

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Vol. 2

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

No. 6

FROM THE CONTENTS

A Review of the State Elections *L. Sharkey*

The Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet
Red Army *K. Radek*

Some Forerunners of the C.P. of A. *J. N. Rawling*

The Case for Industrial Unionism *S. Purdy*

The Moscow Conversations and the United
Front Against War and Fascism

JUNE ISSUE — SIXPENCE

THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

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

CONTENTS:

	Page
The Results of May Day (J.B. Miles)	1
The Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Red Army (K. Radek)	4
The Case for Industrial Unionism (S. Purdy)	11
Working-Class Unity or Collaboration with Capitalism (J. D. Blake)	20
Some Forerunners of the C.P. of A. (J. N. Rawling) ..	26
A Review of the State Elections (L. Sharkey)	37
British Policy After the Berlin Meeting (R. Palme Dutt)	46
The Increased Vote in Hartley (R. Cramm)	51
Hitler's War Policy and the Situation in Germany (reprint from "Inprocor")	55
The Moscow Conversations and the United Front Against War and Fascism (reprint from "Inprocor")	61

of 17 Annandale St. for the publisher, 18 Devonry, 168 MacEillane St., Sydney.
Printed at 15 Dixon St., Sydney, by R. W. Gray, clerk, and P. N. Wignall, printer.



The Communist Review

Vol. 2, No. 6

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

June, 1935

THE RESULTS OF MAY DAY

By J. B. MILES

The May Day demonstrations in Australia this year afford lessons of great importance for the Communist Party and class-conscious unionists.

The most successful demonstrations were held where militant trade unionism exercised a decisive influence. The greatest demonstrations were held in the mining areas of New South Wales. In the northern field—Newcastle, Cessnock, Kurri Kurri—the demand of the May Day committees that May First be proclaimed a public holiday had the support of the Miners' Federation, all the unions affiliated to the Newcastle Labor Council, and the Shop Committees in the area. In Lithgow (Western field) and on the South Coast, the pits did not work and successful demonstrations were held.

In these areas there was an absence of the conflict as to the date of the celebration, which marred the preparations in recent years. The controversy about the date has always reflected the struggle between the militants and the reformists, and consequently had a great influence on the character of the demonstrations and on the mass response.

In the coalfields of N.S.W. and in Newcastle the influence of the militant Miners' Union, allied to the growing militancy of the railway and metal industry unions, resulted in a united front in the preparations for May Day and at the demonstrations. Non-party trade unionists, Labor Party workers and members of the Communist Party worked together for a successful May Day, and on the platforms at the demonstrations speakers represented the committees, the unions, the unemployed councils, the Labor Party and the Communist Party.

The character of the demonstrations—the numbers who marched, the slogans carried and the content of the speeches—reflected the influence of militant unionism and the working-class united front.

The trade unions demanded restoration of wage-cuts and

shorter hours; the unemployed demanded trade union wages and conditions on relief jobs, double dole and a rent allowance; international working-class solidarity was portrayed on banners calling for defence of U.S.S.R., for Lenin's way to emancipation. Opposition to imperialist war and Fascism, demands for the release of Comrade Thaelmann and all imprisoned anti-Fascist fighters were prominently displayed in the processions. The special demands of women and the youth and for the children of our class were featured.

In these successful May Day demonstrations we see a result of the growth of the influence of the Communists in the Miners' Union and, in Newcastle especially, in other unions. Our members were the driving force in the preparations and our Party prestige was evident in the selection of speakers, but the success was also due to the ability shown by the Communists and militant unionists to work in a comradely way with all who desired a successful working-class demonstration.

In other centres there were demonstrations and meetings. The Wonthaggi miners maintained their reputation by taking a holiday to celebrate May Day.

The influence of the militant sugar workers' rank and file movement resulted in a better demonstration than in the past at Innisfail. Here (and in Melbourne) there was in evidence a form of class solidarity in the participation of groups of foreign-born workers, Italians, Greeks, and Jugoslavs. At Innisfail a torchlight procession ended in a public meeting addressed by representatives of unions, mill workers, the A.L.P. and the Communist Party.

Despite bad weather and—on their own admission—a low level of preparation, one thousand marched in the torchlight procession at Melbourne. Here we see again the need for our comrades in Melbourne to organise much better so as to take full advantage of the willingness of the Melbourne workers to respond to calls for working-class demonstration.

Where the influence of the reformists is being undermined (N.S.W. coalfields, Wonthaggi, Innisfail, and where Left Social-Fascism is weak (Victoria, Queensland), good demonstrations are held. These successes are also due to the activity of the Communists, the influence of militant unionism and the united front.

But in Sydney, where the influence of our party is growing (election results) and where militant unionism is also growing,

we find that reformist influence in the unions and the peculiar circumstances created by the date of the State elections, resulted in a comparatively poor May Day demonstration.

This year the Trades and Labor Council of Sydney showed an interest in May Day, and for several weeks debated about the date of the demonstration. It was evident that the Council executive had determined not to allow the May Day executive of the past year to organise a broad committee. In the circumstances, recognising that the Labor Council represents the great majority of unionists in the city, the militants endeavored to have the Council recognise May First and proposed lunch-hour factory gate meetings, a night procession and a central rally. This proposal was defeated and the majority decided on a procession and meeting on Sunday, May 5. Our Party and the militant unionists decided to assist to make the event on May 5 a successful industrial demonstration. The District Committee of the Party, while entering the united front for May 5, also decided to organise a May Day rally in a central hall on the night of May First.

Meantime the date of the elections was fixed and it was discovered that no permit would be granted to the Labor Council for a procession, because the Lang Party had secured one for its election procession. The Labor Council executive successfully evaded meeting the delegates and made no serious effort to obtain a permit. The influence of the Lang Party was strong enough to cause the reformist union officials to forget all they had said in favor of a Sunday as the best day to get a mass demonstration of class solidarity, and they also evaded proposals that they cooperate on the night of May First.

The importance of combining correctly work in the factories with work in the trade unions is sharply brought out by the Sydney May Day experience. The strength of the A.L.P. is in the unions, and our factory and other successes are handicapped and undermined by the reformist control of the majority of the trade unions.

Despite the reformist sabotage a meeting was held in Sydney on May First, at which representatives of the A.R.U., Seamen's and Pastoral Workers' unions, Shop Committees, Unemployed Councils, Communist Party and the Anti-War Councils spoke. During the day lunch-hour meetings were held at several factories.

May Day demonstrations depend not only on a good line of action and earnest endeavor by the Communists, but also upon the success of our day to day work in the factories and the unions to win the workers from reformist leadership to the united front of struggle against capitalism, to the policy of militant unionism. It would be a mistake to underestimate the strength of the reformists and their ability to exercise influence even where May Day was most successfully celebrated. Militant success causes these servants of capital to make desperate efforts to reassert their control or to sabotage the growing militancy of the workers.

Our successes as well as our failures demand from us greater efforts, stronger organisation, more knowledge, better contact with the masses, practical leadership of their struggles.

THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE SOVIET RED ARMY

By KARL RADEK (Moscow)

Colonel Bauer, chief of artillery at German staff headquarters, told me in 1920 that General Ludendorff was highly perplexed at our victories over the Whites.

It not only appeared incomprehensible to Ludendorff that the Bolsheviks—who had destroyed the discipline of the tsarist army—had succeeded in creating a disciplined Red Army, but also he could not understand whence we had obtained our leadership, which was obviously superior to that of the Whites, notwithstanding that the latter enjoyed, not only unlimited material support from the Entente, but also their strategical counsel. To this question—posed by the German commander-in-chief of the world war—bourgeois history to this day has found no answer. It is unable to make clear how people—who not only never attended a staff military college, but the majority of whom had never served in the army—were able to gain a victory over the cream of the tsarist generals, who moreover had the support of the powerful Entente which had but recently been victor over Germany.

Marxism provides an answer to this question, which even the bourgeois military historians would be able to give, in its essentials, were they only in a position to grasp the most important teaching of the most eminent of German military theoreticians, namely, Karl von Clausewitz. In his book "On War" he wrote as follows:—

"In order gloriously to terminate an entire war, or a campaign which constitutes a decisive part thereof, it is necessary to take into account internal public relationships. Here strategy and politics come together, and the commander-in-chief becomes also a statesman."

The statesmen of the Russian bourgeoisie and the Russian land-owning class lost the war because they had the decisive masses of the population against them. The defeated landowners and capitalists then raised the flag of civil war, in order to re-establish their rule. While preparing for a victory over the Bolsheviks, they were not even capable of undertaking steps to lead their own soldiers by the nose. One need only glance at the documents relating to the agrarian policy of Denikin, in order to realise how little the Whites had taken to heart the lessons of the October Revolution.

On the other side of the front of the raging civil war was the Central Committee of the Party under the leadership of Lenin, who had spent his whole life in the struggle for the liberation of the workers and peasants, and who was intimately connected with the masses.

