

Much the same principal is now being applied by the whole Chinese army in its struggle against the Japanese.

There is no single front between the opposing armies in China today. It is estimated that at least one-third of the Chinese forces are behind the advanced columns or garrison detachments of the Japanese.

The instructions issued by the Chinese Military Council to cover this second phase of the war are that the Chinese should avoid meeting the enemy in massed armies, but should harry him with unrelenting attacks under local commands and exhaust them by sheer marching and counter marching, and especially to allow the invader no rest at night.

This strategy has been applied with marked success throughout the last two months. All of the gains made by the Japanese since the fall of Hankow and Canton have been won back and considerable loss of men and material has been inflicted upon the invaders.

The way is being paved for the third period, the period in which Japan will become exhausted and China will claim final victory.

It is in the interests of Australia

that this end be brought about as speedily as possible.

If Japan experiences defeat in China it will lessen if not entirely remove the risk of invasion of Australia.

Therefore we should increase our activities on China's behalf, tighten up the boycott of Japanese goods, and render all possible aid to the Chinese people.

We must condemn the Federal government for its decision to send a representative to Tokio.

Such a decision violates the spirit of Menzies' promise to the Port Kembla wharves.

The action of the Port Kembla men, which was universally acclaimed by the Australian people, expressed antipathy towards any aid being given to aggressors by Australia.

It is not only by the export of war materials that aid is rendered an aggressor. Japan, to finance her aggression, is particularly dependent upon foreign trade.

The express object of Menzies and Co. in sending a representative to Japan is to stimulate Australian trade with that nation.

Whereas the mass of the Australian people favor boycott, Menzies and Co. favor increased trade. They would sell Australia's future independence for a few bales of wool and a bushel or two of wheat.

[From notes compiled by Chinese National Committee for I.P.C.]

LODGING THE LENINS

The following reminiscences were first published in the Swiss periodical, "Schweizer Spiegel," from which they were translated for an American magazine. They constitute the naive and shrewd comments of the Swiss cobbler at whose house in Zurich Lenin and Krupskaya lodged in 1917.

"So, Mr. Krammerer, now there's going to be peace!" Mr. Lenin told me a few days before he travelled to Russia. That was in 1917 just before I moved from the Spiegelgasse to the Culmannstrasse. He wanted to come along, too, but if he could travel to Russia he would not go to the Culmannstrasse, he had said. The Lenins, too, had everything packed, and were ready while we were moving. Only they did not know whether they would go to Russia or to the Culmannstrasse. Then he did get his transit permit, went suddenly to Bern and from there in the sealed car directly to Russia.

I had always liked him. He stayed with me for a year and a half. He lived in a room with his wife, and paid twenty-eight francs a month. At that time it was different from now. Then one was glad if one could get any one for a room. At that time there were so many rooms free, for the Germans and Austrians were all in the war.

First came Mrs. Lenin to inquire about the room. My wife really did not wish to take her. One could notice that she was of the Russian type. But then she brought her husband and the latter made a really good impression. They had had a room temporarily before, but the landlord had gone to the hospital, and when he got well they had to move. That was why Mrs. Lenin was in such a hurry. She was really a good soul. One should never judge a person by appearances. As to looks, she was somewhat ordinary. She wore a dress that was a little bit short for that time, and she spoke somewhat hastily. Lenin himself was simple, too. But he had strength

in his chest. He was stocky with a broad back and a strong neck. My son often said to me: "Gosh, he has a neck like a bull! If that's a sign of will power this man must possess an iron will."

Mr. Lenin frequented the **Eintracht Restaurant**. That was where he often had dinner at noon. When he went out he always wore a visor cap. One would have taken him for a mechanic. His shoes were always the sort for going to the mountains. That is why he never needed many shoes. Only once he bought a pair from me. Very coarse, solid shoes, and he had extra nails put into them.

They were punctual in paying, those two, one must grant them that! We never had any difficulties with them, they were honorable in every respect. Every day he came down to me in the store, and fetched his correspondence. The letter carrier always put the things on the shoe box and said, "That's for the Lenins." They received mail three times a day, a mass of letters and papers.

Downstairs there was a restaurant, the **Jacobsbrunnen**. But Mr. Lenin never went in there. Anyway he was not an alcohol drinker, he drank a lot of tea, however, just like all Russians.

He often went to bed very late. We were usually asleep when he was still walking up and down his room. Mornings he was always up and about in good time.

The Lenins always have been quite citizens. Only once in 1917 they celebrated the Russian Revolution. Then there were at least twenty persons in the room. On the bedside table, on the chest, on the washstand, on the beds, everywhere they were sitting around.

With his wife, Mr. Lenin got

MESSAGE FROM SPAIN

"No pasaran!" we whisper to the guns
downward like wind in summer cornfields
the whisper rustles,
dies,
returns defiant rumbling as an ocean
"No pasaran!"
involuntarily
ranks tighten
close together—
they come
—"They shall not pass!"

But they have passed—
earth sanctified by our dead comrades' blood
has shivered at their quick defiling footsteps
and triumph cries
mock unresponding guns.

What then of our resolve?
What of our broken cities, brothers' pain?
We have bought with these
the dismal desolation of our cause
are we not better to recant, forget,
and acquiesce?

Yet where blood spilt violently into the dry earth
Young grass will spring again—
so too new hope.
Greater than this ephemeral descent of darkness,
wider than a single disaster,
is the vision.
And in the end we know
they shall NOT pass!

—TADG MOR.

THE ANGLO-SOVIET PEACE ALLIANCE

L. Sharkey

From a speech delivered at the recent meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

IN approaching the question of the Anglo-Soviet Pact, our starting point is Comrade Stalin's speech at the 18th Congress of the Bolsheviks. You are familiar with the way he spoke of the real policy of the Anglo-French imperialists being the urging and inciting of the aggressors against the small countries and against the Soviet Union, so that they might become involved eventually in war with the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union would be weakened in this struggle, as well as the fascists, with the result that Chamberlain would have achieved two objects, weakened the Soviet Union and destroyed the German imperialist rival at one and the same time.

It may be good policy from the viewpoint of British imperialism but not so good from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union. Comrade Stalin called that policy pulling "the chestnuts out of the fire" for the British imperialists.

Comrade Dimitrov, in his May Day message, said that the direction of aggression, despite the desires of Chamberlain, had been changed, because of the fact that Hitler and Mussolini had realised

that the Soviet Union and its Red Army was far too tough a nut for fascism to crack. Comrade Dimitrov pointed out that it was plain that the aggression of the fascists was being directed in a westward direction.

Let us briefly review the position following Munich.

Hitler marched his army into Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia and seized the remaining Czech provinces and, in fact, openly tore up the agreement arrived at in Munich, which meant, in effect, that Hitler had agreed to consult Chamberlain and the two packs of wolves would hunt together. This was followed by the seizure of Albania and Memel, the offensive on Lithuania, Poland, Rumania. Also, the German fascists are preparing to seize Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. Holland and Belgium, as far as Britain is concerned, are strategic points and upon the possession of these countries the security of England largely rests. The march threatened by Hitler down through Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary to the Black Sea meant that the fascists would reach Turkey and beyond that lies the British

colonial empire, Mesopotamia and the oil wells, the Suez Canal and, a little further along, India.

At this moment, Mussolini demanded that France be dismembered and that her colonial possessions be taken from her and even provinces of Southern France be handed over to the fascists. Both Germany and Italy were preparing to dismember Switzerland. Switzerland is like Holland and Belgium are to Britain as far as France is concerned; a strategic point between France, Germany and Italy.

At the same time, Spain had been turned into a fascist fortress against the Western Powers.

Mussolini is making all preparations to seize the control of the Mediterranean Sea and so cut the British and French empires in two.

Although the Soviet Union is certainly in danger of a fascist attack, so also are Britain and France. Soviet Russia is not asking for something for nothing, for there is a great danger to the people of Britain and France from the fascists.

As Communists, we do not care if the British imperialists risk losing their empire, we are for self-determination of the colonies, but we do care if they precipitate a war by their policy in which the British peoples will be slaughtered in millions, in which the productive forces and wealth built up by the toiling class will be destroyed. We certainly have an interest in preventing that.

Chamberlain and the British ruling class began to display misgiv-

ings at the rapid advances of the fascists. They very hastily gave guarantees to some of the states that have been threatened; as far as Holland, Belgium and Switzerland are concerned, even in the days of the Baldwin government, they told Hitler he must not touch them. But they added guarantees to a few more—Poland, Rumania, Greece and made an agreement with Turkey. Then, under the pressure of mass opinion in Britain itself and in the Dominions, and throughout the world and in face of the advance of the fascists, something quite new took place, the British government opened up negotiations with the Soviet Union for a peace pact.

You know the story of these negotiations up to the time of Molotov's speech. The Soviet Union, which has taken a leading part over a period of years in fighting for the pact against aggressions, the building of the peace front; which was foremost in denouncing the betrayals and treacheries of Chamberlain and of the French government in regard to the peace and security of Europe, stands on those principles today. Molotov made that clear in his speech. He pointed out that the British proposals were ineffective. These guarantees left the Baltic countries and such countries as Yugoslavia, Hungary and others open to invasion by Germany and Italy at any moment. While, Molotov said, the British government had agreed to the principle of mutual aid, it was hedged around with so many restrictions that Bri-

tain had tied to its proposal, that it would mean that the Soviet Union would have to do the fighting.

Comrade Molotov pointed out that the British guarantees allow a situation where war can start and spread from one area to another.

In regard to Molotov's hard hitting against Chamberlain, the point was to kill once and for all the policy of non-intervention and appeasement. He showed the whole world what this appeasement policy meant and that Chamberlain's mere promise could not be trusted.

I would like to deal with some theoretical considerations in regard to the pact.

Lenin pointed out that for the preservation of the Soviet Union, it was essential that the Soviet government, at all times, take due advantage of the antagonisms that exist between the imperialist powers. In his letter to the American workers, written very early in the life of the Soviet government Lenin dealt with this and showed how at one period, he had taken advantage of the military knowledge of the French army, in order to prevent the Germans advancing. He went on to say that if tomorrow Soviet Russia was attacked by the Anglo-French capitalists and their armies, he would not have the slightest objection to making an alliance with Germany to fight against invasion by France and England.

What are Chamberlain's aims in such a pact?

Not at all to preserve the Soviet Union. His aim is preserve the

British empire, the position is that the line of the Soviet Union and of the British Empire may run parallel for a short distance—maybe the lines are simply crossing each other, but in the circumstances, it is possible to turn this to the advantage of the Soviet Union and of the toiling people throughout the world.

Our objective is to preserve the Soviet Union, and to preserve the world from war for the reasons I have already mentioned. But there is yet another objective. Hitler Germany today is the centre of counter-revolution on a world scale. Hitler is the head and front of the struggle against the masses, not only in Europe, but throughout the world. We know the cruel fate of the people of Spain, because of the attack by the dictatorships of fascist Italy and Germany.

In any country, wherein the people revolt against their masters we would find the same intervention happening. Hitler Germany is the centre of world reaction. An aim of our struggle against Hitler Germany is the overthrow of the fascist dictatorships, the restoration of democracy and the re-constitution of the mass organs of the Labor movement.

Imagine the changed world situation for the working class, with a democratic revolution in Germany, Italy and Japan. We are on sound Marxian principles in this. Marx in the last century characterised Russia as the gendarme of Europe, of the counter-revolution. Marx

had not the slightest hesitation in calling upon the then progressive movement in Germany, although it was capitalist, to fight the Tsar's Russia, in order to destroy the centre of counter-revolution.

There are a number of other questions for us in our work in regard to the pact. You will notice in the report from the Central Executive to the Central Committee that we propose the demand on the Menzies government for the Pacific peace pact, which will be an extension of the Anglo-French-Soviet pact in Europe to our part of the world.

The line of cowardly appeasement is taken by the Menzies government in relation to Japan. Menzies is against the Anglo-Soviet pact. The League of Nations made a decision that all the countries of the world should assist China and that these countries should increase the amount of aid they were giving to China. Australia is a member of the League of Nations. What has Menzies done to carry out the decision of the League to come to the aid of China against Japan? Menzies broke the boycott at Port Kembla and makes trade agreements to strengthen

Japan.

In the struggle for the peace pact and even supposing an Anglo-Soviet Pact is signed, does this mean that immediately we relinquish the policy of refusing to co-operate with Menzies and with the Chamberlain government? It has been mooted in the capitalist press that once the Anglo-Soviet Pact is signed, the workers should give up the class struggle. We do not see it in that light. The struggle must be intensified against these governments, because we have to keep clearly in mind, very clearly indeed, that even the signing of the pact does not guarantee everything when Chamberlain and Menzies are still in office. These people care as little for their pledged word as does Hitler. If you doubt this, think of the fate of the Czechs. The struggle goes on. Our struggle for the united front, for a People's Front, for a people's movement for the defeat of reaction becomes more necessary than ever before and therefore, we have to have the sharpest tactic against co-operation, against the national register, against conscription—all these things must be fought.



LABOR REFORMISM AND THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

R. Dixon

THERE are two aspects of the Labor Party that are very important to an understanding of the trends in the Labor movement today.

Firstly: the Labor Party is by no means a socialist workers' party. It is, to quote Lenin, a "bourgeois Labor Party." Its policy is to secure reforms within the confines of the capitalist system. Labor Party governments have frequently held office without damage to the capitalist system. Those Labor governments in office today in Queensland, Tasmania and West Australia have not much to distinguish them from the ordinary capitalist government.

Secondly: because the Labor Party leadership is ideologically much closer to the capitalist class, because it is bourgeois in outlook and not socialist, during times of crisis when the class struggle sharpens enormously, this leadership more openly aligns itself with the ruling class. In such times the gulf between the demands and desires of the working-class movement and the policy of the Rightwing leaders widens. In very acute periods we even witness a splitting off of sections of the most reactionary of the reformists who join with the capitalist parties. Such was the case during the war when Hughes, Holman and others split the forces of the

Labor movement at a most critical moment, causing confusion and disunity and placing the Labor movement at a grave disadvantage in its struggle against the ruling class. It was also the case during the great economic crisis when Lyons split the Labor Party and came forward as the leader of the United Australia Party.

We should keep these facts in mind, because we are living in a critical period—war may break out and create an entirely new situation, also there are definite signs of a new economic crisis developing. In either case the reactionaries in the Labor movement would swing more to the Right, threatening betrayal of the working class.

It is also necessary to be clear on those facts in order to see the way to the establishment of working-class unity and the People's Front.

There could be no working-class unity, or no People's Front on the programme of the Rightwing Labor Party leaders. Their policy leads inevitably to the splitting of the working-class movement and drives away the farmers and middle classes.

The condition for unity, so far as we are concerned, is as Dimitrov put it: The "struggle against capital." The People's Front has the aim of beating back fascism. Both imply a resolute struggle against those who

would split the Labor movement, against the reactionary reformists.

Unfortunately, there are some in the ranks of the Communist Party who have interpreted the policy of the People's Front to mean that we should whittle down the struggle against the Rightwing reformists and conciliate them. Views of this kind are wrong. By all means we must avoid sectarian criticism but firm and well founded criticism is always necessary.

It could not be expected that in the event of a crisis occurring, we are likely to see a mechanical repetition of what occurred in 1915-16 when there was no Communist Party, or 1930-31 when the Communist Party was weak.

Today Socialism has become a real force in the Labor movement because of the strength of the Communist Party and its contact with the masses. The trade union movement of Australia, or the greatest part of it, supports the policy of the Communist Party, not that of the Labor Party, although it is the organisational basis of the Labor Party. Therefore, already the avenues of betrayal by some of the Labor Party leaders have been narrowed down. In N.S.W. especially, the trade union movement and the Labor Party rank and file have taken far-reaching steps to rid the Labor movement of the most dangerous Rightwing elements, those most bitterly opposed to unity and most likely to betray the workers in the event of a crisis. In short, they are clipping the wings of the traitors before they can deal a des-

perate blow to the working class, as in the years of 1915-16 and 1930-31.

It may be imagined that in waging this fight, in devoting so much energy to the struggle against the Rightwing, we are postponing the day of working-class unity and the People's Front.

What are the facts?

A number of by-elections have taken place recently in New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania. The South Australian branch of the Labor Party and the New Labor Party in N.S.W. are the two most progressive branches of the Labor Party in the country. In these states the Labor Party swept the poll and won Wakefield (S.A.) and Hurstville and Waverley (N.S.W.), from the U.A.P. In Queensland the Labor Party lost votes in all by-elections and in one instance, lost a Labor Party seat. In Tasmania, Wilmot, which should have been an easy seat to win for the Labor Party, was won by a very small margin. The vote in Queensland does not necessarily indicate that the masses are swinging to the Right. On the contrary, the voting in the municipal elections, as well as in the Townsville by-election resulted in an enormous strengthening of the Communist vote and this suggests an even more definite leftward swing.

In New South Wales, where the fight against the "inner group" reached most bitter proportions, the candidates of the New Labor Party won Hurstville and Waverley. An examination of the voting figures

suggests that the Lang candidates actually obtained a slight majority of what might be described as the recognised stable Labor vote in both electorates. The New Labor Party collected the greatest part of the swinging vote, especially the middle-class vote. It was this that turned the issue in favor of the New Labor Party candidates.

To secure the middle-class vote, as in Hurstville and Waverley, or the farmers' vote as in Wakefield (S.A.), is not yet to establish a People's Front, but it is definite progress towards the People's Front.

What conclusions are to be drawn from this?

Firstly: the way to the People's Front, to the winning of the farmers and middle classes into an alliance with the working-class organisations, is not by capitulating to the reformists, or whittling down the fight against them, but by waging a ruthless fight against their splitting policy.

Secondly: that by conducting this struggle against the reactionary Labor Party leaders, we are not postponing the People's Front but more rapidly creating the conditions for its establishment.

It has been the fashion of Labor Party leaders to excuse their reformist policy on the grounds that it was necessary so as to win the farmers and middle-class vote. They said in effect, "if we had a militant or socialist policy, we would frighten the farmers and middle class and this would prevent us from taking office." This is one of the chief arguments of Labor Party reform-

ism against any real working-class policy and against unity; they use it to justify their fight against socialism and the Communist Party.

In recent elections, Labor Party leaders were the first to raise the "Red bogey." Waverley and Hurstville, however, prove that the middle-class people are not only not afraid of the "Red bogey" (it was raised in these electorates to an extreme degree), or a militant policy—they want and will support a fighting Leftwing policy.

It follows from this that it is not a militant policy that drives the farmers and middle class away, but the reformist policy of the Labor Party.

It must also be said that there are many Communists who appear to have capitulated to the "Red bogey" and who are anxious to hide the face of the Party behind some cloak or other. Such people are influenced by the reformist campaign, by the pressure of the capitalist press. They fail to realise that today there is a great demand amongst all sections of the people for information on the policy of Communism. It is necessary to overcome this capitulation to the "Red bogey" and for the Communists to work more openly.

If, for the establishment of the People's Front, it is essential to overcome the splitting activities of Labor Party leaders, it also follows that working-class unity is dependent on this struggle. This is very evident after the decisions of the Federal Labor Party Executive on the representation at the, so-called,

unity conference to be held in N.S.W. The Federal Executive has given a vast superiority of representation to the Labor Party branches over the trade unions.

What is behind this policy? For some years now, the trade union movement has been adopting a militant policy, until the point has been reached when the great majority of the unions are in conflict with the policy initiated by Labor Party leaders. The Rightwing of the Labor Party, the Forgan Smiths, Fallons, Langs and Ogilvies, fearful of the power the trade unions exert in Labor Party conferences, are attempting to base themselves upon the Labor Party branches, instead of the trade unions. They seek to maintain their position and their hold over the working class almost independent of the trade unions. They attempt to flaunt and defy the trade unions that gave birth to the Labor Party and have always been its main organisational basis.

This development is most dangerous. It will be overcome only by linking up ever so much more closely the Left forces that have developed within the Labor Party and particularly amongst Labor Party politicians with the Left of the trade union movement. The utmost opposition from the trade union movement is necessary to defeat the new plans of the Labor Party reactionaries.

Success will not be achieved in this struggle, unity will not be won, or the People's Front established unless more propaganda and agitation is combined with the develop-

ment of real working-class action. In one day of struggle, the masses learn more than they will from a year of propaganda and agitation. Hence, the big problem confronting the Leftwing is the development of greater working-class activity. The fight against the National Register will be, indeed, useful in this connection. It will test out the extent to which the workers really follow the lead given by the trade union movement, the extent to which they are loyal to trade union decisions and prepared to be disciplined by them. The reformist leaders of the Labor Party wish only to offer verbal resistance to the National Register and are opposed to the boycott. They want to sit on the fence.

In the widest possible degree the fight against the National Register must be used to unite Communist, Labor Party and non-party workers and to bring the utmost pressure to bear upon Labor Party leaders who resist to force them out into the open.

There are many facts to show that the masses throughout Australia are swinging left, not through the efforts of the Labor Party leaders but as a result of the work of the trade unions and the Communist Party.

In these circumstances the further development of the struggles of the people will hasten the isolation of the reactionary reformists in the Labor Party leadership, it will create the conditions for working-class unity and pave the way for the establishment of a People's Front against reaction and war.

Sesqui-Centenary Of The French Revolution

J. N. Rawling

ONE hundred and fifty years ago, on the 14th of this month, the people of Paris — small traders, workers, sansculottes—rose as one mass and stormed the fortress of the Bastille. The destruction of that feudal bastion, which loomed before their eyes as the immediate visible barrier to freedom, was more than their symbolic sweeping-away of the Old Regime for which it stood. The action of the Parisian populace on that first July 14 set the seal of victory upon the defiance by the representatives of the Third Estate of the Absolute Monarchy and the remnants of the feudal regime in which it centred. It provided the essential living force that was to drive the Revolution forward and to constitute the source at once of the revolutionary leaders' power and the reactionary leaders' fear. The people of France did well when they instinctively chose July 14 as their National Day. That day in 1789 was one of the days in human history when a deed was done for Freedom and, as Lowell sings,

When a deed is done for Freedom,
through the broad earth's aching
breast,

Runs a thrill of joy prophetic, trembling
on from east to west,
And the slave, where'er he cowers, feels
the soul within him climb
To the awful verge of manhood, as the
energy sublime

Of a century bursts full-blossomed on
the thorny stem of Time.

The energy sublime of more than a century of French history burst full-blossomed on the thorny stem of time in 1789. In France the advance of a capitalist economy had reached a higher level than in any other country except England. And yet it was held in and bound down by feudal bonds and restrictions. There had been during the previous hundred years and more the beginnings of movements to break the chains that kept France partly within a mediaeval world. They had failed to blossom, but withered and died. France remained an absolute monarchy, which war, civil and foreign, had strengthened. The richest bourgeois took part in the administration of the kingdom and shared in the profits it extracted from workers, peasants and the subjects of its colonies. Absolute Monarchy had lasted long enough in France to attract to its support, because of the benefits it offered, a section of the bourgeoisie similar to that which, a hundred years before, had fought and vanquished Absolute Monarchy in England. In the latter country, lack of position, economic progress, political opportunity and the fortunes of war had placed the merchant bourgeoisie in control of an efficient State-machine, which, in a long series of wars, had defeated

France and brought her to the verge of bankruptcy. It was this bankruptcy, of political expedients as well as of the finances, that forced the King to consult the Estates and thus bring to a head the discontent that inevitably in any case must soon have taken a revolutionary direction.

That discontent had not been left directionless. There were the agitators and the theoreticians who had urged the discontented to look towards the source of their discontent and offered blue-prints of a new order under which those sources would dry up. Many of the former must have remained nameless—unremembered men who encouraged and led their people to understand the causes of their misery, to remedy their local grievances and to revenge themselves upon their local seigneur. But in the intellectual and bourgeois world the names of those who condemned the old regime and demanded reform are of men who were in the forefront of French thought and literature.

Chief amongst those who, willingly or unwillingly, in this way turned the minds of the French people towards the necessity of Revolution, weakening by the onslaught of their pens the Old Regime in Church and State, were Montesquieu (1689-1755), Voltaire (1694-1778), and Rousseau (1712-1778).

Montesquieu admired the English system of government of which the legislative, executive and judicial functions were separate and distinct. Such a system would guarantee liberty, he thought—such liberty, we

may add, as was then enjoyed in England, where it was the almost exclusive privilege of the middle and upper classes. "If I could bring it about that everybody should have new reasons for being attached to his duties, his prince, his laws, and that one should feel himself happier in his own country, in his own province, in the post where he happens to be, I should consider myself the happiest of mortals." Not very revolutionary?—no, but Montesquieu was not a revolutionary. It was his works that necessarily became revolutionary and his "*Spirit of the Laws*" became the political text-book of those who believed in a parliamentary monarchy.

Voltaire's is the greatest of these names. His aim was to play the searchlight of reason on the whole edifice of his France. His output of plays, histories, novels, poems, philosophical works, was enormous. In them he poured ridicule upon everything that excited it. It brought him to the Bastille once and to exile several times. Voltaire, however, was more concerned with the Church than the State, and his attacks on it were long sustained and bitter. "Crush the infamous thing" was a phrase with which he used to end his letters. And it was against the Church that he fought his long battle in defence of Calas. He who attacked the Church in the 18th century was loosening the chief cornerstone of the regime.

Rousseau declared that government could rest only on the governed. "Man is born free and yet is now

everywhere in chains" were the words with which he began "*The Social Contract*," and, in 1789, the "*Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens*" of the Revolutionary Government incorporated such phrases as "Men are born, and always continue, free and equal in respect of their rights . . . The law is an expression of the will of the community," that echoed Rousseau.

From the stage and in pamphlets the revolutionary ideas of the period were carried to the multitude. These served in the place of newspapers. Writers were imprisoned and pamphlets burned by the hangman, but the stream of written and spoken protest could not be dammed. On the stage, Beaumarchais' plays, "*The Barber of Seville*" and "*The Marriage of Figaro*," for example, ridiculed the regime and Beaumarchais himself wrote in his *Memoirs* fifteen years before the Revolution "I am a citizen, that is, something entirely new, utterly unknown and unheard of in France. I am a citizen—that is, what you should have been two centuries since, what you may be perhaps twenty years from now."

And the ground upon which the manure of these social protests was poured was already fertile. The crop that would be brought forth would choke the seeming luxuriant but really anaemic feudal plant. The government of the country was a hodge-podge of remnants of systems that had survived their day. It was an absolute monarchy with aristocratic governors of provinces, but with bourgeois intendants in whose

hands was the power. There were provincial assemblies with certain local rights and privileges and the Church that had other rights and privileges all over the country. The "Parlements," or law-courts enjoyed rights, such as that of registering laws and decrees. Civil and common law differed from province to province. Economic contradictions made confusion worse confounded. Internal customs lines made trade all but impossible. The price of salt, for example, differed from 2 to 60 units. The salt that could in Brittany be bought for two francs, cost in Anjou, just across the provincial border, 56 francs!

Then there were the privileged classes. The nobility and the clergy did not pay the most burdensome of the taxes, the *taille*. Landowners were entitled to a share in the peasants' crops. The French historian, Henri Taine, states that, out of 100 francs the French peasant earned, 14 went to his landlord, 14 to the church, 53 to the government, leaving 19 for himself.

Louis XVI, grandson of the Louis XV who had said that the regime would at least see him out, and after him the deluge, came to the throne in 1774 and appointed Turgot as Controller-general. But he was prevented from carrying out his reforms. He was succeeded by Necker who had to finance another war with Britain (War of American Independence).

Calonne followed him—and it was he who informed the King that nothing short of a completely revolu-

tionary change in the administration of the country could save it from bankruptcy. He suggested the summoning of the Notables. They met in 1786, to be told that Calonne proposed abolishing their privileges. They naturally disagreed—and both they and he were dismissed. Then the Parlement of Paris took a hand. It refused to register two new taxes that the King sent it, and claimed that real reform could be carried out only by the *Estates General*, which hadn't met since 1614. The king finally agreed to summon them and, after further attempts on the rights of the Parlement and protests from the provinces, they were finally summoned to meet on May 1, 1789. The elections began.

With their assembly the revolution had begun. On June 15, the Third Estate declared itself the National Assembly. The deputies took the oath not to disband until they had given France a Constitution. "Go tell your master," said Mirabeau to the King's representative, "that we are here by the power of the people, and that we shall be ejected only by the power of bayonets." The rising of July 14 gave force to that claim and resolution, and consolidated the revolutionary National Assembly as the Government of France. After July 14, a municipal government was set up in Paris, and it and the Paris populace became the spearhead of the revolutionary forces. The march of the women on Versailles on October 5 forced the King to sign the "Declaration of the Rights of Man,"

and he was brought to Paris a prisoner, in fact if not in name.

We cannot here trace the history of the next few years nor analyse the dialectical process that ended with the triumph of Napoleon. The main work of the Revolution which survived was done between October, 1789 and June, 1791, when the King tried to escape. Another rising in August, 1792, overthrew the limited monarchy and set up the Convention. In March, 1794, the Paris Commune was suppressed and Hebert and the Left leaders went to the guillotine. The following month, Danton and the Right leaders went too, and, when on July 27, Robespierre was guillotined, reaction and white terror began. In 1796 Babeuf's Society of the Equals was suppressed, Babeuf himself being executed in May, 1797. November 9, 1799, was Napoleon Bonaparte's "Eighteenth Brumaire." He became emperor in all but name—was proclaimed emperor in 1804.

"All manner of mediaeval rubbish, seigniorial rights, local privileges, municipal and guild monopolies and provincial constitutions," these, said Karl Marx (*The Civil War in France*), "the gigantic broom of the French Revolution of the eighteenth century swept away." And so it was the Great Revolution to which we all are heirs. Therefore, "let us not forget the things won, or the deeds of the mighty men of old who fought and died to secure for us those solid living realities, which because they seem assured possessions, are ac-

cepted without enthusiasm, and enjoyed without gratitude." (Prof. F. Anderson, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," p. 14). But, looked at another way, we see the French Revolution as "liberating the people from the chains of feudalism and absolutism," in order to place them "in new chains, chains of capitalism and bourgeois democracy." (Stalin, Kirov, Zhdanov, in "International Literature," No. 9, 1937.)

We do well, therefore, to remember the words of Babeuf, the last revolutionist of the Revolution,—

"The French Revolution is but the precursor of another revolution, far

greater, far more solemn, which will be the last. The people marched over the corpses of kings and priests who banded against them. They will do the same to the new tyrants and new political Tartuffes who sit in the seats of others." (Manifesto, 1796.)

He saw what Anatole France saw, the day of which the Russian Revolution of 1917 was the dawn:

"A new order of things is born. The powers of evil die, poisoned by their crime. The greedy and the cruel, the devourers of peoples, are bursting with an indigestion of blood. However sorely stricken by the sins of their blind or corrupt masters, mutilated, decimated, the proletarians remain erect; they will unite to form one universal proletariat, and we shall see fulfilled the great Socialist prophecy: 'The Union of the workers will be the peace of the world.'"

J. N. Rawling's Discovery

In the August, 1937, 'Communist Review,' Com. Baracchi, in his article 'Something from the History of Socialism in Australia,' had something to say about our international Labor affiliations. He mentioned Daniel De Leon's representation of Australian socialist bodies at the 1904 Amsterdam Conference of the Second International. That, however, was not the first occasion on which Australia was represented at a Congress of the Second International. F. Scusa represented us at the Zurich Congress in 1893—and the relevant documents we shall later publish. And in 1886 John Norton represented the N.S.W. Trade Unions at a Trade Union Congress in Paris. But Com. Baracchi pointed out that our socialist international affiliations went back still further. He quoted R. W. Postgate to the effect that a section of the First International existed in Melbourne.