The Civil War was only the continuation of the October Revolution: The relation of forces, which had decided the October victory, continued to work in favor of the military victory of the Bolsheviks over the Whites. However, this did not mechanically imply victory, for the part played by the military factor in the Civil War, which had commenced in 1918, was greater than the part it played in the October Revolution. But in the field of military action the Bolsheviks were new-comers.

The question, therefore, was as follows: Would the Bolsheviks understand how to carry on a war better than the White officer gang who were supported by the Entente as regards both material and military aid? Within a very short period the Bolsheviks had developed a whole array of brilliant military talent—such as Frunze, Voroshilov, Tukhachevski, Budyonny, Yegorov, Uborevich, Yakir, Chaparev, and hundreds of others. The Bolsheviks did not only bring forth a phalanx of iron

commanders who welded the army together, and led it to victory under conditions amidst which hitherto no army has ever conquered—the Bolsheviks also knew how to form a war staff which was incomparably superior to that of the Whites.

What happened behind the scenes at Red staff headquarters, how the decisions there were arrived at—all this has only become common knowledge among the masses during the recent years. During the Civil War itself, the difficulty of putting aside the regular commanders compelled a concealment of the actual situation. This meant that the leadership of the army was really in the hands of Lenin and his nearest colleague, Stalin.

What were the differences? What was the subject of disagreement? The answer to this question is also the answer to the question regarding the qualities of Stalin as a proletarian commander-in-chief. When one reads the well-known article by Comrade Voroshilov on "Stalin and the Red Army," and studies the historical records which have recently appeared in the press, it becomes clear that these differences are connected with the main current of the former, as well as of, later, differences of the Party with Trotskyism.

With a proletariat which was inexperienced in military matters, although steadfast, as its kernel, we created an army of peasants who had but recently returned from the world war, and who, by the witness of their own eyes, had been convinced that the soil had become their property. This peasant mass was longing to make use of this redeemed land, to begin cultivating it; and it was obvious that only an immediate danger, threatening their land, would give to them the will to fight and to win. In order to accomplish this, a mobilisation apparatus was needed—a training apparatus, an army apparatus. The number of workers who were experienced in the creation of such an apparatus was small. They had so far had no experience of a great military mechanism and its organisation. And the problem which confronted them was not merely that of the mobilisation and training of an army, but also that of the military leadership, which demanded great strategic, tactical and, in a word, technical knowledge.

Trotsky endeavoured to prove that the difference of opinion in this matter was that he was in favour of utilising the professional officers, while Stalin and Voroshilov—were opposed! However, one need only call to mind how Stalin organised the

army on the most dangerous sectors of the front—at Tsaritzin, at Perm; how Stalin did away with partisan methods, with the so-called "column" methods, as a foundation for the formation of an army, to realise how comic it is to accuse this iron centraliser of revolutionary forces of a tendency towards partisan methods. The truth of the matter is that Stalin, Voroshilov, and their colleagues carried on a ceaseless and inflexible struggle against Trotsky, who flooded the front with former staff officers, and not only did not trouble as to what was their attitude to the revolution, but also neglected to find out as to how they carried out their duties at the front. In fact, the general staff uniform impressed him tremendously. But Stalin represented the proletarian point of view with regard to the employment of professional soldiers; and that is: to keep them under the control of proletarian elements, while striving at the same time, as quickly as possible to facilitate the assimilation of military knowledge by cadres of proletarian leaders. Stalin set himself the task of developing proletarian army leaders, capable of leading millions, and he was able to accomplish this because he had the ability to distinguish between the utilisation of the cultural legacy of the bourgeoisie and submission to it.

Whoever desires to understand the part Stalin played as a leader in the Civil War—as well as he who seeks to understand the future conditions of our victories—must go deeply into the report of Stalin and Djerzhinski on the case of Perm, in 1918, and the telegram to Lenin regarding the situation on the Southern Front. Upon both these documents the genius of Stalin as an unsurpassed organiser is unmistakably imprinted. He explores the situation of the army, all the way from the position on the front down to the smallest detail of organisation. An army is a huge organism, and one can only proceed to the rehabilitation of a damaged army by investigating its provisioning, its organisation, the quality of its command, the efficiency of its personnel, its technical equipment, the relations of the army to the population—its contact with the population, the organisation of the toiling masses.

Stalin's strength was also made manifest in the central question of strategy: The choice of the direction in which the attack was to be aimed, and the carrying out of the plan of campaign. The differences with Trotsky on the question as to whether the attack against Denikin should be launched in the direction of the

Don District or of the Don River reflected the distinction between a concrete painstaking analysis of all social factors in the conditions making for victory—an analysis which is typical of Bolshevism—and the schematicism, the abstract decisions, of a bourgeois professional soldier, backed by a petty-bourgeois politician.

When Stalin came to Lenin with his plan, he had in view, not only the railway line, nor only the shortest stretch between two points. He had in mind the actual masses of the people and their social composition. In the direction of the Don District there was its proletarian population—in the direction of the Don River, its Cossack population. The consideration of the relation of these masses with the army constituted a decisive element in his strategic plan. For his strategy did not constitute an operation by an army which was alien to the masses, but by an army which was an integral part of the masses.

Lenin, great leader of the October Revolution, with his eagle glance from the Kremlin, grasped the whole strategic situation, and decided the question by the force of his Bolshevik genius. Stalin, who like Lenin, kept continually in mind the entirety of the military task, had brought forward on the front—far from Lenin—various plans which accorded with those of Lenin, and had at the same time settled a number of organisational and tactical questions, right on the spot, in the most perilous sections of the front.

Von Clausewitz, in his examination of the attributes of military genius, distinguishes spiritual attributes from what may be called attributes of character.

With regard to character, he says:—

"We are here considering, not courage in the face of physical danger, but **courage with regard to responsibility**, what one might term; in the face of moral danger. This type of courage is frequently termed **spiritual courage**, because its source is reason; nevertheless, it is an expression of character and not of reason. Rationality alone is by no means courage; the most rational man often breaks when it comes to a decision. . . . We term **decision the capacity to eliminate the qualms of doubt and the perils of vacillation, in a situation requiring action with inadequately determined factors.**"

Thus, the profoundest of military theorists has to some extent given us a definition of the fundamental, essential features out of which the military genius of Stalin was formed during the Civil

War. An unswerving loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism—principles tried in the fire of three revolutions; outstanding intelligence, embracing the totality of class relationships and the direction of their development; an iron will, based upon a profound sense of identity with the working class and a profound belief in their victory; determination in carrying out accepted decisions—such are the essential features which made of Stalin a great proletarian army chief.

Once the Civil War was over, Stalin devoted himself entirely to the building up of the Party and of Socialism. As a disciple of Lenin, he could never forget that the enemy could not refrain from measuring his strength again with ours, that he could not refrain from desiring to destroy what millions had created through their labour. For this reason, the Red Army remains in the centre of Stalin's attention. For this reason, concern for the Red Army occupies a prominent place in Stalin's work.

Once he has placed at the head of the Red Army the entire muster of leaders, trained by Lenin, he gives unflinching attention to the end that this core—which, in future, is to ensure the victories of the Red Army—develops continually. He demands of proletarian commanders, not that they rest upon the laurels won in the Civil War, but that they **learn more, and ever more learn.** High commanders, whose names are known throughout the world, he sends to the school bench. He sees to it that our Red Army is the best school for the **alliance of the peasantry with the proletariat.**

However outstanding the accomplishments of our Red Army, they are hardly likely to lull the proletarian commander-in-chief to sleep. He follows keenly the **development of bourgeois armies, the development of military technique.** Upon the basis of the rapid industrialisation of the country, he reconstitutes the technical basis of the Red Army. World capitalism is on the decline, yet it can show progress in the field of military technique. Aircraft, the production of poison gas, and the production of tanks—which began to play an important part only towards the end of the world war—have nowadays assumed a most important aspect. To place in the field an inadequately armed mass against modern military technique would be criminal madness. It would be criminal because these masses—the workers and peasants—are the basis of our power, and are our brothers. And it would be madness because a poorly-armed force, from the point of view of

the technique of modern warfare, is simply delivered up to annihilation.