That was as far as our information then went. But in the meantime, Mr. J. McDonald, a keen student of Australian Labor history, had brought to light a cutting from "The Toscin," a Melbourne Labor paper published from 1898 to 1905. The cutting was dated August 8, 1901, and referred to the existence of a section of the First International in Melbourne in 1872 and quoted its organ, "The Internationalist." The cutting was republished in "Common Cause," the "Trimmers" paper, 21/11/1936, and reprinted in the "Communist Review" for February, 1938. I have a copy of the original Toscin containing the reprint. The introductory remarks to it were probably written by J. A. Andrews, who was then editor of the Toscin and who had been through some stormy times as a socialist and an anarchist in the hectic years of the nineties.

The finding of that reference was satisfactory as far as it went. But, of course, it was only second-hand evidence—thirty-eight years ago somebody had seen a copy of a paper published twenty-nine years before! Not very satisfactory to the student anxious to see for himself. Search was made for original documents. But no trace of "The Internationalist" was to be found in either the Mitchell or the Melbourne Public Library.

Then, one day a few weeks ago, I discovered, quite by an accident, a copy of the first number of the "Australian International Monthly," dated June 8, 1872, and found it to be the successor of "The Internationalist" and the official organ of the Democratic Association of Victoria, a section of the First International!

I knew that there was a Democratic Association in Sydney as early as February, 1860, and I was looking through the catalogue of the Mitchell Library in an endeavor to find something about it when I discovered the above. My satisfaction can be imagined.

As a supplement to the 'International Monthly' appeared the document that follows. It is the **Manifesto of the Democratic Association of Victoria**—a priceless document. It will be noticed that it quotes the Preamble to the Provisional Rules of the First International. (It can be found on pages 39-40 of "Founding of the First International," Moscow, 1935). Now that Preamble was from the pen of Karl Marx. Therefore, Karl Marx was the inspiration of an Australian working-class organisation as early as 1872!

MANIFESTO OF THE DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION OF VICTORIA

THE Democratic Association of Victoria is formed with the view of acquiring and disseminating a knowledge of social principles, and cognate subjects; and of preparing itself to take co-operative action with kindred associations throughout the colonies, and with the International Association of Europe and America.¹

The attempt to remove an evil without sufficiently understanding its causes and conditions, only tends to complications and increased disorder. The struggle which comes from a sense of wrong may demonstrate a class power, and be the means of obtaining concessions; but no class can receive proper organisation, nor can it procure concessions of a reformatory nature unless its actions are based upon a knowledge of foundational principles. The diffusion of such knowledge would lead to a systematic and uniform democratic action.²

The efforts of *Trades Unions*, although productive of much good, have necessarily failed to achieve the emancipation of labor, because of their class character;³ nor can we hope for a complete success for de-

mocracy without international democratic co-operation. To be completely successful, Reform must make a consentaneous effort throughout the civilised world; each nation working out its own share, not competitively, but in *concert* with others.

This Society adopts as the basis of its creed the principles contained in the first Manifesto⁴ issued by the *International Association*, viz.—

"Considering,

"That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means, not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class rule;

"That the economical subjection of the man of labor to the monopoliser of the means of labor—that is, the source of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mutual degradation, and political dependence;

"That the emancipation of the working classes is, therefore, the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means:

"That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labor in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries:

"That the emancipation of labor is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concur-

rence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries:

"That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements:

"They declare that this **International Association**, and all societies and individuals adhering to it, will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality as the basis of their conduct towards each other, and towards all men, without regard to color, creed, or nationality:

"They hold it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights."

This *Association* further adopts the following principles and sentiments as its present recognised elements and methods of reform:

1. Wealth is all that is necessary to civilised existence; Purchasing power, is access thereto; and Social prosperity, is the condition of things which creates the greatest amount of wealth, combined with the most equitable diffusion of it.

2. The two great Sub-divisions of wealth are *raw materials* and *manufactures*. *Manufactures* are the results of skill and labor applied to raw materials; Raw Material is an article in an unmanufactured condition, and in an absolute sense can only be applied to the Earth and its native productions, which are the gifts of Nature and not the produce of any labor.⁵

3. Labor and Land being essential to the production of commodities, it is manifest that, to create the greatest amount of wealth, it is necessary to Subdivide the "raw material of the Earth" in such proportions as would give the greatest remunerative

scope to the co-operative skill and labor of the mass of Society.

4. The ability to labor being the property of the individual, it follows that the produce created by means of that labor ought likewise to be the property of the same individual, less equitable deductions for social and State purposes; for, as Shelley observes, "all have a right to an equal share in the *benefits* and *burdens* of the Government."

5. "The essential principle of Property being to assure to all persons what they have produced by their labor and accumulated by their abstinence, this principle cannot apply to what is not the produce of labor, the raw material of the Earth." (Mill).

6. "Labor in every part of the world is the fundamental power of States; and the question in public economy is whether its benefits shall accrue to the laborer himself in the shape of compensation, or to other parties that absorb it to themselves *by oppression and wrong in allowing labor only a bare subsistence.*" (Colton: on Public Economy).

7. Land, *not* being the produce of any labor, cannot be transferred as personal property without violation of natural right; and labor, when compelled to give up the results of its efforts without compensation, is *Slavery*—in other words—*both are crimes.*

8. Barter being inconvenient, interchanges are facilitated by the adoption of a uniform representation of value, called Money.

9. Capital is the savings from

produce, or the value of commodities less consumption; and its strict economic use is to supply the requirements of civilized life while more commodities are being produced and interchanged, and to provide against scarcity.

10. The Capital of an individual ought therefore to represent the amount of property which, under equitable circumstances, each could save from the result of his own labor and skill.

11. "A nation may be impoverished by the very acts which enrich some of its individuals."—(Colton on Public Economy).

12. Monopoly in Land deprives labor of its natural right and opportunity to employ itself, and so limits the fund of total wealth; Monopoly in Capital enslaves, robs, and impoverishes not only individuals but whole classes, because it is the equivalent of unrequited labor.

13. "Freedom consists in the great strife of the world for the rights of labor, for commercial rights, for the enjoyment and independent control of commercial values by those who create them."—(Colton on Public Economy).

14. "That Public policy which protects the weak protects all, and is the best possible policy."—(Ibid.)

15. "The distribution of Wealth depends upon the laws and customs of Society."—(Mill).

16. It is the duty of the State so to regulate its affairs as to protect Society in its every member from the abuse of personal liberty; and to protect individuals and classes

from being the victims of social injustice.

17. Since the transfer of Land is an unjustifiable violation of natural right, and productive of manifest injury to the largest and most useful portion of Society, the State ought at once to forbid any further alienation of public lands; and at the same time initiate measures calculated to reclaim what has already been parted with.

18. Such measures ought to be judicious and gradual in their operations, so as to cause as little disturbance to Society as possible. The character of the struggle, however, mainly depends upon the tenacity with which monopolists may cling to vested interests, or the intelligence with which they may acknowledge the claims thus made upon them by natural and social rights.

19. The Conservative classes require timely intelligence so as to know how and when to yield what they must feel does not in justice belong to them. The people require timely intelligence so as to know how and when to demand what they already begin to know is their own by right.

20. A reform, founded upon principles so clearly put as to be indisputable, and supported by a popular organisation so powerful as to be irresistible, would be comparatively easy, and bring about the best possible rule—the Majority ruling according to intelligence. A Minority ruling by its intelligence, has created monopolies, and is naturally conservative and exclusive. A struggling

but ignorant democracy, restive under a dawning sense of its wrongs, is a disturbing element, vilified as "vulgar," "unwashed," and "obtrusive." The redemption of Society depends upon removing the barriers which prevent intelligence from reaching the masses. Rule, by the selfish intelligence of a Minority or by the ignorance of a Majority, would be almost equally vicious. Rule by an intelligent Majority would naturally tend to procure "the greatest good to the greatest number" as the only feasible policy.

21. It is therefore desirable, if not absolutely necessary, to take immediate steps to enlighten the masses upon social principles and expediences, so as to effect a thorough reform with the least possible confusion.

The Democratic Association purposes to give this opportunity to the friends of Freedom and Humanity throughout Victoria, which even monopolists ought not to neglect as a compromise they owe to selfish interests.

Although the character of the Association is thus a propagandist one, yet out of it may arise, from time to time, special organisations having in view specific objects, such as Land-Tenure reform, decreasing the hours of Labor as a counterpoise against Capital and as a means of obtaining opportunities for recreative and educational purposes, or any other social or political matter which may require prompt and special attention. By such means only can the "Emancipation of the Working-classes be conquered by the Working-classes themselves;" the justice of their demands is not sufficient to win their cause, without the power of enforcing them.

Throughout the civilised world the tide of popular reform seems fairly set in; and, if the movement has a destiny which cannot be arrested, those who attempt to obstruct its onward course, or who neglect to ameliorate its conditions while in progress, must be held responsible for any inconvenience or avoidable injury which may be caused to society during the transition period. This responsibility rests more or less upon every citizen, but pre-eminently upon those possessing social, literary, political, or religious influence.

Offices pro tem:
Secular Academy,
32 Nicholson Street,
Fitzroy.

1.—That is, the Workingmen's International Association (commonly called the First International), founded on September 28, 1864, at a public meeting held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London.

2.—The necessity for a theoretical understanding before action is here stressed. It is to be remembered that the word 'democratic' had a more revolutionary connotation seventy years ago than it has today.

3.—"Class" is here used, I think, in the sense of sectional.

4.—That is, the preamble of the "Provisional Rules of the Association," presented by Karl Marx at the end of his "Inaugural Address" on September 28, 1864. In the text as given in the "Founding of the First International," (Moscow, 1935), there are two differences from that printed above. They are: 2nd paragraph: "mental" for "mutual"; 3rd paragraph: "economical" is inserted before "emancipation."

5.—The ideas contained in the above "principles" show the influence of various economists and writers, Stuart Mill, for example.

6.—Labor theory of value!

7.—John Stuart Mill, economist and philosophical writer, 1806-1873.

8.—I haven't been able to see any such work.

9.—The doctrine of Surplus Value!

10.—For some of the activities of the Democratic Association of Victoria see the usual Pages from the Past, next month.

PAGES FROM THE PAST

A series of documents illustrating Australia's Social and Economic History, with special reference to the working-class movement and the struggle for democracy. Edited with introductions by J. N. R.

Period II.— Free Colony and Self-Government, 1823–1856 (Continued)

3—POLITICAL FERMENT (Continued)

DEMAND FOR IMMIGRANT LABOR

Immigrant labor was a commodity much sought after in the early fifties, when thousands were flocking to the goldfields. There follows a report of a Brisbane meeting of protest against the practice of Sydney's keeping immigrants there for whose passage Moreton Bay money had paid.

PUBLIC MEETING TO PETITION FOR DIRECT IMMIGRATION

Held Thursday, March 4, 1852, in the Court House.

Shortly after 6 o'clock, a considerable number of persons had assembled, composed of all classes of the community.

In the chair: John Richardson, M.L.C. (on motion of Dr. Cannan).

He said that only one vessel had ever arrived here at the proper cost of the land fund—the "Artemisia." Thus they had never received a fair share of immigration provided by their own funds; and when they considered the large amount of their territorial revenue, in comparison with the small number of immigrants received, it was actually, to use a familiar expression, enough to make one's blood boil with indignation.

Dr. Cannan moved first resolution:

"That in the opinion of this meeting the present scarcity of labour in these districts calls for prompt measures, to insure an immediate and continuous stream of immigration to the port of Moreton Bay."

The question was one of vital necessity. They need not go to the bush for evidences of the want of labor. If they only looked around them they would find such evidence in the gloomy and languishing condition of the town itself. It was in vain that they could boast of a salubrious climate and a fertile soil while they suffered so severely through the emigration of labor. The evil was caused by distance from Sydney. It was necessary to seek redress from Her Majesty.

Mr. Eldridge seconded. It was a well-known fact that the colonial government could not do much good for them, and therefore they must

appeal to a higher power. Hitherto the meetings held at Moreton Bay had chiefly been on subjects whereon opinions were divided and consequently were generally unsuccessful. Carried unanimously.

Mr. G. F. Poole moved the second resolution:

"That it is the opinion of this meeting that one principal cause of the present disastrous state of the labour market, is the injustice we have suffered in not getting any share of the emigrants forwarded to this colony at the expense of the land fund."

The sum contributed by these districts towards the immigration revenue, for 15 months only, amounted to about £20,000, and for this they have received literally nothing—the few immigrants arrived came at own cost. The memorable words, "if a son ask for bread will you give him a stone," were generally considered to apply to an extreme case indeed; but in Sydney they not only gave nothing, but treated all applications with the most withering contempt.

FAREWELL TO "HOARY LECHER"

[Everything that was reactionary was, for the liberals of the 'fifties, typified in the person of Governor Fitzroy. Nor were they afraid to say so. The following is an Amendment to the official Address of Farewell, moved by that fine old liberal and patriot, Dr. J. D. Lang. This is what Dr. Lang himself said of the Address and the Amendment: "If Her Majesty could have commissioned the Prince of Darkness to represent her in the colony during the period that terminated with the government of Sir Charles Fitzroy, I doubt not but his sable Excellency would have received a Farewell Address of respect and regret at the close of his felicitous administration. Of course, there were such addresses presented to Sir Charles Fitzroy on his leaving the colony, not only by the Legislature, but by certain of the clergy of more than one denomination. Feeling deeply interested, as I did, in the character and reputation of my adopted country, I submitted the following amendment on the Farewell Address to His Excellency by the Legislative Council of the period on the 1st December, 1854."]

That this Council, on the eve of its prorogation, and the departure for England of His Excellency Sir Charles Augustus Fitzroy, desires to record its deliberate opinion:

If it had not been for the 2000 Chinese and others who had been introduced, the sheep would be roaming wild in the bush. To understand the want of labor properly he would ask any person to imagine these 2000 abstracted from the population, and in the bush nothing but the bleating of shepherdless sheep would be heard while Brisbane must consist of empty houses. This would show what the southern gold fields had done for them. All that could save them was a stream of immigration, and a stream it would soon become under just arrangements.

Seconded by Dr. Hobbs.

Carried unanimously.

Mr. Wm. Wilson, J.P., moved the third resolution:

"That in consequence of the inability of the local Government to redress the grievances complained of from a scarcity of labour in this district, it is resolved to petition Her Majesty the Queen in Council, forthwith."

—Moreton Bay Free Press, 11/3/1852.

1.—That His Excellency's administration has, throughout, been a uniform conspiracy against the rights of the people of this land.

2.—That, from the lamentable in-

efficiency of His Excellency's government, as well as from its utter inability to meet the wants of an unprecedentedly important crisis, this colony, which was evidently designed by nature to take the lead in the Australian group, has fallen from the high position which it might otherwise have easily maintained, and become, in the estimation of Her Majesty's government, of the British public, and of the uncivilised world, only the second in the list.

3.—That in order to maintain and perpetuate the anti-popular system which has uniformly characterised His Excellency's government, the funds of the colony have been lavishly expended in the maintenance of unnecessary offices and the payment of extravagant salaries, while public works of urgent necessity to the community, in all parts of the territory, have been postponed and neglected.

4.—That no such efforts, as were indispensably necessary under the extraordinary circumstances of the times, have been made during His Excellency's term of office, to supply the colony with an industrious population of the working classes from the mother country, and that the efforts of private individuals to supply this great desideratum have uniformly been frowned upon and systematically discouraged.

5.—That little exploring work had been done and that while Great Britain and the United States of

America have been vying with each other in their search for Sir John Franklin and his companions in the icy regions of the north, the lamented Leichhardt, a name not less illustrious in the annals of geographical discovery, has been left to perish miserably in the central desert of Australia, and no effort, at all worthy of the colony, has been made to search either for himself or his remains.

6.—That instead of relaxing in any way the oppressive character of the land system, in accordance with the obvious intent and spirit of the Orders in Council, His Excellency has voluntarily exceeded the powers entrusted to him for the time being by the Imperial authorities, in rendering that system still more oppressive, and thereby curtailing unnecessarily the rights and privileges of a misgoverned and down-trodden people.

7.—That the moral influence which has emanated from Government House during His Excellency's term of office has been deleterious and baneful in the highest degree to the best interests of this community; and that the evil example which has thus been set in the highest places of the land has tended, more than anything else that has occurred in this colony these thirty years past, to bring Her Majesty's government into contempt, and to alienate from Her Majesty the affections and respect of the Australian people.

[Of course, the amendment was not carried. But six (against twenty-eight) voted for it and among them were: Charles Cowper (afterwards Premier and knighted) and Henry Parkes.]

Period III.—Democracy and Unionism, 1856-1890

UNIONISM IN THE SIXTIES

There follows the prospectus of the Miners' Protective League founded on the N.S.W. Goldfields in 1861. It is marred by a strong anti-Chinese bias. But, when we consider how the Chinese were used to lower living standards, we must regard that as inevitable.

PROSPECTUS OF THE MINERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

The neglect, indifference and apathy shown by the government of New South Wales about everything appertaining to the mining interest has been so great, so culpable, and unjust that it is now thought absolutely necessary that a society should be formed which would devote itself exclusively to the discussion, agitation, and removal of the numerous grave obstacles at present impeding and obstructing the progress and prosperity of the working classes.

Complaints have been repeatedly made to the government of the many serious injuries that Europeans have sustained from the presence of such vast masses of the Chinese upon the different goldfields of the colony—it has been represented over and over again how they waste an extraordinary quantity of water, which is actually necessary to the regular miners for the successful prosecution of their arduous pursuits, this wanton waste often occurring in places where water is as precious as gold, for gold cannot be procured without it—that they filthy and destroy water set aside for domestic purposes, and fill

up holes with tailings and sludge which would pay the ordinary digger moderate wages, besides using up and destroying immense quantities of auriferous ground, which would afford an independent means of subsistence to thousands of civilised men in future years, for it must be borne in mind that these holes were the work of Europeans, and many of them were only abandoned for a time, perhaps on account of some new rush which seemed to hold out a prospect of a better class of ground being obtainable. It has been explained that the present desolate and insolvent state of the old goldfields of the colony is solely due to the admission of such overwhelming numbers of this abominable race into the country, and that it is impolitic and unjust to the working classes that a labor market already overstocked should be glutted by the importation of such hordes of a hostile race, whose habits and customs are repugnant to all civilised men, and who are tainted with a terrible and dangerous disease.

Six thousand miners congregated

upon the Burrangong goldfields are not considered by the government of this great progressive colony of New South Wales to be deserving of a regular postal communication.

We have only a nominal police protection.

Our gold is taxed.

Our public lands are locked up in such a way that no poor man can buy them.

We also contribute towards the upholding of ministers of the Gospel, and yet we have no place of public worship. It will therefore be one of the main objects of the Miners' Protective League that the Word of God shall be promulgated throughout the mining districts of this colony.

And lastly, a diggings discovered and developed by European enterprise is exposed to the incursions of a swarm of Mongolian locusts, who have forced us to fly with our wives and families from all the other diggings in the country until we are obliged to turn at bay upon this our last resting-place—our only hope of establishing a homestead—and drive the moon-faced barbarians away.

The government has been deaf to all our complaints; the welfare, prosperity and happiness of a lot of adventurers was not thought worth their attention or consideration, and a body of laborious and industrious men—the bone and sinew of the colony—are neglected, their interests uncared for, by those whose duty it is to be their guardians and protectors. Therefore it behoves the miners to take immediate steps to

secure a few of the benefits to which they can lay just claims.

A well-founded conviction being gradually forced upon the diggers of the colony, that unless the mining community take some decided course to obtain the privileges, rights, and benefits that they are entitled to, they deserve to be under the curse of that neglect. Believing that complaints may be made until doomsday without any beneficial results, they have felt it their duty to adopt a clear, resolute and united plan of action, and after due deliberation the idea of a *Miners' Protective League* was decided upon.

REPRESENTATION BASED ON POPULATION

The representation of the mining community in Parliament has been always overlooked by the legislators in this colony. The southern mines, with a population of about twelve thousand, is represented by only one member, where as several pastoral districts with a population of less than two hundred returns two members. Consequently the Miners' Protective League calls upon every miner to join the League and unite in order that their voices may be heard within the walls of the Assembly.

PROTECTION TO NATIVE INDUSTRY

In looking at the depressed state of the labor market, we see a great number of tradesmen not able to get employment, all through the introduction of goods manufactured in the prisons of the United States and Great Britain. It will, therefore, be

the duty of the League to agitate and petition Parliament about the desirability of at once imposing an import duty on all such goods imported to this country.

OBJECTS OF THE MINERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

The objects of the Miners' Protective League are to organise and unite all the great laboring classes—the mining community—in fact, every member of the great working body—in one grand harmonious confederation, having the same objects in view, and pursuing the same line of conduct for their accomplishment, the members of the League being all governed by the same rules and entitled to the same benefits.

THE PURPOSES TO WHICH THE FUNDS OF THE LEAGUE MAY BE DEVOTED.

As the business of a public body cannot be conducted without expense, it was found necessary that a fund should be raised in the following manner: Every person on becoming a member of the Miners' Protective League to pay two shillings and sixpence entrance money, and one shilling per month. A portion of the money to be expended in building places where the League can hold its meetings, in paying for printing, postage of letters, payment of secretary, etc. The members of the League have also considered it would be their duty to use a portion of the funds of the League in procuring proper medical assistance for

any member of the society who may require such assistance.

DUTY OF MEMBERS OF THE MINERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUE

As it frequently happens that a considerable number of men are collected upon new rushes particularly in a very short space of time, and it being impossible for the proper authorities to be on the ground at a moment's notice, it will be the duty of the members of the Miners' Protective League to use their utmost energies to preserve order and to protect the property and rights of every individual, and to seize, secure, and hand over to the government authorities any thief, robber, or ruffian who violates the laws of his country.

We invite men of all nations, except Chinamen, to enrol themselves as members of the League; and lastly we call upon every man whose spirit yearns for equality, fraternity and glorious liberty. Let us then unite, organise, and go hand in hand in our grand struggle for the advancement of our race—let us lift up our voices and exclaim, "Fairplay for all," in one grand harmonious shout that will be echoed from the north to the south, from the east to the west, until the deafening sound is responded to by an acknowledgment of our rights as freeborn men, the descendants of the patriots of the old world.

—"The Miner and General Advertiser" (Lambing Flat), 6/3/1861.

(Continued Next Issue.)



FURTHER AND DEEPER.

From "Low Again," The Cresset Press, London, 1938.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND CIVILIAN DEFENCE

W. F. Burns

A contribution to the discussion of the Communist Party's Defence policy, as previously outlined by Comrade Dixon in these columns.

ACTIVITY around the question of Civilian Defence, which Comrade Dixon declared should be the issue of a great campaign by the Communist Party, is now becoming apparent in different parts of the Party organisation.

Already (April 29) two leaflets on the question have been issued by Party organisations, one by the Eastern Suburbs (Sydney) District Committee and the other by the Thirroul (South Coast) branch of the Party.

From Party platforms everywhere comrades are now raising this question, and a number of Party branches have already started on the job of discussing how best a campaign for adequate Air Raid Protection and other forms of civilian defence can be secured in their particular areas.

In all discussion by members of the Communist Party on this question the fact that the Federal government has not done anything about that very important aspect of defence and the total absence of any apparent allowance of money for Civilian Defence is remarked upon and bitterly criticised.

But simply to remark upon it and criticise it, is not sufficient. If members of the Communist Party are to

be in the position to give a real lead to the people of Australia for real civilian defence, they need to know what is behind the Federal government's disgraceful neglect. This is essentially a matter of foreign policy and, in particular, of Australia's part in the re-armament plans of Great Britain.

Many Communists, speaking from Party platforms and in other places, have condemned the foreign policy of the Federal government as being simply "slavish support for the Chamberlain policy of strengthening the fascist aggressors." More needs to be said of it than this.

About two years ago Lyons and Parkhill represented Australia at the Imperial Conference (held in London at the same time as the Coronation). The deliberations of that conference have a great bearing on the attitude of the Federal government on Civilian or other forms of Defence today.

Although the Baldwin government had previously sabotaged the League of Nations and collective security during Italy's robber invasion of Abyssinia, it was at the Imperial Conference that the League was finally jettisoned as part of

Great Britain's foreign policy.

Instead the Conference adopted a policy "of uni-lateral Empire re-armament in isolation from the League and the rest of the world." ("C.R.," July, 1937.)

At the same time the line of assisting the fascists to launch an attack on the U.S.S.R, the agitation against the Franco-Soviet Pact (at that time one of the biggest factors in the struggle for maintenance of peace) and other forms of aid to fascist aggression, which previously had been more hidden, became quite obvious.

The object of British foreign policy, as it emerged from the Imperial Conference, was to assist fascist aggression with the hope of directing it against the Soviet Union and at the same time to increase British Empire re-armament in the hope that these new arms would prevent any attack on the interests of British imperialism.

And in the general Empire re-armament Australia had a specific task. Australia was to become an arsenal in the Pacific for Great Britain.

This was put very clearly in a cable which came to Australia from London on May 26, 1937.

This read: "As a sequel to the plan of Lyons and Parkhill a permanent Imperial organisation will be established to create machinery for pooling munitions and food-stuffs. Australia, in addition to her own requirements, will expand her production to supply explosives, shells, etc., to the Far East, Singa-

pore and New Zealand."

Australia, then, was to hop into the armaments business in a bigger way, not for the defence especially of Australia, but for the defence of British imperialist interests.

A start was soon made on the job. It was in the same year that Lord Dungowan visited Australia and gave advice on, amongst many other things, the best site for an aircraft factory.

It was also significant that the site he suggested (Fishermen's Bend, Melbourne) was later chosen for the factory of the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation which is linked with Dungowan's own branch of the armaments ring (Imperial Chemical Industries, Great Britain).

The Australian delegation at the Imperial Conference were very loyal supporters of this policy of Baldwin and Eden, and as soon as they returned to Australia proceeded to do their best to put it into effect.

"Empire Defence," then, and not "Defence of Australia," was the basis of Australia's rearmament in 1937. It apparently still is.

The policy adopted at the Imperial Conference was, of course, welcomed by the B.H.P. and metal magnates of Australia, as it gave them greater opportunities for profit making. They could then cut in on the armaments ring.

The policy of the Australian government has since then followed closely that of the British imperialists throughout. When Chamberlain and Halifax disagreed with Eden and the latter was removed

from the British Cabinet, the Federal government still stuck to its slogan of "Tune in to Great Britain" and Australian arming was apparently still for the same purpose.

When it became obvious that the "Western Pact" spoken about at the Imperial Conference was, under Chamberlain's guidance, to be a Four Power Pact directed against the Soviet Union, Australian government support for British Foreign policy remained unwavering.

Even when Australia's most likely invader, Japan, commenced its invasion of China and the British government did not take any steps to halt this aggression, although it threatened British interests in China, the Federal government remained loyal, despite the fact that this made Australia's safety more gravely in danger. In fact the Federal government has even given assistance to Japan.

Obviously the Federal government did not greatly fear attack on Australia, but relied on the working out of Chamberlain's policy of directing aggression against the Soviet Union. Seemingly the Cabinet thought that Japan, as part of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis, would be too busy fighting the U.S.S.R. to worry about Australia.

The reason for the failure of the Federal government to make any allowance for Civil Defence would then be easily explained.

Not fearing any invasion, they did not fear air raids. So there was no need for Air Raid Protection.

That this idea is certainly preval-

ent amongst a section of the U.A.P. politicians was shown by the recent statement of the New South Wales Minister for Social Services (Richardson) that "it was not likely that war would come to Australia's shores."

Either this theory, that the Federal government had such blind faith in the foreign policy of Great Britain that it did not see the danger of invasion of Australia is correct, or else the entire Federal Cabinet are deliberate and faithless traitors.

For, as the Communist Party has consistently pointed out, their every action in connection with international politics over the past two years has been such as to weaken Australia's capacity to resist invasion and our potential attacker, Japan, has been moving closer and closer.

It is not necessary to enumerate these one by one. The selling of pig iron and lead concentrates to the Japanese militarists and the use of the Dog Collar Act against workers who refused to assist in this work, are evidence enough.

The above factor, together with the fact that every penny of the £63,000,000 "Defence" vote will be needed if the building of the Pacific "arsenal" is to be carried out, makes it obvious that any Civilian Defence proposals brought forward either by the Federal government or the State government authorities must be so flavored by their foreign policy as to be innocuous.

The slogan "Defence of Australia" is necessary if the workers

are to be kept busy at the manufacture of armaments, if the money for the armaments construction is to be kept coming in. The name of "Defence" is essential if the Australian government's part in Empire re-armament is to be kept up.

The people are beginning to realise that Civilian Defence and air raid protections are part of the defence of any country against present-day aggression. So the governments must come forward with some talk of Civilian Defence, even if its sole purpose is to try and prevent the development of a mass movement such as that in England around this question.

And so we have the half-baked proposals of Bruxner and Co. in New South Wales, one of whose most salient features is that it does not cost much money. Total expenditure of the National Emergency Services in New South Wales would appear to be the wages of a few officials and clerks.

Any real protective measure, as for example gas masks, or bomb-proof shelters, which would cost money, is vetoed immediately. Any excuse, no matter how feeble, will do.

Every suggestion of the authorities on this question is based on the minimum amount of expenditure. Lectures costing the government practically nothing are organised. Women are told how to make one room in their homes gas-proof, at their own expense. Gas treatment centres are selected. They are schools which are government buildings. Example after example can

be given to show that every suggestion of the government for Civilian Defence is based on being practically costless for the government.

Civilian Defence of Australia is a very complicated technical problem involving not only considerable expenditure of money (the cost would be at some millions) but also detailed information of almost every locality in the Commonwealth.

It would, for example, be almost as tragic to have bomb-proof shelters for 2,000 people in some suburb and have 15,000 trying to get into them in a hurry, as to have none.

In some localities (even in Sydney) it would be more necessary to have underground shelters than others. Fire precautions are, for example, more necessary in Rozelle, where there are many wooden houses, than in Vaucluse where they are next door to non-existent.

Bomb-proof shelters in scattered areas, like Merrylands, Sydney, would need to be more plentiful and smaller than in crowded areas such as Glebe or Woolloomooloo.

Such a scheme can only be worked out fully by a really competent government which sees this form of defence as highly important, or else by the people in the municipalities and residential districts themselves.

The Federal government does not wish to work out such a scheme. Even if it did, it is far too incompetent to do it successfully. The same applies to most, if not all, the State governments.

The job, then, must come from the localities. The particular fea-

tures of each municipality and each township for Civilian Defence must be fully worked out. Some will need more anti-aircraft guns than others. Others will need the inclusion of coastal batteries as part of Civilian Defence. The geography of almost every district, the transport arrangement of almost every district, will have an altering effect on its Civilian Defence needs.

But, unfortunately, none of the municipal and shire councils seem interested in providing such a scheme for their areas. They appear to be waiting for the governments to bring forward a scheme to give them a lead. But such a lead, such a scheme, will never be forthcoming.

It is up to the Labor movement to give the lead. Particularly, it is up to the Communist Party branches in the areas to do so.