We desist here from once again enumerating the details of the initiative which Comrade Stalin has taken in the reconstruction of the Red Army. Stalin's best comrade in the struggle, Voroshilov, spoke of this with deep devotion at the Seventeenth Party Congress. Here, we would present the general aspect of this question. The military theory of the bourgeoisie, as it has developed since the war, is full of contradictions. In the main, these theories proceed from the fact that since the October Revolution, the bourgeoisie dares not arm the masses. Another difficulty lies in the fact that to arm the masses according to the latest military technique would require a vast expenditure. Thus has arisen the tendency, in nearly all the capitalist countries to form small, highly-mechanised armies, equipped according to the latest technique. If, however, it comes to large-scale warfare, the bourgeoisie will have to venture on the risk of mobilising large armies. Faced by the danger of a new war, the bourgeoisie seeks to suppress all opposition in the country by fascist methods, and to utilise all industrial forces for the technical preparations for war. Therefore Stalin, when applying himself to the reorganisation of the Red Army, did not only take thought for the provision of a superior, modern, technical equipment; but also for the assurance of a high effective strength. Stalin's plan for the reorganisation of the Red Army and its armaments has as its basis the profoundly assimilated Marxist-Leninist theory in its relation to the approaching war. This is the basis not only of the general plan for reorganisation of the army, but also of the comparative strength of various classes of armaments, which, for the first time, will be available on a mass scale. It is the basis of the strategic plan against which all the designs of the enemy will be shattered.

The Soviet Union perceives the increasing danger of war, and makes every endeavour to avoid it. But we know that if the enemy attacks us we shall oppose him with a strength of which he has no conception. It will be the strength of organised Socialism, the strength of the collective farmer, the strength of the great Communist Party which knows that the happiness of the whole world depends upon its victory. It will be the strength of clear foresight, built upon Marxist-Leninist theory. It will be the strength of the inflexible execution of a pre-determined plan. It will be the strength which knows no doubt. The spokes-

man of this strength will be Lenin's best colleague in the struggle—the supreme field commander of the Civil War, who already then gave proof that he knew how to ensure victory; the chief reorganiser of the whole land and of the Red Army; the leader who, far-sighted, can see the essential outlines of future developments, as well as the iron lever of victory. Our whole country knows that he who knew how to organise conclusive victory over the internal enemy—he who, cool, determined, unwavering, organised the most complicated manœuvres as well as frontal attacks—would, in the case of an imperialist offensive, know how to ensure victory for the country, for the proletariat.

The Red Army is an army of peace, for the defence of the Socialist Fatherland, and therefore it has no need to conceal its strength. It is for this reason that the Seventeenth Party Congress welcomed Voroshilov so enthusiastically, when he openly rendered his report on the strength of the Red Army. For this reason the Seventh Congress of Soviets greeted Comrade Tukhachevski so warmly when he set forth the progress which the organisation of the Red Army had to show during the past year. The enemy endeavours to discover the number of tanks and bombing planes at our disposal. But he is incapable of estimating one of the greatest sources of our strength. That strength is the Revolution, which made Stalin into the first proletarian commander-in-chief—the Revolution which surrounded him with a brilliant muster of mass leaders to the great decisive struggle for the conclusive victory of Socialism.

THE CASE FOR INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

By S. PURDY

Industrial unionism has become a burning topic these days, caused and made necessary by the development of capitalism itself. Workers of different crafts are employed by the same master, therefore the necessity of their showing a common front is obvious, especially in a period such as this, when capitalism, far from granting reforms, is only able to improve its position at the expense of the living conditions of the masses. "The basic

line pursued by the capitalist class to overcome the crisis—that of passing the burdens on to the working class and small farmers—has already resulted in reducing living standards of the working class by 34 per cent.” (Fourth Plenum resolution, April, 1934).

This common front can be realised most effectively per medium of industrial unions—one union one industry. This is necessary in view of the fact that craft unionism has the effect of sectionalising the workers and thereby reducing their organised strength. Instead of, in the railways, for instance, having 49 craft unions, each endeavoring to gain improvements for its members from the common employer (the State, per medium of the Railway Commissioner), a railways industrial union would mean that the railway employees would present a compact body when making their demands—the railmen in one voice facing the one employer, instead of, at present, in 49 voices.

With the shop committee as the basic organ of such a union, uniting and organising the men right on the job, causing a mass activation of the union membership, lifting their level of class consciousness, and ensuring democratic control of the union's affairs, what reasoning person with working-class interests at heart could do anything but decide in favor of industrial unionism? And it is for this very reason that the members of the various craft unions are in ever larger numbers deciding in this manner.

But industrial unionism does not come overnight, nor does it drop from the clouds—it has to be organised and fought for. The first steps necessary are to strengthen the craft unions by injecting into them a militant trade union policy—by bringing about the amalgamation of the various craft unions, even if it is done only two at a time. In this process the shop committees, already existing and growing stronger, wielding an authoritative influence over rail workers, play an important and decisive part. Even at this stage, with the 49 craft unions in existence, the shop committees have been able to win many concessions. It is also a fact that the A.R.U., the strongest railway union, developing a militant policy, was able to win the 44-hour week.

It is such proposals as these that people opposing industrial unionism must answer to justify their case. This they cannot do, and are therefore forced to misrepresentation in an endeavor

to stop the swing in its favor. A classic example of this is the leading article in the “Locomotive Journal” (official organ of the A.F.U.L.E.), dated February 28, 1935. It endeavors to cause confusion, mislead; and answers nothing. It would have A.F.U.L.E. members believe that industrial unionism means a levelling down of conditions, and because they are amongst the most highly paid, and in a minority, their conditions would be lowered. What nonsense! Already the shop committees have been successful in winning job improvements for the various crafts, irrespective of whether relatively high or low wages were paid, because of the unity expressed in the shop committees; and with the higher form of organisational unity per medium of an industrial union, and the tremendously increased strength accruing from same, the only result possible would be improved conditions all round—higher wages for all.

Argument in favor of arbitration is also sponsored. Does the writer conveniently forget the ruthless attacks on wages by the Arbitration Courts during the six years of crisis? Does he forget the basic wage reduction of 12/6 made by the N.S.W. Arbitration Court in August, 1932? Is he unaware of the many conditions won and maintained by the mine-workers, due to their reliance on organised strength and direct negotiation? What of the recent victories of different sections of our class, victories gained, not by arbitration, but by organisation, agitation, demonstration, and, when necessary and advisable, strike action? The five-months' Wonthaggi struggle against victimisation and for the right to strengthen the union organisationally—the winning by the Wonthaggi miners of the £8000 previously denied them—the rubber workers' strike at Goodyear's, when the principle of seniority was maintained, previously eliminated from the award by the Arbitration Court—the concessions won by the Teachers' Federation—the winning of the 44-hour week by the A.R.U. in N.S.W. (Judge Drake-Brockman said he “intervened because of the unrest and threat of strike action amongst the employees in the service”)—the recent success of the Melbourne relief workers, who gained a thirty-three and one-third per cent. increase in wages—these comparisons effectively answer the feeble attempt to build a case for arbitration.

Relying on craft prejudices, the article aims at keeping the railmen divided by inferring that there are ulterior motives behind the proposed amalgamation—that the other sections cannot struggle without the A.F.U.L.E. men, and draws an

analogy between the Miners' Federation and the F.E.D. and F.A. Well, Mr. Craft Unionist, the miners have, on many occasions, struggled successfully without the F.E.D. and F.A. So your attempted analogy is proven false by working-class history itself. True it is that the A.R.U. members would be strengthened by amalgamation with A.F.U.L.E. members, but this would be the case with A.F.U.L.E. members also. It is also noteworthy that the closer unity which you abhor is being achieved between the Miners' Federation and F.E.D. and F.A., as per the recently signed agreement by the executives of both unions on behalf of their respective organisations.

The crowning stupidity is the statement that "the boss wants one big union" (meaning industrial unionism), at the very moment when the Railway Commissioner is attempting to restrict the activities of the shop committees—when trade unionists everywhere, and the official trade union movement also, are actively resisting the Commissioner's ban. The Railway Commissioner and the Government recognise that closer unity and strengthened trade union organisation is a barrier against further wage-cuts and worsened conditions generally. The trade union movement recognises the attack on the shop committees as an attack on the union movement generally. Surely a peculiar way for the boss to express his wish for closer unity within the trade union movement! A most remarkable stand for the A.F.U.L.E. leadership to take right at the very moment when trade unionists elsewhere are in the midst of a fight to maintain that degree of closer unity already accomplished!

In the course of writing this article, I glanced through the Davidson Coal Commission report, and it seemed that part of it was used as a basis for the article in the "Locomotive Journal." In fact, parts of the latter read almost word for word. What is known as the Davidson Coal Commission report was submitted by Mr. Justice C. G. W. Davidson, H. W. Gepp, Esq. (of late Bread Commission fame), and Dr. L. K. Ward, at the behest of the Bavin Government, in 1930. Neither the members of the commission nor the Bavin Government were noted for sympathy to the workers. The aim of the commission and report was to "bring about a better situation in the coal industry" (for the coal barons), and this process was going to be achieved by attacks on the miners' conditions and their industrial organisation. The members of the Coal Commission and the "Locomotive Journal" speak with a united voice.

Our opponent of industrial unionism quotes in an abstract manner the failure of the "only industrial union ever formed in Australia" to prove his case, and refers to an abortive attempt to establish an industrial union in Newcastle in 1923. Nothing ever came of it. However, the opponents of industrial unionism are so bankrupt that they will grasp at even nothing in order to try to justify their threadbare position.