Some comrades have indicated that a real Civilian Defence scheme for Australia should be forthcoming from somewhere.

Actually, not even the Communist Party can centrally produce such a scheme. It must have its genesis in the localities.

Centrally the Party can adopt certain precautions as an absolute minimum. We have already declared that free gas masks for all, bomb-proof shelters, free training in gas treatment and first aid, anti-aircraft guns and other things are necessary.

Party branches in the locality must

take on themselves the task of ascertaining the amount of each of these which is necessary in their area and other details such as the most suitable of spots for training headquarters (civilian, not military), shelters, mask distributing centres and so on. And having worked out such schemes, the Party branches, with the assistance of other sections of the Labor movement in their districts, must fight for the adoption of these schemes by the local Civilian Defence authorities, which, in N.S.W. at least, will, it seems, be under the control of the local government bodies.

The degree to which this is successful will, of course, depend on the amount of mass work done in the areas by the local Communists.

One final point on the campaign for Civilian Defence. Every scheme will mean the expenditure of money. No money is provided.

Although some of the work could easily be done by the men who are now doing relief work with the Wages Tax money being taken for other purposes than relief of unemployment, the bulk must come by allotment, from the Federal government from the "Defence" vote.

It seems to me that the Party, in taking up this campaign, must make one of its central points a demand for an immediate allotment of some minimum sum (say £10,000,000) for Civilian Defence.

PRICE OF MILK IN N.S.W.

II.

This is the conclusion of the second article written for the "Communist Review" by a group of young economists whose researches are of particular interest, giving as they do statistical evidence that should be of great value to speakers, writers, etc., connected with the Labor movement.

ON the figures cited last issue the investigator commented as follows:

"If what is regarded as the generally recognised practice were followed, namely, the setting aside of any amount written off goodwill account out of profits and not as a charge against profits, the net profit transferred to profit and loss appropriation account for the year 1934-35 would have been shown as £36,331, and for 1935-36 £32,263, as against £15,516 and £15,935 respectively. With regard to Bad Debts Reserve I must invite attention to the fact that this stands today at £31,000, being approximately 25 per cent of the total trade debtors. So far as depreciation is concerned, as admitted by the Directors in their Annual Reports to shareholders the provision made by the Company is ample.

"The published balance sheet as at 30th June, 1936, disclosed a general reserve of £64,000 of which £43,395/3/4 is not, under a resolution passed by the shareholders, to be distributed until the debentures have been redeemed, and then only to shareholders of the Company as at the 31st December, 1926."

Further on in his report, Mr. Swift expressed the following opinion:

"I am certain that, at the present rate of the Company's progress and with yearly review of its financial position, it will not be long before the Milk Board will be faced with a situation in which it will either have to elect to allow the Company abnormal profits — not necessarily disclosed — or reduce the margin."

In 1938 the net amount provided for depreciation had risen to £33,031.

The Company is continually adding to its equipment. It has recently acquired a new pasteurising plant which is claimed to be equal to anything in the world, also additional bottle-washing, filling and aluminium capping equipment. New depots are being built, large suburban dairies are being bought, and additional glass-lined rail transport tanks have been acquired.

At the investigation of 1937 the Chairman of Directors, the Hon. A. N. Binks, M.L.A., stated that one channel for milk distribution had always been the objective of his Company. "The idea of the company," he said, "was to get a monopoly of the sale of milk, but not necessarily the sale to the retail consumer."

The Milk Board itself, when it assumed office, advocated "one channel" for the wholesale distribution of milk, and there is no doubt that the policy of the Board has favored a monopolisation of wholesale distribution. An outstanding instance of this has recently occurred in Newcastle.

In 1925 the Newcastle and Suburban Co-operative Society Ltd. entered into an agreement with the Farmers and Dairymen's Milk Co. Ltd. of Dungog for a supply of its milk requirements. Later this company was taken over by the Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Milk Co. Ltd. which supplied milk under the terms of the existing agreement. The milk was supplied from the Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Milk Co. depot in Newcastle. The milk was treated free and distributed amongst the Co-operative Society's carts at the depot. This meant that the depot of the Newcastle Co-operative Society was not used, as the treatment and distribution of the milk amongst the carts was being done by the Dairy Farmers Co-operative Milk Co. In 1931 the Board refused to license the Newcastle Co-operative Society as it held that the Society was an unnecessary agency. This did not affect the Society at the time, as the Milk Board's distributing agent, the Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Milk Co., continued to supply milk at the old rate of 1/1 $\frac{1}{4}$ per gallon. However, in March, 1938, as a result of the Board's price fixation, the Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Milk Co. had to pay 1d. per gallon extra for its milk and the Company raised the price of milk to the Society by 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per gallon, i.e. from 1/1 $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1/4 per gallon. At the same time the price

to the consumers in the Newcastle district was increased by 1d. per gallon.

In December of last year the Dairy Farmers Co. took over the only other distributing agent in the Newcastle district, the Newcastle Bowthorne Milk Co., and now has a complete monopoly of milk distribution in the Newcastle district. The Newcastle Co-operative Society states that in 1937 the high quality milk supplied from Dungog, which contained up to 4.6 per cent. butter fat as against a statutory minimum of 3.2 per cent., was cut off, this milk being sent directly to Sydney.

Year	Net Profit	Dividend per cent.	Amount
1934	15,662	5	14,195
1935	16,142	5	14,195
1936	16,400	5	14,195
1937	16,550	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	15,615
1938	17,049	6	17,034

It will be noted that in recent years profits have shown remarkable consistency. As an indication of how much of this profit is due to milk, Mr. Swift "adopting the basis of apportionment of overhead costs which the late general manager of the Company, from his knowledge and experience of the business, stated might be accepted as reasonable," estimated the net profit on milk and cream to be £9,910/4/9. Allowing for "considerable business done in other lines," it would appear that the Company's milk business is quite profitable. In 1936 a complete new pasteurising and bottling plant was installed, and a new ice cream factory was completed during 1938.

It must be borne in mind that both the Distributing Companies are large retail milk vendors and that some portion of their profits is derived from this source. In the case of these companies retailing milk they receive the whole of the difference between the retail price of 2/4 per gallon and the price to the producer (1/-) less freight (variable) and factory treatment charges (1d.).

THE COST OF RETAIL

DISTRIBUTION

Under the Board's 1932 price the vending margin was fixed at 11d. This has since been reduced to 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. by the price fixation of March 1938.

It is obvious that costs of milk distribution must vary very widely, according to the amount taken per consumer, the area to be covered by the distributor, the number of bad debts incurred and so on. Probably the greatest waste in distribution is due to the fact that several ven-

It is worthy of note that the population of Newcastle is mainly industrial and can ill afford any increase in price.

The other Licensed Milk Distributing agent, the New South Wales Fresh Food and Ice Co. Ltd., does a very considerable business in other lines such as bread, fish, ice cream, game and poultry. Between 1927 and 1933 the profits of this Company fluctuated wildly between £4,052 in 1932 and £17,536 in 1928. The average profit was £10,243. Since then the profits and dividends have been as follows:—

dors cover the same area. Thus there may be half a dozen milkmen serving a few houses each in the same street. The distance covered by these carts is therefore six times greater than would be necessary if one cart did the whole street. The working hours spent in actually calling from house to house, or from flat to flat, would be much greater if done by six different men each calling at a few houses or flats instead of one man doing a whole row of houses or a whole block of flats. This is one of the classic socialist arguments in favor of socialisation of distribution. In our capitalist world it has an entirely different application. Where there are a number of distributors the one having the largest number of customers in any given area has a competitive advantage over his rivals. The Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Milk Co. and the Fresh Food and Ice Co. are the biggest retail distributors at the present time and are gradually extending their control of retail distribution. Canvassers are often employed to organise new trade. The Dairy Farmers Co., for instance, employs women goodwill officers "to talk matters over with housewives," or in other words to canvass for extra business. The N.S.W. Fresh Food and Ice Co. has gone so far as to purchase the businesses of several suburban dairymen and form a subsidiary company. Any extension of the business of these companies is likely to mean a reduction of distribution costs through reduction of overlapping in distributing services. But this reduction in costs will not mean a cheapening of

milk to the consumer. It will go to swell the profits of the companies.

The small vendors are probably not making excessive profits. Milk runs can be bought. They are priced according to the number of gallons sold daily. Mr. Swift found in 1937 that the price ranged from £10 to £15 per gallon. This meant that a good 50 gallon run could be purchased for about £750. In paying this price the buyer was in reality purchasing himself a steady job. The vending margin is sufficient to allow the small vendor to make a living. But the expenses of the small vendor must, for the reasons given above, be much greater than those of the large companies. It is not therefore unreasonable to deduce that the large companies are making big profits from retail distribution. And the more these companies extend their business the less their unit costs of distribution become.

The position in regard to retail distribution is therefore that the consumer is paying a price sufficient to keep a large number of small distributors in work and to earn large profits for the two large distributing companies.

CONCLUSION—WHY DOES THE CONSUMER PAY 2/4 PER GALLON?

It will be obvious to the reader that the process of transferring milk from the cow to the city consumer is a long one and needs great labor equipment and organisation. It is often assumed

that, because the producer gets only 1/- and the consumer pays 2/4 the whole of the difference accrues as profit to the "middleman." This is a very naive view. Under the most efficient system of distribution considerable cost would be involved in these essential steps. However, in each of the stages of production and distribution we have found that costs could be cut down by proper organisation and control. Taking each stage separately the consumer is paying for the following excess costs:—

Production: He (the consumer) is paying to support the less profitable branches of the dairying industry and is also paying a price which will support a number of inefficient producers.

Wholesale Distribution: The consumer is making a considerable but indeterminate contribution to the large (but partially concealed) profits of the Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Society Ltd. and to a lesser extent to the profits of the N.S.W. Fresh Food and Ice Co.

Retail Distribution: He is paying for overlapping and inefficiency in distribution and making another contribution to the two large wholesale companies who are steadily increasing their retail business.

There is no excuse for these excess costs of a food so vital to all classes and in particular to the young and the sick.

(Written April, 1939.)

"HOW AUSTRALIA IS GOVERNED"

A Programme of Safeguards for Australian Democracy.—
D. M. Davies, B.A.

"Eighty years have passed since the miners and landless men of the 'fifties secured for Australian citizens the right to vote. But today the measure of political freedom for which they made Australia famous does not remain unquestioned. In Europe democracy, the fruit of so many painful struggles, has almost vanished. We in Australia must again turn our energies to the task of preserving our democracy, as-

sailed now by forces more formidable than ever before."

This is the opening paragraph from a new pamphlet of the above title, published by the Council of Civil Liberties, Melbourne.

It is a very well written and concise exposure of some of the major anti-democratic weaknesses in the present system of government, together with a ten-point programme of reforms.

It is a pamphlet which we have no hesitation in commending to all readers of the "Review."

MILESTONES IN HISTORY

A Colony Revolts

HISTORY books still tell our children that colonies were acquired by the British ruling class to carry the blessings of civilisation to backward peoples, etc. How different is the real story!

On July 4, 1776, one colony, America, declared its independence—independence forced from a reluctant British government after it had precipitated a bitter war by its ruthless and stupid policy.

In the eyes of the British capitalists, sentimentally styled the "Mother Country" for school consumption, colonies existed for the purpose of facilitating and increasing their own profit-making; originally, by way of providing exclusive markets for the products of their flourishing industries and for supplies of raw materials.

So, the products of the new industries were sold at the highest practicable prices fixed by the British merchants. On their part, the colonies were expected to provide raw materials for the "home" industry at low prices fixed by "head-quarters."

This was the sort of "two-way" traffic which the British ruling class insisted upon as its right. All went well until the colonies themselves began to develop a trading and manufacturing class of their own,

and it was seen that the lopsided arrangement restricted their development in the interests of the "Mother Country."

With extraordinary near-sightedness the politicians of Great Britain failed to see the significance of the growing demands of the colonies for a different arrangement and set out to meet all argument by autocratic edicts to perpetuate the old conditions.

Peopled by European settlers with traditions of independence and liberty, the North American colonies resisted this exploitation and finally revolted against it. Even then, the British ruling class failed to see "the writing on the wall" and instead of "bending" maintained its autocratic stand.

The tipping into the ocean of tea which was being foisted upon them at exorbitant prices was the signal for active resistance, precipitating the American War of Independence. The result of the conflict was that the merchant capitalists of Great Britain lost their most profitable colony, and the foundation was laid of the United States of America, destined to oust the former "Mother Country" from its position of world economic hegemony—historic justice!

N.Z. NEWS LETTER

Defence Leagues Versus Defence

RECENTLY Mr. Savage made his eagerly awaited broadcast statement on defence. A radio speech by Mr. Savage is a national event at any time. His simple, persuasive manner of speaking, closely modelled on President Roosevelt's "fireside talks" has won him a place in the people's sentiments, not equalled by any New Zealand leader since the time of Seddon. This speech was particularly important, not only by what was said which was just, but also by what was left unsaid which was necessary.

The Prime Minister declared his belief that war could be averted, and that "if the decision between war and peace lay in the hands of the people, there would be no war." But his only proposal to avert war was his favorite project of a World Economic Peace Conference, with undefined constitution and objects—a sort of Rotarian get-together. The New Zealand government has not yet declared its support for the Anglo-Soviet Peace Pact which alone can check fascist war.

He affirmed that the defence of New Zealand democracy was "within the compass of our united endeavours" and that "strength and vigilance are the conditions of our survival." But again the necessary conclusions were not drawn. Survival for New Zealand democracy depends on sharpened vigilance towards the disruptive manoeuvres of

Chamberlain and towards the reactionaries in this country who are playing their own game against the Labor government under cover of their concern for defence.

For a remarkable mobilisation of the reactionary forces has taken place in the last few months around the question of defence. The Tory Defence League, formed in 1936 to advocate conscription, has taken on a new lease of life. The strike-breaking Legion of Frontiersmen, of 1913 disrepute, has obtained permission from the Defence authorities to recruit and assume patronage over a special unit of the territorial forces. In the Taranaki, the Vendee of New Zealand, there is a suspicious move for the formation of a "National Guard," which can only be regarded as a private army. In Auckland a Captain Humphrey Davies has, on his own initiative, enrolled an "Imperial Veterans' Brigade" of 300 ex-Imperial Army men. All kinds of shady and suspicious elements are erecting their own little "defence" organisations.

All this has been viewed with remarkable equanimity by the Defence Department and the government. Even the recruiting campaign, until the time of Mr. Savage's speech, has been left in the hands of reactionaries like Sir Ernest Davis, New Zealand's leading beer-baron and Mayor of Auckland. The attitude of the Defence Department can be

understood. They have always cooperated with organisations like the Legion of Frontiersmen and still consist of the same people as under Massey, Coates and Forbes. But why the foolish complacency of the government?

It is not that the workers do not realise the dangers of the present position. At the recent Labor Party Conference a strong minority demanded the suppression of the Defence League out of hand. An interesting development is the move sponsored by the Auckland Trades Council and by Mr. W. J. Lyon, M.P. for the formation of two trade union companies, to be manned and officered by trade unionists. One reason for the keen interest which this proposal has aroused is the distrust of the ordinary trade unionist for the defence forces as at present constituted. "Democratisation of the armed forces" is a phrase that the man in the street understands better than the Minister of Defence.

The position with regard to civilian defence, air raid protection, is chaotic. The Minister of Defence claims that there is no need for bomb-proof shelters, while the Prime Minister calls for volunteers for coastal defences. Anaemic Air Raid Precautions Committees exist, mainly as a playground for wealthy women. The government has a plan of "emergency precautions," but it is difficult to discover what it is, other than certain bureaucratic centralised measures by the police and the military. There is no shadow of democracy in present civilian defence

arrangements.

At the same time, it should be said that the Prime Minister's speech was a rebuff, although a mild one, to the conscriptionists (the National Party last week came out openly for the first time as a champion of conscription, which has its ironical side when one remembers that it was the Tories who abolished compulsory military training in 1931 on the grounds of economy). The government has taken over the leadership of the recruiting campaign, and Mr. Savage publicly rebuked the Defence League for its interference. New Zealand's national register, unlike Australia's, is to be voluntary, and does not go beyond the formation of a reserve force of men with military experience. All this is to the good.

While defence has moved to the centre of the stage in New Zealand politics, the financial situation of the government and of the country still occupies an important place in public attention. Increased expenditure on defence will accentuate all the already serious problems.

A few days ago the Supreme Court, as the outcome of a test case brought by an importer, declared the government's import control regulations invalid. The government has announced its intention of passing the necessary legislation to validate its actions, and imports remain under strict control. But the reactionary groups behind the importers' campaign can claim a victory, which need not have been given them, had adequate steps been taken by the government to establish a democratic

judiciary.

In any case it is now apparent that import control by itself cannot solve the government's problems, as the Communist Party claimed from the start. The government therefore has abandoned its previously proclaimed policy of cheap (and even costless—though this was in theory only) credit and its opposition to borrowing. With the blessing of the Stock Exchange and the press it has launched an internal loan for £4,500,000 at 4 per cent. interest, leading to an all-round rise in internal interest rates. Mr. Nash's visit to London is connected with the conversion of the £17,000,000 loan falling due early next year, and almost certainly with a hoped-for new loan. Through its failure to raise taxation on the rich and to extend its control over banking, as provided for in its own election programme, it is being pushed into one expedient after another.

It would be wrong to assume from this that the government has entirely lost its progressive impetus. It has shown commendable firmness towards the "doctors' strike" organised by the B.M.A. against the new Social Security Act which commenced operation on April 1. Contracts for maternity benefits were issued regardless of the B.M.A. attitude, and 22 doctors had the courage to defy ostracism and boycott by signing them. Providing that the government stands firm, it seems likely that other doctors will come in and the boycott will be broken. The outlines of a Bill for a paid

fortnight's holiday for all workers have been given by the Minister of Labor, though he has given no undertaking that it will be enacted, and has even suggested a "compromise" with the employers. The campaign for Labor dailies is taking on big proportions.

Through its attack on the finances of New Zealand, reaction here and in the city of London hopes to deal the final blow at the Labor government before very long. Sir Henry Batterbee, newly appointed British High Commissioner, is slated to play the part of New Zealand's Runciman, and is believed to be putting heavy pressure on the government to "go easy" with its social legislation. The recent 3 per cent. cut on meat exports, while it applied also to Australia, tells more heavily on New Zealand, dependent to a far greater extent on meat export.

The heavy guns are being trained against New Zealand. Mr. Justice Callan's judgment declaring the import regulations invalid is an experiment in "constitutional" methods of hamstringing the Labor government; at the same time the extra-Parliamentary forces are being mobilised through the Defence Leagues and National Guards. In London Mr. Nash will undoubtedly be presented with an ultimatum. Reaction is laying its plans deep and well. It has left only one thing out of its calculations—the determination of the New Zealand people to defend its living standards and democratic institutions.

—GORDON WATSON

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

By "Lawyer"

MOST Australians learn at an early age that there are no "racecourse certainties." After this usually bitter lesson they either abandon racing or risk losses in the hope of wins. This is one respect in which politics is akin to our national pastime. To wait for political certainties is to abandon political activity.

It seems to me that the objections of Comrades Dixon and Purdy are based just on this attitude. It is indisputable that monopolies in Australia are seeking "to further concentrate and consolidate their political power." But it is equally indisputable that Labor needs constitutional reforms to enable a Labor government to govern efficiently and to secure, if possible, democratic safeguards.

The Australian Constitution was drawn to meet the needs of an Australia of 1900 and its machinery is totally inadequate to meet the needs of Australia in 1939. Problems of marketing, monopolies, finance, defence, etc., have all arisen urgently and in different form today and cannot be adequately dealt with under the Commonwealth Constitution with its division of powers between Federal and State governments.

To view the question of constitutional reform only from the viewpoint of the danger to us if the U.A.P. wishes were adopted is to

ignore entirely the danger of a Labor government being hamstrung by constitutional difficulties. It is to disregard entirely a real opportunity of placing democratic safeguards in the Constitution.

Apart from this general proposition, Comrade Purdy takes three specific objections to Comrade Pater-son's arguments.

1. He declares that "centralisation of Arbitration and Parliament could only be of benefit under certain conditions, but never as an absolute principle." This is, of course, a truism. But so is a further declaration that "decentralisation of Arbitration and Parliament could only be of benefit under certain conditions, but never as an absolute principle." So what?

2. He argues that "any referendum under the present government will not be in the interests of democracy. They will not allow the people to vote for a more democratic constitution." This seems to me a complete form of defeatism. The proposition under discussion is whether Labor should adopt a negative approach of opposing all discussions on constitutional reform or whether we should advance our proposals for constitutional reform in opposition to those of the government and to have ours popularised, to be eventually adopted. Reaction needed the National Insurance Scheme, com-

plete freedom with pig iron, the banning of the Party just as much as it needs constitutional reform. Labor defeated these attacks; it can defeat Menzies' constitutional reforms as it defeated Casey's National Insurance.

He declares that Labor should prove itself capable of repealing the Transport Workers' Act, defeating the U.A.P. Federal government, etc., before attempting constitutional reforms. I feel rather strongly that this is purely an artificial division. A real appreciation of the need for constitutional reform and a proper campaign to secure it seems to me to be a necessary part of any campaign to secure the reforms he mentions.

3. He disagrees with Paterson's estimate of the widespread feeling of opposition to many governments and the fear that reactionary politicians may be able to marshal this. I think that this feeling of opposition is very strong, not in the city or among the workers, but in the pastoral and wheat areas of Australia. In those parts, where the fall in prices of primary products has been catastrophic, there is a real feeling of complete frustration, of almost abject fear.

Holding after holding is heavily mortgaged to the banks, and the owners allowed by the banks an incredibly small pittance to live on. These people are desperately seeking a remedy. Their problems (low and still falling prices for primary products, heavy mortgages due to drought, lack of any marketing or finance schemes) are problems which

cannot be solved by either a Commonwealth or State government alone. There has been in the past a failure on the part of all governments to co-operate to deal with the position. This has inevitably led to a feeling of complete frustration that the Constitution has operated only to prevent anything being done. At present this has led only to a vague demand for unification, but there is also present a desperate demand that something be done.

In the last crisis Labor allowed this discontent to be rallied behind the New Guard and the Riverina movement. We can only stop a repetition by knowing how to act and showing out intention to act.

At the Easter conference of the Labor Party, there was great difficulty in formulating a rural policy, particularly marketing, which could be carried out within the confines of the Constitution. The only way to "keep our feet on the ground" is to understand and make known now the constitutional reforms we will find necessary for Labor to give an Australian New Deal. The fact is that without constitutional reform a Labor government would, at best, be hampered; at worst, be completely helpless.

One very urgent task in this country is to preserve democracy. Democracy cannot be preserved as in a glass case in a museum, but only by making it work. Our task at the moment is to take steps to make the democratic machinery of government face and solve the problems of the people, of the workers, pastoralists,

wheat growers, etc. These problems cannot be dealt with within the framework of our Constitution, a constitution framed to deal with different problems arising under different circumstances.

The question of constitutional re-

form is urgent and is intimately linked with all other questions of what a Labor government must do. It cannot be solved alone—but neither can Australia's problems of monopolies, of finance, of peace, of fascism, of depression, be solved without it.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

We invite brief expression of views on matters of current interest.

Our defence policy calls forth the following comments from A. E. Butler, of Casino:

IT is true, as R. Dixon says, that the present government supported Franco, Hitler and Mussolini. True we have been, during the past few months, through several crises, at each of which war seemed imminent, and the need for arming against fascist aggression apparent. It is also, unfortunately, true that working-class movements, including the C.P. of A., have not made clear enough their policy on defence.

R. Dixon says, for instance, that we are not opposed to armaments or to the voluntary militia, but we have been told that we must not advise recruits to join. If we are to do anything to protect the democracy we have against the aggressor must we not fight in the only defence force that exists at present?

That the government must be changed cannot be denied, and with it the foreign policy of the nation. Labor leaders and Communists assure us that this can be done. Do they suggest that the enemy will wait until this has been accomplished?

R. Dixon says we are not necessarily opposed to armaments, which seems rather equivocal, or a sort of grudging concession. Either we are opposed to them or we are not; if the latter, then we cannot

be opposed to men learning to use them. He goes on to say: The working class are assisting in defence preparations, but these would be hastened if they were to fully co-operate, but what would be the cost to the movement? This means that the workers are really hampering the defence preparations in some measure by resisting attacks on their standards and so preserving in some measure their independence. The question is asked whether in the event of defeat at the hands of fascism we would preserve any independence at all.

All are agreed upon the danger of the common enemy, but the greatest danger is the weakening of morale through confusion. We know that we have no guarantee as to the use that will be made of an army, but what are we to do? Refuse to fight against fascism until we have forced this guarantee, or leave ourselves unarmed and exposed to aggression? Should not our slogan be: To arms against the Axis, but be prepared to use them against treacherous leaders and the internal enemy?

Universal training is the subject of a letter from A. Weaver, of South Australia:

I HAVE always been in the past a strong anti-conscriptionist, but after reading several accounts of the rape of Spain, Austria and

Czechoslovakia, I am very doubtful if it is altogether wise to oppose universal training for home defence. Let us take Spain, by way of an example. It seems to my mind that, had the Spanish workers and peasants been trained men when first Franco rebelled, there would be a different story to tell today. In the April issue of your "Review," pp. 228-29, R. Dixon names four demands with which I agree, but which I think strengthen the case for universal training.

Let us take the first of these:

"a) Instead of the government's War Precautions Act, the fullest democracy for the working-class movement and all loyalist people, and maximum measures against the fascists and their supporters within the country."

Should a Labor government obtain power and try to enforce this under present circumstances I am afraid it would at once cause a rebellion, in which case, unless amongst the trained forces individuals with strong democratic principles predominated, it is easy to see how we could become a fascist state.

We know that a good many of those that join the Defence forces do so because of unemployment, the majority of whom see nothing but poverty and degradation for their future; this being the case, if an officer with fascist views promised them constant work, etc., it does not require much imagination to see what the result would be.

Now, let us view this question from another angle. Suppose a fair proportion of recruits have a good knowledge of working-class ideas, not only do we have in them solid support for democracy, but transmits for propaganda also. I am quite cognisant of the fact that the workers do not trust the present government; but I think all will agree that we are living in one of the most critical periods in the whole of human history. Therefore, dangerous though universal training can become, we may be showing wisdom by the advocacy of that method in our fight for democracy. Dangerous courses have sometimes to be adopted in order to obtain satisfactory results.

[In the June issue of the "Communist Review" we published a letter by W. Drinkwater in which he disagreed with our policy on defence. In this issue we publish letters by A. E. Butler and A. Weaver on the same subject.

All three writers are so obsessed with the danger of fascist invasion that they overlook the danger of fascism arising within Australia. What needs to be realised, however, is that the menace of fascism arising within Australia outweighs the danger of fascism being imposed from without. It follows from this that the working class must set its face against the danger from within as well as from without.

Under what slogans does Australian fascism parade? Its main slogan is "Defend Australia." Messrs. Drinkwater, Butler and Weaver do not seem to realise that behind all the capitalist press talk of "defence" lurk the ugly features of fascism, promoted by Menzies, the militarists and big monopolists. They have been taken in by the propaganda of the capitalist press.

Mr. Weaver writes that "dangerous though universal training can become, we may be showing wisdom by the advocacy of that method . . ." Mr. Drinkwater has "more faith in the Australian people" than to believe that they will submit to fascist dictatorship and believes that conscription "defeats its own ends." Oh, that it did. Hitler and Mussolini, who have conscripted the German and Italian people militarily and in-

dustrially, would long ago have been destroyed.

Mr. Weaver argues that if only the Spanish people had been trained men from the first Franco would not have won. The fact is, however, that it was the trained men, the army, made up very largely of conscripts, that was the basis of the fascist revolt. Militarism provides the most fertile source of fascism. Give to the militarists conscription or compulsory military training and you immediately enhance their power to an enormous degree. Mr. Menzies wants to do this. His government is taking a register of man-power to facilitate the introduction of military and industrial conscription.

We agree that Australian man-power must be trained to defend the country and therefore, contrary to the belief of A. E. Butler, the Communist Party does not oppose the voluntary militia. Many of our members have joined up.

The officer staff of the armed forces of Australia are, however, undeniably pro-fascist in outlook in the main. They want compulsion because they will then be much more powerful. Should we give to them, the enemies of democracy, this power?

Before the question of support for compulsory military training can be positively approached by the Labor movement, the fascists must be driven out of the army. We must be sure we are building a force for democracy instead of for fascism. More than this, the voluntary system proved itself in this country during

the last war. And who can say it is a failure today? The voluntary system also has the advantage of being more democratic. Militarism, without the weapon of compulsion, is shorn of much of its power.

The proposals of A. E. Butler, A. Weaver and W. Drinkwater would, in the last analysis, mean working-class co-operation with the Federal government—the avowed enemy of Labor. They would result in disaster befalling the Labor movement. We cannot defend Australia by co-operating with the rich exploiting interests who are driving towards fascism.—Editor.]

From Bungunya, "Reader" writes, among other things, about a National School:

In a recent "Review," there was an article on the National School inaugurated for the purpose of enabling Party members to gain a better understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

May I suggest that a real National School be inaugurated, whereby all workers, Party and non-Party, may be enabled to grasp theory, such a School being run as a correspondence school, comprising elementary to senior sections, members, for instance, having a year's course at a fee of one shilling per monthly lesson.

I don't think workers will mind such a small outlay for the knowledge gained. Workers who can't grasp everything by individual study, because they can't lay hands on every book which would help them to solve their particular problems, would be able to go forward more rapidly if such a school as the above, led by competent tutors, was formed to put forward in simple language theory which otherwise might be difficult to understand.

There is no reason why the

School, with necessary support, could not be a financial success for the Party. The fee might have to be more or could be less than 1/- per month, depending on the cost of material, etc. Anyway, what do the readers of the "Review" think of the idea as a Party and knowledge builder?

Kearsley reader writes:

I have just read with interest the article in the "Communist Review" by Kevin Connolly on overhauling our language.

It is a great credit to the "Review" to publish such a straightforward criticism of the form of speech used by comrades. I am far from a master of English myself, but like most people, I like to hear a case explained in simple and clear language. Some of the phrases used jar on the mind in some way or other, such as "fascist butchers" and the terms of endearment given to Soviet leaders. It is difficult to explain the "worst" "correct way" to explain the brutalities of these barbarians.

Hoping you will not think my criticism harsh, but it is only by such methods that the Party will be assisted on its way to what it is striving for—a better life for all.

Prosper Byrne writes:

I congratulate you on the Party's policy re the defence scheme, it is a people's democratic one; we must take no risks with the "enemy in our midst," they are out to enslave us, by foul and bloody means, so we must give them no quarter. Had the Spanish government taken Lenin's example, there would be no fascism in Spain today; I think we must be very wary of the government we support.

George Wilkins, among other things, writes:

Following your invitation re Constitutional Reform I append some remarks. I think the whole question turns on the removal of the U.A.P. government. Your proposals and arguments in favor of opposition should be adopted while they remain. When gone, if subsequent government is strong enough and progressive in character, Comrade Paterson's proposals should be made a major point. Unification would enable us to bring

pressure on Rightwing labor and clarify the political field, making the task of a People's Front easier.

The installment of "Pages From The Past" in our last issue evokes a criticism from L. H. Gould:

TWO mistakes occur in J. N. Rawling's article in the June issue of the "Communist Review." It is a pity, for they mar the rest of his material which is, as usual, a fine sample of the author's able writing.