However, despite all the raving against industrial unionism, concessions are made to it. The "Locomotive Journal" is forced, due to increasing support for militant unionism by A.F.U.L.E. members, to raise the bogey that "reactionaries may get control of the industrial union." We are living in a period when reformist leadership is being supplanted by militant. When industrial unionism is an accomplished fact, it will be due to the efforts of militant leadership and mass support for the latter. It is hardly likely that in such a situation the trade unionists will allow people into the leadership of their industrial unions who have spent a lifetime fighting them. No, Mr. Writer for the "Locomotive Journal"! Craft unionism—reformism in general—is surely giving way to the militant tendency, and it is not likely that the reactionaries will get control of the stronger organisations which the unionists, under militant leadership, build. It is not likely that even yourself, whoever you are, will be in the running. Narrow, reactionary, reformist craft union leaders will be at a low price then.

The drive for unity is not only expressed here in Australia, but is an international phenomenon. In France the members of the Red and reformist unions are coming together, and so strong is the movement from below that in some instances the reformist leaders have been forced to come to unity agreements. Further, the R.I.L.U. has approached the reformist trade union international, in addition to individual reformist unions in the European countries, proposing to them a basis of unity. These proposals are being received favorably by the masses, and the perspective for the future is not only unity in action but also organisational unity.

After dealing with all the "horrors" of industrial unionism, our "Locomotive" friend then raises a number of political questions arising out of his attempt to give Parliament his blessing and prove its "supreme value" to the mass of trade unionists. "Only through Parliament under the present system will you get substantial and uniform reforms for the masses. Only in the political [should read Parliamentary] field can you fight now to

gain control." Before dealing with these words of "wisdom," is not out of place to ask our craft unionist and Parliamentarian to be consistent. If Parliament is all-powerful, as he contends why spend time defending craft as against industrial unions? Why not advocate the elimination of unions altogether and concentrate all efforts on the "all-powerful" Parliament? Surely our "friend" doesn't honestly believe this. We have had years of Labor Government (which he places so much reliance on) and where are the workers to-day? He must remember the last Federal Labor Government, the regime of the last Lang Government in N.S.W., and their attacks on wages and living standards generally. Is he not aware that the present Forgan Smith Labor Government in Queensland and the present Labor Government in West Australia have failed to maintain conditions, but, on the contrary, have operated the Premiers' Plan in its attack on the masses? Does he not remember how the ruling class of N.S.W. and England, through Governor Game, dismissed the last Lang Government from office when it suited them—dismissed from the same Parliament which is "all-powerful" to the workers? Even the great mass of trade unionists recognise the limitations of Parliament, even though many of them still support the "lesser evil" theory. Is our "Locomotive" writer so naive as to believe otherwise? Has he refused to learn any lessons from life itself? Further, the events in Europe, of Germany, Austria, etc., have taught us that reliance on Parliament leads, not to improvements for the masses, but to Fascism. Have all these events passed our "Locomotive" writer by? His attempts to intimidate his A.F.U.L.E. members with the threat of the Crimes Act, etc., condemn his own proposals and reflect his cowardly attitude. Has not the Crimes Act been law during the regime of both U.A.P. and Labor Governments? It is clear that trade union opposition to same can only be effective by mass organisation and active opposition. Reliance on Parliament spells defeat.

"Your industrial might is as strong as your stomachs. You can be starved back to work."

What an outlook of defeat, despair and cowardice. No one would imagine that the class struggle can be pursued without hardship and sacrifice—that the workers will suffer defeats as well as victories. But there is no need to mention the numerous instances when the workers have not been starved back to work, but have conducted their struggles to victory. But if the toilers accept the advice of the "Locomotive Journal"—if they remain

passive and show no signs of active opposition, they surely will starve. The most backward unionist recognises the fear of opposition of the employers and their Governments, and that if they were sure that opposition would not be forthcoming, attacks on wages, etc., would be speeded up for the benefit of profits.

"Only treachery will defeat you on the political (means parliamentary) field. Guard against the seduction of your political representatives by Tammany union bosses; let Labor see that its original basis of organisation—the political (means parliamentary) branch—is preserved and time will do the rest."

Let us briefly analyse these statements of "Locomotive." The labor movement's original basis of organisation was the trade unions, not vice versa as stated above. The political Labor party was born out of the trade unions and the fierce class battles conducted at the end of the last century. It was intended that the Labor Party serve the interests of the trade unions, but the process which has developed is that Parliamentarianism has become dominant, subjecting the trade unions to the Parliamentary policy and not vice versa, as intended. However, a pleasing awakening is taking place and the labor politicians are finding it more difficult to subject the unions to their reformist domination.

It is not a question, as stated by "Locomotive," of union bosses seducing the politician. With the rise of Parliamentarianism the politician became dominant, so that when the Parliamentarian wing cracks the whip, the industrial wing is expected to fall into line. It is a question of guarding against honest elements in the trade union movement being corrupted by the politicians. Further, when trade union leaders refuse to become corrupted and subservient to the reformist Parliamentarian policy of the labor politicians, they meet with the most vile abuse and slander from the official Labor Party leadership. The last miners' elections were a classic example. Here, Lang, the "Labor Daily" and the whole reformist machine were thrown into the campaign of vilification against Orr and Nelson. But the miners returned Orr and Nelson with a greater majority than ever.

The latest slander was that of W. J. Carlton, newly-elected labor member for Glebe, who during the course of his campaign stated that "the late Arthur Chapman [for years A.R.U. leader and militant fighter] was a 'scab.'" This statement was

made precisely because the late Arthur Chapman refused to fall into line when the reactionary Parliamentary whip cracked. It is not true that "big sweeping reforms cannot come through the trade unions," as stated in the "Locomotive Journal."

The trade unions were the first organised force of the workers, both in Europe and Australia, and the main factor in forcing from the bourgeoisie the eight-hour day, freedom of association, free speech and assembly, full franchise, and many other reforms, both economic and political, too numerous to mention.

The unions will be forced to continually fight to maintain living standards and political rights and to force concessions from the employers, so long as capitalism continues. The unions also need to see that their struggles get correct political guidance, but they can never get this from the Labor Party, relying as it does on the executive organ of the capitalist State, Parliament. The unions have need for uncompromising struggle against capitalist exploitation and cannot afford to be dominated by the Labor Party which makes its policy subservient to the needs of Parliament and capitalism instead of to the working class.

The unions in addition to fighting for reforms under capitalism are faced with the task of struggling for the abolition of capitalism—for Socialism—the final goal of the toilers; of helping to institute an era which will realise "big sweeping social reforms" unheard of under capitalism, even in its most palmy days. The Labor Party, however, does not approve of this. Its policy is the "Nationalisation of Banks, no more, no less." (J. T. Lang at A.L.P. Easter Conference, 1934.) Nationalisation of banking, which "is but a means of saving millionaires threatened with bankruptcy." (Lenin.) The abolition of capitalism and the building of Socialism can only be achieved by the masses themselves and at their will, with correct political leadership. The unions are the mass organisations of the workers, most capable of conducting the struggle to this end. On the other hand, history has proven the Labor Party incapable of giving leadership to the masses. With the development of more open class rule on the part of the capitalists the Labor parties are found wanting.

Political, in addition to economic struggles, become inevitable for the masses. In fact they intertwine. The Parliamentary struggle is insufficient, at times impossible, and because the Labor Party is only a Parliamentary party, does not support any

other form of political action, and therefore, even if it wished, is unprepared for same; it is impotent as a working-class force.

Is this not proven in Europe? When Fascist dictatorship was established Social-Democratic Parliamentarians were either helpless or went over openly into the camp of Fascism. (Wels and Liepart in Germany are examples of both tendencies.) Even in N.S.W., the Labor Party, depending on Parliament, was forced to give way to Governor Game. Who would say that this would have happened if the Labor Party had called on the trade unions, on the masses for militant demonstration and general strike to resist this attack on their democratic rights? So, on the international arena and here in Australia, in face of the growing struggles of the workers, the bourgeoisie is going over to methods other the Parliamentary ones to maintain its rule, and the Social-Democratic parties, including the A.L.P. and N.S.W. Labor Party, are disintegrating, unable and unwilling to face the tasks confronting our class and its organisations—a different proposition from that put forward by the "Locomotive Journal" that only the Labor Party is capable of achieving "big sweeping social reforms."

The opposition to the reorganisation of the trade unions along the lines of industry is puerile and reactionary. It is the placing of sectional interests before that of the whole class. It is the reflection of that narrow craft outlook which has for so long dominated Australian unionism, combined with a spurious opportunist desire on the part of grasping trade union officials, who fear that the going over from craft to industrial unionism will displace them from the positions they have occupied and abused for so long. This attitude of the reactionary reformist officials may delay the much desired strengthening of the trade union movement, but cannot prevent its final realisation.

WORKING-CLASS UNITY OR COLLABORATION WITH CAPITALISM

By J. D. BLAKE

On April 10 this year, the Victorian Central Executive of the Labor Party published its official reply to the proposals for united front action made by No. 4 District Committee of the Communist Party during November, 1934.

The whole line of the reply is an evasion of the real issues and the actual proposals made by the Communist Party. That the A.L.P. Executive was forced to reply at all, then to evade the main issues and couch its reply in very careful words, indicates a considerable weakening of the position of the A.L.P. leadership as compared with 1933, when the Executive did not deign to reply at all to proposals for united front action made at that time by the Communists in Victoria.

This weakened position of the A.L.P. Executive results from the considerable growth of the Communist Party in Victoria during this time, and to the fact that the united front campaign has met with important successes amongst wide sections of the workers. The Wonthaggi strike, the Kisch-Griffin campaign, the Dole strike and a number of successes in various unions and A.L.P. branches are indicative of this growing support for the united front.

The carefully worded reply of the A.L.P. Executive evades the main issue of united action by directing main attention to the differences of principle between the two parties. For example, the reply states:

"The A.L.P. . . . must insist that the methods of the Communist Party and the A.L.P. are irreconcilable.

"For these reasons my Executive cannot see that the proposed form of co-operation between the Parties would help the workers. The policy and methods of the Australian Labor Party are determined by our Party. We cannot concede to the Communist Party—or to anyone

else—any voice in determining that policy and those methods. Your proposal, if adopted, would bring into existence all the evils of Union without any of its possible advantages. The Australian Labor Party does not want union with the Communist Party. Any attempt to ignore or sink the differences in principles and methods between the Communist Party and the A.L.P. will end in general disappointment."

In this, the essential point in the united front proposals is submerged in an argument about principle. The Communists are the first to insist that their principles are fundamentally different from those of the Labor Party, and one of the strongest indications of the sincerity of the Communists consisted in the fact that when making their united front proposals, they declared that they did not intend to sacrifice their principles and that these differences of principle would continue to exist even after the establishment of a united front agreement between the two parties.

The important question here is that the experience in France, Austria, Spain, etc., has shown that the Communist parties and Labor parties can take part in united front action whilst preserving their separate party principles. In France, both the parties are working under a united front agreement, and both parties preserve their separate principles, organisation, recruiting, etc. Thus, it is clear that the proposal for united action made to the A.L.P. Executive by the Victorian Communists did not raise any question of a union or merging of the two parties; no attempt was made "to ignore or sink the differences in principles and methods between the Communist Party and the A.L.P." The Communists did not ask for any say in determining the policy and methods of the Labor Party. Consequently in raising these issues the Labor Party Executive is creating its own "straw men" and attempting to divert the discussion to matters which are irrelevant to the proposal for organising the struggle for the restoration of wage-cuts and against war and fascism on the basis of the combined efforts of both parties.

The reply calls upon the Communist Party to work in the spirit of co-operation; yet a number of the statements in the reply indicate that the A.L.P. itself does not intend to work in the spirit of co-operation. For example, the Executive opens its reply by stating that the Communists gave their second

preferences to the U.A.P. in the Federal elections. The A.L.P. Executive knows this to be untrue; in the Federal elections the Communists advised the workers to allocate their preferences as they pleased, and the Executive shows real dishonesty when it ignores the fact that in the recent State elections the Communists advised the workers to give their second preferences to the Labor candidates, and this was done precisely for the purpose of removing any further obstacles to the establishment of the united front.

In other words the A.L.P. Executive is afraid to give a really concrete reply to the united front proposals. The Executive knows the widespread mass support for the united front and this in addition to the fact that it cannot advance any valid argument in public against the united front, forms the basis for the evasions and attempts to take the discussion into extraneous side issues.

The reply stated. ". . . Accepting, however, your assertion that this proposal was made in sincerity and honesty, my Executive has tried to give it dispassionate consideration." Thus the A.L.P. Executive is compelled to admit the sincerity and honesty of the Communists which it has so long—denied. Again: "If Communists desire a better spirit, a co-operative spirit, in the Labor movement, they know how to get it. Most of them are members of unions or entitled to be members of unions. Let them take part in the work of their unions in the spirit of co-operation, not of disruption. . . ." is an important admission of the fact that the Communist Party is a party of the working class. But if the A.L.P. Executive is prepared to agree to co-operation "in the unions, among the unemployed and on the Trades Hall Council," it is clear that the Executive has no valid reason for rejecting the united front proposals.

The reply states:

"My Executive reminds you that the Australian Labor Party has, in season and out of season, fought for peace. It defeated conscription in 1916 and 1917; it advocated peace by negotiation, when the people's will-to-war was white-hot; it prevented Australia's participation in the various war moves made by Lloyd George after the Treaty of Versailles. THE LABOR MOVEMENT HAS CREATED AN ANTI-WAR ORGANISATION IN WHICH EVERY WORKER CAN FIND WORK TO DO."

Here, of course, the A.L.P. Executive distorts the real position and seems to forget that it was the Labor Prime Minister, Andrew Fisher, who coined the slogan "To the last man and the last shilling" in 1914. The Executive also appears to forget that the last war created a violent split in the ranks of the Labor Party, which seems to contradict the statements contained in the above quotation.

In speaking of the creation of its own anti-war organisation, the Executive fails to mention that it did this when a strong anti-war organisation had already developed in Victoria, and the Executive set up its own anti-war organisation in order to split the organised movement against war, and the question quite obviously arises, if every worker can do work in this anti-war organisation, why does the A.L.P. Executive oppose any form of co-operation between the Victorian Council Against War and the separate organisation of the A.L.P. and the Trades Hall Council? Again, on the basis of the statements in the above quotation, how does the A.L.P. Executive explain its rejection of the proposals of the Communists that the A.L.P. and Communist Party should together organise the workers for united struggle against war?

UNITY WITH THE BOURGEOISIE

The events which took place at the time of the united front discussions served to bring out with complete clarity, the entire position of the Labor Party as a party opposed to any attempts to develop the organised struggle of the workers, against capitalism; a party of class collaboration and arbitration; a party which prefers a policy of unity with the bourgeoisie as opposed to a policy of class struggle and the establishment of unity in the ranks of the working class.

At the exact time when the A.L.P. Executive was busy with the formulation of its letter rejecting the proposals for united front action from the Communist Party, it was also working out with the leaders of the Country Party, the party of the big agrarian capitalists, the basis for a parliamentary alliance between the A.L.P. and Country Party; this alliance provides for the support of the A.L.P. to the Country Party government and it is upon the support of the A.L.P. that the government is compelled to rely for its continued existence.

Behind its demagoguery, the Country Party government is carrying out a policy of intensified attacks upon the toilers. The

so-called full time work scheme for the unemployed, is in reality an attempt to eliminate the unemployed workers from the dole and the first step towards reducing the general living standards of the entire working class. The poor farmers in the countryside are being tied more closely to the big monopolists and finance capitalists. It is this policy which is receiving full support from the Labor Party in parliament.

The events which led up to the formation of the Country Party government brought out certain antagonisms and conflicts in the ranks of the bourgeoisie, but these are still only antagonisms within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, and the Country Party's breakaway from the U.A.P. does not alter in the slightest the position of the Country Party as a bourgeois party. No one, not even the Labor Party leaders, could say that the Country Party has come any closer to the working class; nor has the Country Party lost any of its anti-working class character. On the contrary, it is still the same party which, together with the U.A.P. in the previous government, carried out a vicious and continuous drive against the toilers. The difference now is that whereas formerly this was done by a government of the U.A.P. and Country Party, it is now being done by the Country Party government with the support of the Labor Party.

This clearly demonstrates the baseness of this treacherous policy of the Labor Party; yet this present role of the Labor Party is not something new, nor a break with the previous policy of the Labor Party. The present position of the Labor Party as the main support of an openly capitalist government is the logical outcome of the entire policy of parliamentarism and class collaboration of the A.L.P. In recent years the official Labor Party has more and more carried out a policy of unity with the bourgeoisie. In almost every struggle of the workers during the past two or three years, the Labor Party in Victoria has done its best to force the workers to retreat; in the Wonthaggi strike and two dole strikes, the Labor Party leaders condemned the action of the striking workers and gave tacit support to the employing class. The A.L.P. leaders have done all in their power to extend the split in the ranks of the toilers—every attempt on the part of the Communists to develop united front action has been carried out in face of the strongest opposition from the Labor Party leaders.

Thus it is clear that the present alliance between the Labor Party and an open capitalists' government does not mean that

the A.L.P. has made any radical change of policy, but simply brings more clearly into the light of day something that has existed over a long period—the Labor Party's policy of unity with the bourgeoisie in preference to a policy of class struggle and unity in the ranks of the proletariat. The participation (without portfolios) in a bourgeois government against the toilers is the logical outcome of this policy of the Labor Party.