The first is the heading of an introductory par on page 361—"Bolsheviks of a Century Ago."

Robert Owen was a great man for his time, and when the Bolsheviks appeared on the scene of history at a much later period they did not withhold the honor due to this advanced thinker and fighter for progress. But Owen was not a Bolshevik. He was a Utopian Socialist. The term Bolshevism is treasured by the militant workers and all participants in the movement for freedom in every part of the world. It must never be used in a loose and, as in this case, in a decidedly incorrect way.

The second mistake is even far more serious. Rawling writes: "Robert Owen filled a position in the estimation of his bourgeois contemporaries similar to that occupied by Lenin and Trotsky in 1918."

Trotsky is presented as if he were the close colleague, indeed the co-equal, of Lenin.

What are the facts?

In 1918, Trotsky was plotting with Bukharin and others to assassinate Lenin! By 1921 the traitor had become linked up with foreign secret services. One understands why the Nazi press hail Trotsky as an "old Bolshevik" and a "pure Communist"!

Finally, an examination of the capitalist press of the post-revolutionary years reveals that the campaign of slander and abuse conducted against Lenin was different in form and intensity from that directed against Trotsky. This was because the capitalists knew of Trotsky's treachery, that he was undermining the revolution, and that he was to be regarded as their friend and ally.

[We wish to express our concurrence with the above criticism, as does also J. N. Rawling.—Editor.]

Lodging The Lenins

(Concluded from Page 391.)

along well. I think the two of them never quarreled. With Mrs. Lenin it was easy to get along. She was allowed to cook in our kitchen together with my wife. We had agreed to let her do that. The two women always got along well together, which is something to wonder at if one considers that the kitchen was a narrow intestine of a room, and that the two women had to squeeze by each other to pass. Mrs. Lenin would have been a good Hausfrau, but she had her mind always on her other work. She often went up to the library and at home, too, she wrote an enormous amount, always by hand. That's how the household had to suffer for it. My wife made the beds. The washbowls and pails Mrs. Lenin emptied. For the dish-washing she paid four francs a month. That was not arranged but she paid it voluntarily.

The two of them had to live with unbelievable economy. In the evening there was often only tea and buttered bread. I never would have had enough from a supper like that! Only on Saturdays she made meat patties for Sunday, and these she always called cutlets. For the noon meal Mrs. Lenin often boiled only oatmeal. Now and then it happened that the oatmeal was burned, and then Mr. Lenin always told me, "Mr. Kammerer, you see we live in grand style! We have roasts every day." He called the burned oatmeal a roast.

When Mrs. Lenin wanted to travel to Russia my wife was disturbed about her going into this insecure land at such an uncertain time. Then Mrs. Lenin answered, "You see, Mrs. Kammerer, that's where I have work to do. Here I have nothing to do."

Before the Lenins travelled to Russia, Mrs. Lenin promised to write to us. Probably she did, too, but at that time one never received mail from Russia.

Before the Lenins' departure, he packed many of his belongings into a box, and said: "If I return, I take these things again, otherwise you may dispose of them." I opened the box only after the news got around that he was dead. But then I saw that the moths had raised such havoc with the plunder that I burned everything. An overcoat of his, which he left, I presented to a relative. The tea kettle, the tea strainer, and the tea glasses that the Lenins left behind, I gave to my son.

The furniture is now again in a room that I have rented on the Culmannstrasse. Only in the wardrobe I put the mirror. My people who now rent the room, do not know that these are the beds in which the Lenins slept. Many people have rented the room since that time, who would have been shocked if they had known that Lenin had slept in that very same bed.

In his room there stood two beds, a sofa, a washstand with a mirror attached, a wardrobe, a table and a few chairs. The room was well but simply furnished. After Lenin's death a reporter came once, and took pictures of the house and the store, and above all of the room and the table in it. Afterwards it was said that this was the table on which the plan for the Russian Revolution was drawn. But that was not the table at all, for the table which at that time had been in Lenin's room, stands today in my living room.

CANBERRA COMMENT

Prepare For Federal Election!

CANBERRA, June 12.

THE Menzies government, at the time of writing, is floundering drunkenly towards a two-months' recess, not quite clear (as Deputy Labor Leader F. M. Forde observed in Parliament) "whether it is coming or going."

The "Sydney Morning Herald," leading U.A.P. organ, today described the situation as "intolerable."

And John Curtin, Leader of the Federal Labor Opposition, and probable Labor Prime Minister Designate, said:

"It is a long time since the Commonwealth Parliament witnessed such a pathetic attempt at government. The Labor Party alone has handled the business of the nation with clarity of outlook and steadfastness of purpose. It alone has presented a compactness which hallmarks it as being singularly capable of government in a sensible, consistent manner."

This statement should suggest that the Opposition does not suffer from an inferiority complex—that it has heard the vast majority of men and women throughout the Commonwealth crying out loud for a Labor government.

There is no doubt where the people stand. Election after election, despite the mediocre material put forward as (and by) official Labor candidates in various electorates, the people have voted solidly for Labor in State and Federal spheres.

A main obstacle to final victory in the race to the Treasury benches has been the timidity and/or the insufferable complacency of certain politicians; and if Curtin's latest statement means an end to some of this, Australia can rejoice.

The present minority government, ushered in with an almost unprecedentedly good press a couple of months ago, is already divided and discredited, and ready for the scrap-heap or electoral melting pot.

Including the Speaker, the United Australia Party has only 26 of the 74 Members of the House of Representatives. Moreover the U.A.P. is split inside and outside the Cabinet. No love is lost between Prime Minister R. G. Menzies and his veteran deputy, Attorney-General W. M. Hughes, who has been in Federal Parliament since its inception in 1901, and in the Cabinet on and off since 1904, and who feels keenly his narrow failure to seize the helm again.

Influential U.A.P. and Country Party private Members, including ex-Ministers, make little secret of their bitter feelings against newcomers in the Cabinet. Colone! White and ambitious future Fuehrers like ex-P.M.G. Cameron delight in asking conscriptionist government leaders (such as Menzies, Sir Henry Gullett, Casey, Fairbairn, etc.) when they intend to honor

their promise to introduce compulsion (usually at moments when the government is trying to persuade a suspicious Opposition that no compulsion has ever been thought of).

Menzies himself is an impressive if not popular personality, and an effective speaker on any destructive theme, and has enormous vested interests behind him. But, so far in his career, he has shown little constructive ability, and it is doubtful if he is capable of it under any democratic form of government. He feels this is possible only with dictatorial powers.

He tactfully avoided Parliament while the National Register Bill was being gagged and guillotined through the House of Representatives, leaving it to the Minister for Defence, Brigadier Street, who is being spoken of as a future Prime Minister.

Bitter hatred (there is no milder word for it) exists between the Prime Minister and the party which some months ago he announced he would discipline if he got the chance—Sir Earle Page's so-called Country Party, a motley collection of 15 near-liberals, non-liberals, reactionaries, crusted reactionaries and worse, with a dangerous political maniac like Cameron thrown in for good measure.

On the Opposition side sits the Labor Party, largest party in the House, with 31 Members from six States voting always as a united body, with fairly general support

from one or two independent breakaways from the Country Party.

With all its faults—and they are many—the Opposition keeps its feet somewhere near the solid rock of the trade union movement, and to that extent reflects the mood of the people. The Labor Party appears not as a Socialist party but rather as the most hopeful expression in Parliament of militant Australian democracy.

A year or so ago, there were prominent Labor Members who in private conversation seemed almost to glory in the belief that Labor would never again win enough seats to take over the government of the Commonwealth, and who were resigned to accept their £1000 a year pittance as His Majesty's loyal and more or less permanent Opposition.

Today, there is nobody of any party who would dare to suggest that Labor in any general election, from now on, has not an excellent chance of coming back with a solid majority.

There are, in fact, about 20 more Federal seats that can be won for Labor—most of them certain to be won if the A.L.P. in all States were to go forward with (for example) the same drive that brought the hitherto underestimated New Zealand Labor Party to power four years ago.

In addition to the new blood expected from the advance of the Heffron A.L.P. in New South Wales, there is already ample talent

in Federal Parliament to make a worthwhile and highly successful Commonwealth Cabinet — given militant leadership and an honest interpretation of the Federal A.L.P. platform (which at present has its weaknesses exploited and distorted by the Langsters).

Friendly critics at Canberra — seasoned journalists, leaders in the public service, in the armed forces, etc.—are almost unanimous that Labor would sweep the country if it showed more of that quality expressively known as “guts.”

Labor should prepare at full blast for a general election, and not shirk any challenge by the government. If Labor is caught unprepared in a whirlwind campaign, the trade unions will be entitled to place certain political leaders in the dock and the discard.

Much is made of Labor's narrow minority in the Senate, where the party has “only” 16 Senators against 20 of the U.A.P. and Country Party combined. The next Senate elections, out of which Labor should emerge with a substantial majority, are at least a year away. But if the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party cannot carry on with 16 Senators for the interim period, it is not worthy of the name of Labor. Present Opposition Leader, septuagenarian Senator Collings, for three years put up a good fight against

the government with only one or two followers in the “Upper House.”

Not should it be forgotten that, given a chance, the Menzies government if allowed to consolidate its position, will undoubtedly gerrymander the Senate electoral system to kill Labor's majority before it is born.

One final tremendous argument in favor of preparing for an early election. In Britain, a general election is expected round about October. Labor's victory in New Zealand and has had an enormously stimulating effect on the rank and file, but it has not dispelled all the defeatism of certain poltroons and traitors who wield big influence over the British Labor Party.

A Labor victory in the Commonwealth of Australia, a country almost as vast as Europe, would demonstrate to the whole world what Labor can do when it shakes off the millstones from around its neck.

It would be a great step towards assisting Labor or a progressive Labor-Liberal coalition to office in the key country of the world, ousting Chamberlain, the chief aide and abettor of Hitler, and changing the whole trend of world affairs in favor of peace and democracy.

—JOHN FISHER

TROTSKYITES AND LABOR

J. D. Blake

THE drive for the People's Front and for the establishment of unity in the ranks of the Labor movement requires a consistent struggle against the Trotskyites who act as the agents of fascism by their disruptive and splitting work in the Labor movement.

There are still many people who look upon the Trotskyites as some kind of legitimate political trend in the workers' movement and there are even some Communists who, although unconsciously, approach this question in much the same way.

Any doubts about the role played by the Trotskyites should have been completely dispelled by the evidence brought forward at the trial of the “Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites” in Moscow during March of last year. In his final speech at this trial State prosecutor Vyshinsky drew conclusions about the trial in a very apt statement:—

“The historic significance of this trial consists before all in the fact that at this trial it has been shown, proved and established with exceptional scrupulousness and exactitude that the Rights, Trotskyites, Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Bourgeois Nationalists and so on and so forth, are nothing other than a gang of murderers, spies, diversionists and wreckers, without any principles or ideals.”

A little later in his speech prosecutor Vyshinsky said:—

“The Trotskyites and Bukharinites, that is to say, the ‘Bloc of the Rights and Trotskyites,’ the leading lights of which are now in the prisoners' dock, is not a political party, a political tendency, but a band of felonious criminals, and not simply felonious criminals, but of criminals who have sold themselves to enemy intelligence services, criminals whom even ordinary felons treat as the basest, the lowest, the most contemptible, the most depraved of the depraved.”

In the struggle against the Trotskyites in the Australian Labor movement the first thing which must be borne in mind is the well established fact that Trotskyism is not a political trend in the Labor movement.

The revelations during the trial of March last year established beyond all doubt that Trotsky was already an agent of the British intelligence service in 1921, and that Bukharin helped to organise the attempt to assassinate Lenin which was carried out by the Socialist-Revolutionary Kaplin as far back as 1918.

These facts take us far enough back into history to warrant us looking upon Trotskyism as always having been an agency of the enemy in the working-class movement — that is what it has always been and that is the role it plays in every part of the world today.

In Spain it was these Trotskyite

agents of fascism who stabbed the Spanish people in the back while the republican soldiers were fighting heroically at the front against the fascist interventionary military forces. In China the Trotskyites have been the main corps of paid spies in the service of the Japanese militarists.

In Australia also we have had some bad experiences of harmful effects of these disruptive enemy elements both inside the Communist Party and in the Labor movement as a whole. Such Trotskyite nests as that led by Jackson (Lovegrove) in the Victorian organisation of the party until it was rooted out in 1932 did much damage to our party and the whole Labor movement.

The majority of the present members of our party joined our ranks after the main nests of the Trotskyites had been exposed and driven out of the party; because of this it is necessary to point to the methods used by these enemy agents to disrupt the work of the party. It was the practice of these elements at that time to develop the most sectarian and narrow ways of working as part of the process of attempting to strangle all real activity among the masses of working people; they replaced inner-party democracy by the bureaucratic commands of a small group of enemy agents, and tried to conceal their disruption and sabotage of party work by making noisy charges of bureaucracy against the central committee of the party; they followed the practice of using every kind of slander against the central committee and its mem-

bers in order to develop anti-party and anti-leadership moods among the party members; at the same time attempting to cover up their own wrecking and disruptive activities.

These Trotskyite agents of the enemy were driven out of the ranks of our party, but the experience gained in the struggle against them needs to be used far more than hitherto for the cultivation of greater vigilance in the struggle against Trotskyites who try to worm their way into the ranks of our party; it is especially necessary to make these experiences from our party history known to the thousands of new members who joined the ranks of the party since the time when the main nests of Trotskyites were exposed and driven out.

It would be foolish and dangerous for us at the present moment, when the struggle against reaction and fascism is sharpening in every way, to believe that the Communist Party will be immune from efforts at penetration by disruptive Trotskyite elements. It should go without saying that as the struggle between progressive and reactionary forces becomes sharper the enemy will strain every effort to send as many of his agents into the ranks of our party as possible. We must expect that this is being done and that it will continue to be done while there is still a conflict and struggle between classes.

But it is also obvious that these elements could not get into our party, nor could they remain in it, by openly taking up a Trotskyite posi-

tion on matters of policy. Because they have no ideals or policy which appeal to the masses they play the role of double dealers; they use the methods of disguise and camouflage and as a rule do not parade themselves as Trotskyites; they try to hide their face by all kinds of trickery while doing everything possible to stimulate disruption from under cover.

These enemy elements, who act as spies and disruptors, cannot afford to show their real face either to the party membership or to the masses; to provide a mask for their disruptive wrecking activities they must give the impression that they are supporters of progressive policy; they do not form a political trend in the labor movement but they must make use of what appears to be a kind of political line as a screen from behind which they can organise disruption and wrecking which constitute their main aims in the working-class movement.

How do these enemies carry on their work? They try to create doubts, hesitations and confusion about the correctness of the policy of the party, about happenings in the Soviet Union and other matters; they will play possum and lie very quiet for a long time until they feel that the ideal time has come to strike a blow at the Communist Party and the whole labor movement; their practice is to try to provoke others to do the dirty work for them; in the words of an old couplet:—

“Damn with faint praise, assent

with civil leer; and without sneering, others teach to sneer.”

Because of the double-dealing methods of the Trotskyites it is essential to keep in mind that any struggle against them, to be successful, must be a political struggle. Sectarian ways of working, since weakness in educational work provides a basis for Trotskyites to work upon; any narrowness in work and leadership in the party will be seized upon by these enemies for their own disruptive purposes.

Failure to understand these important questions would be extremely dangerous for us and such a failure would cost us very dearly. The first condition for a successful struggle against Trotskyism is the whole-hearted application of the party policy in the life and struggles of the masses. Without real political capacity and leadership in all party committees and branches we cannot guarantee a successful struggle against Trotskyism.