These developments reveal very sharply the complete bankruptcy of the Labor Party. The urgent need of the moment is the organisation of united struggle of the workers to secure an improvement in their living conditions; to fight against war and fascism, but the A.L.P. rejects such a policy of struggle and actively hinders any attempt to carry it out.

As against the Communist policy of organised class struggle, the Labor Party insists upon its policy of collaboration and unity with the bourgeoisie, and this policy has led the Labor Party into the position in which it acts as the appendage of one of the openly capitalist parties; as a prop upon which the capitalist government is able to maintain itself in office. This is the position to which the Labor Party in Victoria has degenerated, because from the two alternatives—organised class struggle against the employers, or unity with the bourgeoisie—the Labor Party has chosen the latter path.

These were the two alternate paths which the Labor Party had before it when it made its decisions. The letter from the Communist Party, proposing the organisation of united front struggles of the workers against the employers and against the government, was discussed by the A.L.P. leaders at the same time as the proposal for an alliance with the Country Party was being discussed. The Labor Party preferred the path of unity with the bourgeoisie—instead of organising the struggle against the government it is now attempting to drag the workers of Victoria into support for the bourgeois government. Nothing could more clearly reveal the complete bankruptcy of Labor Party policy, its impotency in face of the crying need for leadership of the workers in their struggles, than this step.

The bankruptcy of the Labor Party, places even greater responsibilities on to the shoulders of the Communists for the organisation and leadership of the united front struggles of the workers. It is necessary as quickly as possible for the Communists to get into much closer contact with the A.L.P.

workers in the unions and in the A.L.P. branches, seizing upon every opportunity which presents itself for the organisation of united front struggles around even the smallest issues confronting the workers. It is necessary above all, to ensure that the forces of the Communist Party itself are so organised to make possible the carrying out of this work.

It is necessary to bring the strongest pressure to bear on the Victorian Executive of the A.L.P. to reconsider the united front proposals in the light of the further letter of the District Committee of the Communist Party in Victoria of May 1 this year. Every Labor Party worker must be acquainted with the fact that the Executive of the Labor Party has given no reason for its rejection of the Communist united front proposals. The interests of all toilers lie along the path of united struggle against the employers and the government and the rejection of the Labor Party's present policy of unity with the bourgeoisie with its resultant tailing behind the bourgeois parties.

SOME FORERUNNERS OF THE C.P. OF A.

By J. N. RAWLING

The 'eighties of last century constituted a period of intellectual ferment and of great working-class activity in political, industrial and social spheres. Labor was awakening—here in Australia not less than in England, Europe, and America. Consider, in Europe and America, the promising beginnings of May Day demonstrations. Think of the revival of unionism in England—the coming of the new unionism: the mass organisation of the unskilled workers. Then, of the great London Dockers' Strike of August, 1889—and of its great victory, rendered possible by the £30,000 that Australian trade unionists sent over in its support!

We have already referred (see "C.R." for April) to the great impetus given to the industrial organisation of the workers in

this formative period of Australian capitalism, when a large proletariat was being created and all the requisites for rapid capitalist development were present. It was inevitable that a workers' political party should also have its beginning then.

Contact with and influence of working-class and radical thought and development in England and Europe had never been lacking in Australia. The Chartists had influenced Australian thought by means of immigrants, deportees and the printed word. Irish revolutionary and anti-imperialist propaganda by the same means fostered independence and love of liberty among the workers of Australia. The programme of the Diggers' Reform League on the Victorian goldfields in 1854 shows the influence of the Chartists, as the subsequent rebellion, culminating in Eureka, showed the influence of the 1848 revolutionary movements in Europe. The Diggers demanded manhood suffrage, payment of members, abolition of property qualification for members. These had been some of the demands of the Chartists just a few short years before. In the 'sixties and 'seventies, various bodies were organised with the object of gaining representation in Parliament. For example, in 1859, the New South Wales Diggers sent one of themselves to represent them in Parliament, and, in 1865, the Workers' Industrial and Political League was formed in Melbourne, with demands for secret ballot, payment of members, manhood suffrage. The payment of members was becoming a burning question, and workers realised that their representation in Parliament was impossible as long as members remained unpaid. There were quite a number of instances of constituencies which paid salaries to their representatives.

Australian working-class organisations were in close touch with the First International and, according to T. A. Coghlan ("Labor and Industry in Australia," p. 1834), "delegates from Australia were present at the meeting of the British section of the International in Nottingham in July, 1872." Coghlan says, again, that "the close communication between the International and the Sydney Trade Unions, which existed before this, may be inferred from the fact that, when the latter wished to stop immigration in 1866, the letter on the subject was sent to Robert Applegarth, a leading member, and at one time Secretary of the International." Australia, then, has been connected with all three Internationals!

There seems to have been three important developments in Australia which helped to weld its working-class into a more solid and militant bloc than would otherwise have been the case. In the first place, it had been a young and thinly populated country. It had thus inevitably bred an independent and far from servile working-class, which had no tradition of servitude behind it. It was militant because its members had no desire to lose what independence they had. The struggles of the 'seventies and 'eighties were, in some respects, the struggles of those who did not wish to see the shackles of capitalism bound tightly on them—not of those who were revolting against a capitalism which had held them in check for generations. Secondly and thirdly, the workers saw in the influx of Chinese and the Government-aided immigration schemes a growing menace to their standard of living and even their jobs. The workers blamed the Chinese and the immigrants for the rapidly increasing unemployment—instead of seeing that it was the employers and squatters who were using them to break down the standard of the workers' living. So, the Chinese question was one which led to spontaneous organisation. In 1861, the riots at Lambing Flat (now Young) were inspired by hatred of the Chinese, and it, and later agitation, resulted in the passing of Chinese Restriction Acts in 1880 and 1888. It has to be remembered that, although this question gave rise to much race antagonism and cruelty towards the Chinese, it was at basis an economic question. Employers and pastoralists wanted cheap labor—and they were successful in dividing the workers by playing upon racial animosities and by sponsoring anti-Chinese leagues.

Even the Socialists of the day were not immune from this race hatred. In June, 1888, for example, an aggregate meeting of the Hunter River miners was held in Hamilton (Newcastle) to discuss the Chinese question. A resolution was passed approving of Parkes' Chinese Exclusion Bill and, after John Norton, of the Anti-Chinese League, had spoken, another resolution was passed which placed a fine of 5/- upon any miner who patronised any Chinese greengrocer or tradesman (or anybody employing Chinese), or who allowed any member of his family to patronise such! This resolution, says the report of the "Australian Radical" (Socialist organ published at Hamilton), was "carried almost unanimously." Several weeks later, in an editorial comment, this Socialist paper upholds this boycotting of Chinese, pointing out that this means has proved better than relying on the law. And

it goes on to say that "we ourselves were amongst the very few who held that the Chinese are an inferior race, and that under fair conditions the white man can more than hold his own against the Mongol." ("A.R.," August 4, 1888.) Thus racial animosity and incitement to hatred against another people could masquerade in the 'eighties under the banner of Socialism. The statement stressed the necessity for organisation, but so-called Socialists in the 'eighties could not see what the great majority of the workers see to-day, that it is essential that organisation must include all. A really Socialist newspaper in 1888 would have urged unity with the Chinese and the immigrants—instead of endeavoring to split the working-class asunder.

But there were many other influences in the 'eighties that aided in the development of Socialist organisations. The secularists (freethinkers) were strong and they published weekly papers which had big circulations and much influence. Of the secularists in England, one leader (Mrs. Besant) was a Socialist and the other (Mr. Bradlaugh) was a Republican—both had their followings in Australia. The Republican Movement here was strong. It naturally made headway among the masses and was supported by many capitalists because of the refusal of Britain to annex New Guinea and because of what was regarded as the pro-German influence of the British court. A Republican Union was set up in Sydney and a Republican League, later, with branches in Melbourne. A weekly newspaper, "The Republican," was published, and the Sydney "Bulletin" was rabidly republican. The latter had immense influence.

Then there was the Single Tax propaganda of Henry George and his followers. George's "Progress and Poverty" was published serially in a Sydney daily. Many branches of the Single-tax League were set up and amongst those prominent in the movement were Hughes, Holman and Beeby.

Socialist ideas were everywhere in the 'eighties and early 'nineties. Every mail brought news and propaganda of the Socialist bodies in England, where Burns and Mann were engaged in building the new unionism as well as the Social-Democratic Federation. Bellamy's "Looking Backward," which had a great circulation in Australia, also gave impetus to the spread of Socialist ideas here.

Out of all of this welter of ideas and movements of the 'eighties was born the Australian Socialist League, in 1887. Its founder was W. H. Macnamara. A weekly paper was started,

called "The Radical," and later, "The Australian Radical." For a number of years it was published in Hamilton (Newcastle). It had a fairly extensive circulation, not only all over the coalfields but in other States. [In Melbourne, there was formed the Social Democratic League about the same time.] The A.S.L. had its headquarters at 533 George Street, Sydney. Its programme, as given by Black, was as follows:—

- (1) Free, secular and compulsory education;
- (2) Adoption of the Referendum;
- (3) Prohibition of child labor;
- (4) Adult suffrage;
- (5) All revenue to be raised by land and income taxes;
- (6) Free railways and tramways;
- (7) Municipal control of gas, water, power and electricity;
- (8) National banking only;
- (9) Abolition of the Legislative Council;
- (10) An eight-hours' working day.

In 1891, the Political Labor League was formed—that is the organisation which is now known as the A.L.P. For the next six years the A.S.L. was merely an appendage of the P.L.L. It was the left wing of the Labor Party. In 1895, Macnamara and his followers, disgusted with the trend of events, broke away and formed the **Social-Democratic Federation**. Two years later, in 1897, the A.S.L. severed its connection with the P.L.L., and, in the following year, drew up a new constitution and resolved to run candidates at elections. For the elections for the first Federal Parliament the A.S.L. ran six candidates for the Senate, upon a programme of immediate demands, which, at the Conference of 1901, it altered to a programme for the collective ownership of land and the means of production, distribution and exchange.

In the meantime, there had been other developments in Queensland. There, William Lane set out his aim to organise the workers of Australia in a movement not merely to better their conditions here and there, but to reconstruct Society. He began a newspaper, "The Boomerang," and gave as his objectives to bring all non-unionists into the unions, to create new unions for the unorganised, to unite the whole industrial forces of Australia into a solid body, ultimately to take over control of all industry—in the meantime to use the strike weapon to bring about the betterment of conditions. He began by organising the shearers.

After the failure of the Maritime Strike (1890), Lane gave up hope of establishing Socialism in Australia, and (in 1892) led some hundreds of his followers to establish a New Australia in Paraguay.

Another development that must be mentioned was the growth of an Anarchist movement. There was an Anarchist Club in Melbourne in 1887, and another was functioning in Sydney in the 'nineties—centring mainly around one man, J. A. Andrews. A small paper was published in 1892, called "Anarchy." In Melbourne, J. W. Fleming was active as an Anarchist and was a well-known identity. For several years before the war there was a Communist-Anarchist movement in Sydney. Between 1895 and 1905, the Anarchists attracted quite a deal of attention to themselves, but as a mass movement Anarchism never made any headway in Australia.

To return to the A.S.L. In 1901, the new constitution was published. In it the Object was laid down as this:

"The establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth founded on the collective ownership of the Land and Means of Production, Distribution and Exchange."
The methods to be followed to achieve these were to be:

"The industrial and political organisation of the workers—mental and manual; distribution of Socialist literature, lectures on Socialism, also social, political and industrial questions, and, to attain our object (a Co-operative Commonwealth), the election of Socialists to Parliament—Federal and State—and Municipal Councils."

When contesting elections the League was to be known as the Socialist Labor Party. Consequently the logical thing followed, and the name was changed, in 1907, to the Socialist Labor Party. The S.L.P. contested N.S.W. State elections regularly before the war and the Senate elections, except those of 1914. In the 1917 Senate elections, the S.L.P. (in N.S.W.) gained 32,692 votes! That was the high-water mark of its influence. The bane of the S.L.P. has been its sectarianism and its aloofness from the every-day struggles of the workers. "Come unto me," it said, "and be converted unto Socialism." When it had converted everybody it would inaugurate Socialism. If you didn't come, you were a bonehead. Every-day demands did not matter—in fact, struggle for them was dangerous—they were palliatives!

Early in 1907, some members broke away from the S.L.P. and formed a Social-Democratic Party, which soon became known as the International Socialist Club. In the same year, a unity conference was held in Melbourne. At it were represented the Victorian Socialist Party (Tom Mann being one of the representatives); the S.L.P.; the International Socialist Club; the Social-Democratic Federation (Sydney); the Barrier Socialist Propaganda Group; the Social-Democratic Vanguard (Brisbane); and the Social-Democratic Association (Kalgoorlie). The combined financial membership of these bodies was over 2000. The following resolution was carried, only the two S.L.P. delegates opposing:

"That the time has arrived when a united class-conscious Socialist Party is necessary for Australia."

The S.L.P. delegates moved this amendment:

"That in view of the fact that the S.L.P. of Australia is a class-conscious organisation of working-class men and women, based on the revolutionary principle of the class-struggle, organised in two of the principal States of the Commonwealth—N.S.W. and Victoria—the unity of other Socialist bodies can only be accomplished by the acceptance and endorsement of its revolutionary, economic and political principles as set forth in its Constitution, methods and tactics."

Upon the defeat of that amendment the S.L.P. delegates withdrew.

From that unity conference sprang the Socialist Federation of Australia, later known as the **Australian Socialist Party**.

Partial unity was thus achieved by this 1907 Conference, but antagonism remained and grew between the S.F.A. (later A.S.P.) and the S.L.P.—in spite of more unity conferences, debates and negotiations. The S.L.P. still pursued its policy and tactics of not sullyng in any way its De Leonist purity. It frowned on all "palliative" demands and gains. Both parties were tainted with sectarianism, and personal antagonisms prevented co-operation, but there were more fundamental reasons for failure to achieve unity. In spite of much confusion of thought, the A.S.P. was generally conscious of the character and role of the State, and came to realise the necessity of forcibly overthrowing the capitalists' State and of setting up the Workers' State and the dictatorship of the proletariat. With the example of the Russian Revolution before it in later years, the A.S.P. membership was

not held back by dogmatism from adhering to the line and policy of the Communist International—in spite of the sectarianism that was rampant within the organisation and which did so much damage, holding back unity for so long.

But, on the other hand, it was not merely sectarianism which divided the S.L.P. and the A.S.P. Unity was impossible because of the rigidity of outlook of the former, which accepted, with an absolute determination to refuse to listen to any contradiction, the teachings of that American who, somehow, had gained a great reputation as a Socialist and a Marxist: Daniel De Leon. The word "Socialist" has been used to cover a multitude of sins—and sinners, so he might be called a Socialist, but Marxist he never was. For De Leon did not understand what the State is. For him the future society was to be created by the workers organised in their factories and their One Big Union—after the political party had abolished the governmental power of the bourgeoisie. There were two necessary arms of the revolutionary movement; **the industrial arm** (the political I.W.W., later known as the W.I.L.U.), which is to prepare itself to administer the new society, by means of organising all workers in their industries and in one big nation-wide union, whose executive, composed of representatives from all sections of the revolutionary movement, would constitute the future administrative and governing body of the new society; and **the political arm** (the S.L.P.), which is necessary merely to cast off the skin of capitalist Government as a snake casts its skin. "As the slough shed by the serpent that immediately reappears in its new skin," said De Leon, "the political State will have been shed and society will simultaneously appear in its new administrative garb."

He drew, it will be seen, an opposition between the capitalist State which he called "political" and the workers' State which would be merely "administrative." The S.L.P. was necessary to abolish politics! Not the ownership of industry by the capitalists was the fundamental fact, but political control by the capitalists! All that it was necessary to do was that the S.L.P. should gain a majority in the parliament and then decree that the political State was abolished. Then the S.L.P., politics and parliaments would be no more, and the industrial arm would be free to build up the new social organism—society would have put on its new skin. "The goal of the political movement of labor is purely destructive," said De Leon, "the razing to the ground of the

Robber Burg of capitalist tyranny." "The reason for a political movement [that is for the purpose of destruction—J. N. R.] obviously unfits it," he went on, "to take and hold the machinery of production. What the political movement moves into is not the shop, but the Robber Burg of capitalism—for the purpose of dismantling it."

Moreover, De Leon envisaged a peaceful transition from capitalism to Socialism, but allowed for resistance by the capitalists before the Socialists gained a majority. In such an eventuality, that is if the capitalists commit "some lawless act," then "further efforts for a peaceful measuring of strength would have been rendered superfluous by capitalist barbarism. Capitalism would be swept aside forthwith" provided, of course that the industrial arm has "reached the requisite quantitative and qualitative minimum of perfection, and that in turn will depend upon the freeness of its previous agitational work, a freedom that it never could enjoy, **except it plants itself upon the principle that recognises the civilised method of peaceful trial of strength—the political ballot.**" In other words, the proletariat will be in a better position to overthrow capitalism and to crush capitalist resistance the more it is taught to rely on the ballot! It is like advising a soldier that the more he sticks to his beer and keeps away from his rifle, the better marksman he will make.