The replacement of all formal, routine methods of leadership by political leadership, that is politically convincing the entire party membership on all aspects of party policy, is an essential condition for a successful struggle against Trotskyism. The vigilance we need to develop among party members is a live political vigilance capable of identifying Trotskyism in all its disguises; this requires that the whole membership be convinced on the policy of the party; that they understand this policy and know how to apply it in practice.

Only political education and struggle gives us the guarantee that in fighting against Trotskyists we will not drive genuine but confused workers out of the movement. So soon as the main issues of policy become clear to the membership it is far more easy to separate the wheat from the chaff, or honest workers who through former lack of knowledge have become a prey to Trotskyite elements—from the Trotskyite agents of fascism themselves. With a majority of party members able to think independently for themselves the double-dealing practices of Trotskyites will be far more quickly exposed and these enemies driven out of the party and out of the labor movement.

Wherever in the party there develops any prolonged stagnancy and disruption; wherever we find a party organisation which refuses consistently to develop mass work on the lines of party policy, it is necessary to dig right down very deeply to root out the concealed Trotskyite who is often as not the cause of the whole trouble. Always correct politics must be our guide in such efforts; where there is absence of politics; where routinism and immersion in detail is present, there Trotskyite elements find the best ground for their disruptive work, because under such conditions they are able to hide their real face. Reveal the political face of all members and the biggest step has been taken towards exposing and rooting out Trotskyite agents of reaction and fascism.

We have to start from the assumption that such agents are working in some places in our party. We know that they are carrying on their disruptive splitting work in some trade unions and in certain sections of the Labor Party. In addition to cultivation of vigilance in the struggle against Trotskyites in the Communist Party there is a great need to extend that vigilant spirit throughout the whole of the working-class movement so that a Trotskyite will only have to show his face to be immediately thrown out and isolated from the movement.

Some of the Trotskyite poison which our party ejected from its ranks has since been absorbed by the Labor Party, more especially in Victoria. These Trotskyites have become the centre of splitting and disruption in those sections of the Labor Party into which they have been able to worm their way, and when we urge a struggle to drive these enemy agents out of the Labor Party we are concerned above all that the Labor Party should not suffer all the ill-effects of the disruptive work of these wreckers which we know from our own experience of the role they played at one time in the Communist Party.

Clearing the Trotskyite rubbish out of the labor movement is a measure which is essential for the establishment of unity; it is essential for the establishment of the People's Front; it is essential if we are to prepare a successful struggle for Socialism in Australia.

CONCISE HISTORY OF BOLSHEVISM

E. Yaroslavsky

(Continued From Last Issue)

In actual fact, the working classes under the leadership of the Party proceeded from purely industrial strikes of the nineties to the political strikes and demonstrations of 1900. In the short period from January, 1905, until December of the same year the Russian working class progressed from the "Revolt on the Knees" of January 9, 1905,* passed through the political General Strike in October and the mutiny on the battle-cruiser "Potemkin" and in other sections of the army and fleet to the armed rising in December. The rising was crushed because a considerable section of the peasants still put their faith in the Tsar and because a section of the soldiers and sailors allowed themselves to be used to crush down the rising of the workers and of the consciously revolutionary section of the peasants by force of arms. The Revolution of 1905 suffered defeat because the working classes were not united within their own ranks. A section of the workers still followed the Mensheviks, an important section of the peasantry still followed the Narodniks and the Social Revolutionaries.

Then there began a period of the worst reaction for the revolutionary

movement. Thousands were executed, fell at the hands of Tsarist executioners and punitive expeditions and were tortured to death in Siberian prisons. The Bolshevik Party which before had led the attack of the working class, now led its retreat also. The Party taught the working class to work and fight under the hardest circumstances of reaction and, side by side with illegal activity to make full use for their organisations of tiniest legal possibilities for agitation and propaganda.

The Bolshevik Party, under these difficult conditions, understood how to maintain the framework of its cadres, to tighten up its organisation at the Prague Party Conference of 1912, to set up a Bolshevik Central Committee and to break off all formal relations still existing with the Mensheviks.

The Bolshevik Party led the revolutionary movement in the years of the imperialist war since it alone in Russia, and nearly alone in the Second International, held high the banner of Internationalism with honor and revolutionary zeal. It alone did not fall to the chauvinist intoxication but stood by the banner of revo-

* "Bloody Sunday," when the tremendous demonstrations, headed by Father Gapon, gathered in St. Petersburg to present a "humble petition" to the Tsar, were shot down and dispersed by the troops.

lutionary Marxism and Leninism, the banner of the Communist International. In blood and fire, amid the raging of the imperialist war of 1914-1918, the Bolshevik Party sent out its call to arms away over trenches and barbed wire entanglements to the workers and soldiers of the various nations and called on them to fraternise and turn their weapons against their own bourgeoisie.

The Bolshevik Party knew how to prepare the mass of the people, the soldiers and peasants for the downfall of Tsardom.

From the beginning of the struggle it made fast the alliance between workers and peasants and this alliance proved itself strong enough to overthrow Tsardom which in its day was the strongest citadel of European and international reaction.

After the downfall of Tsardom the Russian Revolution covered in the short time between February and October, 1917, a whole period of world history.

When the Bolshevik Party emerged from its illegal existence it numbered in the whole country hardly forty or fifty thousand members.

In October it had already a quarter of a million members, it led the Socialist Proletarian Revolution to victory. In order to achieve that, it had to unmask the liberal bourgeoisie (the Cadets), the treacherous policy of compromise of the Mensheviks and of the Social Revolutionaries and also the traitors in its own midst. It had to withdraw from the influ-

ence of the Parties of compromise those workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors who still believed them; it had to educate the masses politically, unite them and arm them for the October rising; it had to win authority—for the Socialist October Revolution was victorious under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party *alone in opposition* to all other Parties—fighting against all other parties.

This victory was possible chiefly because the working class possessed a Party of Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism, tried out in two revolutions. In the two bourgeois-democratic Revolutions of 1905 and of February to March, 1917, the masses had seen *all Parties and all classes* in action. They were convinced in practice that only the Bolshevik Party kept faith with the Revolution and the People.

* * *

How was the Bolshevik Party able to win such authority? To what circumstances did the Bolshevik Party owe its victory over so many foes? What compass guided this Party at the most difficult times and in the most complicated situations of the struggle? What gave it the strength and assurance of victory and the ability to see its way clearly among the most complicated conditions of the struggle for the victory of the Revolution and for the construction of Socialist society?

This strength and security was given to the Bolshevik Party by the revolutionary teaching of Marx and Engels, extended and increased under new circumstances, under the cir-

cumstances of Imperialism, of the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution by Lenin and Stalin.

"And the correctness of this—and only this—revolutionary theory has been proved not only by the experience of all countries during the entire nineteenth century but particularly by the experience of the wanderings and vacillations, the mistakes and disappointments of revolutionary thought in Russia. For almost half a century—approximately between the 'forties and 'nineties of last century—advanced thinkers in Russia under the oppression of an unprecedented, savage and reactionary Tsarism, sought eagerly for the correct revolutionary theory, following each and every "last word" in Europe and America in this sphere with astonishing diligence and thoroughness. Russia achieved Marxism, as the only correct revolutionary theory, virtually through suffering, by half a century of unprecedented torments and sacrifice, of unprecedented revolutionary heroism, incredible energy, painstaking search and study, testing in practice, disappointments, checking and comparison with European (experience). Thanks to the emigration enforced by Tsarism, revolutionary Russia, in the second half of the nineteenth century, possessed such a wealth of international connections and such excellent information about world forms and theories of the revolutionary movement as no other country in the world possessed." ("Left Wing Communism," p. 11.)

This unerring compass, the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, also guided the Party to the Socialist Revolution. It led the young country of the Soviets, the first Socialist State in the world through the fire and hardship of civil war to victory over the Russian Counter-Revolution and the intervention of international capital. The revolutionary doctrine of Marxism-Leninism proved itself to be the sharpest weapon in the struggle of the masses against all foes of the Revolution, against the great landowners, capitalists, kulaks, wreckers,

spies, against all hirelings of the surrounding capitalist countries, in the revolutionary struggle in which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) became great, strong and steeled.

Led by this revolutionary theory the Soviet people was able to break the Imperialist blockade, to put an end to the war, to restore the backward and shattered industry of Russia destroyed by Imperialist and civil war and to convert it into a highly developed Socialist industry. Thanks to this revolutionary theory the Soviet Union became a strong fortress of the Proletarian Revolution, a land of flourishing Socialist agriculture, of mighty industry, of high socialist culture of the masses, of continually rising material, political and cultural standards of the working people.

Led by the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, this Party knew how to create a great brotherhood of Nationalities in this land of many nations in which the Tsarist government incited one nation against another, in which Great-Russian Chauvinism and the nationalism of the oppressed nations flourished abundantly. The Bolshevik Party gave an example of how the nationalist question is to be solved, how equal conditions of development for all nations are introduced in order that their culture, Socialist in content and nationalist in form may grow.

The Bolshevik Party has trained admirable cadres of technicians, engineers and Stakhanovites who pro-

duced new averages of productivity and developed new forms of labor discipline. In this way it has shown the superiority of the Socialist over the Capitalist State systems.

Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin and Stalin, the heroic Red Army was created, the armed guardian of the Proletarian Revolution, the army which defends only the interests of the working people.

In this way the Bolshevik Party proved the correctness of the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism which formed the granite theoretical foundation on which the Party arose, grew and became consolidated.

In the article, "Three sources and three components of Marxism," Lenin wrote:

"The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true. It is complete and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world conception which is irreconcilable with any form of superstition, reaction or defence of bourgeois oppression. It is the legitimate successor of the best that was created by humanity in the nineteenth century in the shape of German philosophy, English political economy and French Socialism." ("Marx, Engels, Marxism," Lenin, p. 68, Moscow edition.)

This teaching was expanded and developed by Lenin, Stalin and their pupils.

"It may be said without fear of exaggeration that since the death of Engels the great theoretician Lenin, and after Lenin, Stalin and the other disciples of Lenin have been the only Marxists who have advanced the Marxist theory and who have enriched it with new experience in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat." ("Short History.")

It is the peculiar good fortune of the proletarian movement that the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism has

become the doctrine of the advanced working class of *all countries*, that thanks to the activity of the Bolshevik Party the great international union of the proletariat of *the whole world* has been made—the Communist International.

No persecutions of Communists, however cruel they may be, however serious may be their consequences for one or another Communist Party on many an occasion, can halt the victorious Communist Movement. The history of the C.P.S.U. (B.) is a rich source of strength for the Workers' Parties of all countries. It does not only derive experience from three revolutions—the bourgeois-democratic Revolution of 1905, the February Revolution of 1917 and the Socialist October Revolution of 1917:

"The history of the C.P.S.U. (B.) is the history of the overthrow of Tsardom, of the overthrow of the power of the landlords and capitalists; it is the history of the rout of the armed foreign intervention during the Civil War; it is the history of the building of the Soviet state and of the Socialist society in our country." ("Short History.")

None the less, the history of the C.P.S.U. (B.) is also united with the greatest international experience. The three fundamental features of the struggle of the working class—political, industrial and theoretical—were put to the most thorough test in the course of our Party's history. All forms of the mass movement experienced an equally thorough test, from strikes and demonstrations to armed rising, from the activity of illegal organisations to the creative construction of Socialist society.

(Continued Next Issue)

NEW BOOKS OF INTEREST

Reminiscence Of A Rebel

"ERNE" Lane, by publishing his memoirs, has made a valuable contribution to Australian working-class literature.

His reminiscences of half a century spent in close association with the Australian Labor movement make interesting and instructive reading.

Lane's connection with the movement dates back to the time when Labor was struggling for existence.

He, and other members of his family, played a big part in establishing the foundations of working-class organisation in this country.

He has seen the Labor movement in all its phases, witnessed its growth from struggling infancy into powerful maturity.

This fact alone makes the reading of his memoirs well worth while. One regrets, however, that, as stated in the preface, he had neither the records, data, nor inclination to make his book more of a history of the period.

At the same time one must agree that the "record is of interest as indicative of some of the unseen currents and shallows of the movement that have been responsible for much of the disaster and shipwrecks that have marked the track of the workers towards their goal."

In other words it represents a damning indictment of reformism,

a crushing exposure of opportunism and opportunist leaders who have abandoned the cause of labor to serve the master class.

Some of these people, like Hughes, openly deserted to the enemy, but there are others, as Lane relates, who remain within the ranks of labor, but who nevertheless serve the interests of the other side more faithfully than they do the cause of the workers.

The following incident will serve to illustrate the technique employed to bring about this end.

In 1925 the Queensland Arbitration Court reduced the basic wage from £4/5/0 to £3/15/-. There was a State-wide agitation by the unions for the Labor government to restore the cut by legislative enactment.

The government shirked its responsibilities by declaring that wages were fixed by the Court and it was outside the jurisdiction of Parliament to interfere.

This aroused such a storm of protest that the Queensland Central Executive of the Labor Party was forced to deal with the question at a special meeting.

All the union representatives on the Q.C.E., and they were in a majority, were instructed by their organisations to insist on a restoration. But the Labor Ministers headed by Theodore and McCor-

mack came to the meeting armed to the teeth with statistics and arguments to prove that if the workers' claims were granted it would lead to the bankruptcy of Queensland, the ruination of industry and mass unemployment.

The politicians, by their unscrupulous distortion of the true position, and by their brow-beating tactics, were able to swing all but seven members of the Q.C.E. against restoration.

The sequel was written a few weeks later when the railway workers throughout the State went on strike for the restoration of the basic wage to £4/5/-. The strike was settled by the government (W. Gillies was now Premier) granting the restoration.

Needless to say there ensued none of the ruin, unemployment nor bankruptcy prophesied by the Labor politicians.

This particular incident is chosen for repetition because it so well characterises the attitude of the present-day Labor government in Queensland and seems to contain a moral.

Whilst not agreeing with Ernie Lane's designation of the Queensland Labor Party as a Fascist Party, there is no doubt that it far to the right and is leading the workers headlong to disaster.

Now, when unity is more needed than ever, the Labor movement in Queensland is being split asunder. The chief responsibility for this

rests on the shoulders of the Right-wing leaders.

The Forgan Smith government by giving priority to the interests of the capitalists over those of the workers and working farmers is alienating the sympathy and support of the masses for Labor, is fostering disunity and encouraging the growth of movements such as the Protestant Labor Party, and heading for a situation favorable to the triumph of reaction.

This policy is but a continuation of that which Ernie Lane reveals to have been so disastrous for Labor in the past. It has nothing in common with the real ideals and aspirations of the Labor movement.

These latter are to be found today embodied in the Communist Party.

"The Communists," writes Lane, "are destined to be in the near future the corner stone and foundation of the new building which will rise, Phoenix like, from the dead ashes of the futile past."

That, however, remains a matter of the future, no matter how near.

The thing of the moment is to establish unity in the struggle against capitalist reaction and this in turn means to intensify the fight against the agents of capitalism within the ranks of Labor.

—E.W.C.

"Dawn to Dusk—Reminiscences of a Rebel," by E. H. Lane (Jack Cade). Brisbane, 1939. Prices, 3/6 and 6/-.
iii.

MODERN PUBLISHERS PTY., LTD.

312 Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place,

Sydney

A Suggestion from Our Editor

Become a Subscriber to the "Communist Review," and thus insure regular and punctual delivery by post.

Fill in this form and return it to us with a remittance.

Please post me:

The Communist Review regularly for
12 months 6 months 3 months
(Strike out what is not required)

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months, 6/-; 6 months, 3/-
3 months, 1/6. Post Free.

I enclose.....

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

OBTAINABLE BY SUBSCRIBING TO
SOVIET PERIODICALS IN ENGLISH

Moscow News

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

Twenty-four pages.

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

Single copy 2d.

Sovietland

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

U.S.S.R. In Construction

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

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

International Literature

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

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

Combined annual subscription rates:

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

Orders to be placed with:

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