There is no need at this late day to underline the total unreality of that whole outlook on society and the perfect inability to understand the nature of the State or to appreciate the necessity for a workers' State and of proletarian dictatorship. But there were other ways in which the S.L.P. constituted itself an obstacle to a real socialist party. Its attitude towards "palliatives," immediate demands, its refusal to see the necessity for the day-to-day struggle, its inability to understand that it is for immediate ends that the masses must be organised to attain—these led to treachery, opposition to strikes and to forming a united front with the employers against the workers.

Unity negotiations went on in 1912, 1913, 1914 and in succeeding years, and in 1920-22 the S.L.P. was alone in its refusal to merge into the Communist Party. Since then it has degenerated into a mere clique kept alive in the interests—varied—of its leader, disowned even by its parent body in America, but still rejoicing in its virgin purity which is unsullied even after

having been received into the embraces of the "Sydney Morning Herald"!

In the meantime, the "anti-political" I.W.W. had been established in Australia. Its programme was practically the same as that of the S.L.P. and W.I.U. with the political arm left out. According to it, emancipation could be achieved on the industrial field alone without any interference by a political body. During the years 1911 to 1916, it grew, spreading to all the States and exerting influence upon industrial organisation everywhere. But its sectarianism, its lack of political understanding and its failure, as a result, to build a mass basis made its destruction by the Government in 1916 easy.

There have been other smaller bodies at various times, calling themselves Socialist, but about which we have no time to speak. There was the Socialist Party of Victoria, which for long tried to hold a centrist position and met the fate of all centrist organisations. A Social-Democratic League was in existence during and just after the war. It was one of the organisations which met to set up the Communist Party. An Industrial Labor Party also came into existence after the 1917 strike.

The Socialist Federation of Australasia (later the A.S.P.), which was created by the Unity Conference of 1907, carried on consistent and valuable propaganda for over twelve years. It was affiliated to the Second International. On April 30, 1910, it began publication of the "International Socialist," just anticipating the setting up of the first Labor Government in N.S.W. and the Commonwealth. And during those years it kept up a consistent and valuable criticism of the Labor Party, exposing its real character. In 1913, Lenin published in "Pravda," just after the Federal elections of that year, a criticism of the A.L.P., which he characterised as a Liberal Labor Party and not a Socialist Labor Party. The S.F.A. had branded the A.L.P. as "Liberal" long before. In 1910, the S.F.A. sent its report to the International Socialist Congress. In that report, this is what it had to say of the A.L.P.:

"The Labor Party does not clearly and unambiguously avow Socialism, nor does it teach it; it is unlike any other working-class creation in the world in that it builds no Socialist movement, issues no Socialist books, debates no Socialist problems. It is not international; it is not anti-militarist; it is not Marxian. **In politics and practice it is liberalism under a new name; in utterance and ideal it is**

bourgeois. The coming conflict in Australia is to be between Laborism and Socialism."

In the various industrial upheavals, S.F.A. members took an active part. Tom Mann was organiser for the miners in Broken Hill during the lockout there in 1909, and H. E. Holland was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for sedition in connection with that lockout—he served five months. Members were active during the coalminers' strike of 1909. After the introduction of Compulsory Military Training in 1911, the S.F.A. and its paper carried on a persistent campaign against it. The "International Socialist" was continued until 1920, then becoming the "International Communist" in sectarian opposition to the "Australian Communist," organ of the United Communist Party of Australia. Unity was finally achieved between the United Communist Party and the A.S.P. (which since December 1920, had persisted in calling itself the Communist Party) in July 1922, leaving only a few disgruntled elements to linger on. The word "united" was dropped from the title as then being unnecessary.

In 1887, the advanced elements amongst the workers were feeling their way towards a Socialist Party. Since then various organisations have been set up; some have played a part and died, some have become fossilised or degenerate. But the dialectic of victory and defeat, of error and correction, of sectarianism and opportunism has shown the way to progress and brought us to the unity and achievements of 1935.

A REVIEW OF THE STATE ELECTIONS

By L. SHARKEY

The elections in New South Wales and Queensland have a number of important results bearing on the future of the working-class struggle. Engels once referred to elections as a "barometer" which gave some indication of the direction in which events are moving, of the tendencies and processes in operation among the masses at the given moment. This barometer has shown something of great importance, namely, the advance and consolidation of the influence of the Communist Party over the Australian working class.

These elections took place at a time when the situation in Australia is typified by Comrade Stalin's brilliant diagnosis of the position of capitalism:

"Capitalism has succeeded in somewhat easing the position of industry at the expense of the workers—increasing their exploitation by increasing the intensity of their labor; at the expense of the farmers—by pursuing a policy of paying the lowest prices for the product of their labor, for foodstuffs and partly for their labor. . . ."

How aptly this definition fits Australia is shown by a glance at the situation of the working class after several years of the Premiers' Plan, the purpose of which was to seriously reduce the living standards. A recent Census bulletin shows the growing pauperisation as follows in the chief State of the Australian Commonwealth, the State of New South Wales:—Of 1,209,805 who are designated as breadwinners, 135,335 have no income, 323,819 earn less than £52 per annum, 211,055 earn less than £103 per annum, and 138,540 earn less than £155 per annum; whilst, at the same time that this mass poverty is growing, the capitalists, through wage reductions and greater exploitation, record greatly increased profits. For example, Woolworth's, in 1931-2, made a profit of £108,738; in '32-3, £125,532; in '33-4, £150,013; whilst the corresponding figures for Goodyear Tyres were £58,013, £140,220, and £223,001. The Broken Hill Proprietary in '32-3 made a profit of £343,517, and in '34 of £427,587.

These examples could be expanded almost indefinitely, and prove beyond doubt that the "prosperity" of which the bourgeoisie sing is a class prosperity.

Comrade Stalin's analysis further explains that "what we are witnessing is the transition from the lowest point of the decline of industry, from the lowest depth of the industrial crisis to a depression, not an ordinary depression, but to a depression of a special kind, which does not lead to a new boom and flourishing industry, but which, on the other hand, does not force it back to the lowest point of decline." And this also expressed aptly the situation of capitalist industry at the moment when the State elections took place, and was one of the main factors determining the results. In Queensland, the Labor Party Government was returned with a swollen vote and greatly increased majority. In N.S.W., the United Australia Party Government was returned, losing only half a dozen of the enormous majority it won at the 1932 elections after the dismissal of the Labor Party from office by the Governor of N.S.W.

The easing of the position of industry at the expense of the workers and the recovery brought about by the working of the internal forces of capitalism was used by the Labor Party in Queensland and the U.A.P. in N.S.W. to show, on the one hand, that the Labor Party policy had rescued Queensland from the chaotic conditions of 1931, "caused by the U.A.P.," and in N.S.W. to show that it was only the policy of the U.A.P. in N.S.W. that rescued N.S.W. from the chaotic conditions caused by the Labor Party policy. The Lang Labor Party Government in N.S.W. and the Moore U.A.P. Government in Queensland, who were unfortunate enough to be the administrators of the capitalist State at the lowest point of the crisis, were pilloried by their opponents as the cause of the conditions operating in 1931, at the lowest point of the crisis, and the number of unemployed, contrasted with the present (partly faked) figures, and this move was successful enough in deceiving large masses into the belief that it was the statesmanship displayed by these parties and leaders that was leading to prosperity, and thus ensured their victory over their opponents.

The elections also indicated the decline of the Labor Party. The Lang Labor Party followed the defeat of the Victorian Labor Party and the failure of the Labor Party in the Federal

elections with yet another severe defeat. This severe defeat was occasioned by the memory in the minds of the masses of the attacks launched upon them by the Lang Government in 1931-2, and of the utter bankruptcy revealed by the Labor Governments in office during the crisis—by the Federal Labor Party Government and the A.L.P. Governments in office in N.S.W., Victoria, and South Australia at that time.

The disintegration of the Labor Party was further revealed by the split in N.S.W. and the fact that two sets of Labor Party candidates were running. The decline of the Labor Party is thus a fact, despite the victory of the Labor Party in Queensland. The Labor Party in Queensland occupies a special position. For almost 20 years, with one break of a Parliament (the U.A.P. Government of 1931-3), it has been the governing party in Queensland. The bourgeois nature of the Governments of the A.L.P. stands clearly revealed by the long reign of the A.L.P. in Queensland. If the economic structure of Queensland is examined, it will be seen that it does not fundamentally differ in any respect from that of the States which have been ruled by Labor Party and non-Labor Party Governments alternatively, as in N.S.W., or that have been ruled almost entirely by non-Labor Party bourgeois Governments, as in Victoria. It is a purely capitalist structure that has not been altered in details, even by the years of A.L.P. administration. The leaders of the A.L.P. in that State enjoy the confidence of the bourgeoisie, and Forgan Smith, its present leader, is the recipient of continual flattering references by the bourgeois press, in particular, the Sydney "Herald." The Queensland Labor Party wholeheartedly supports the Premiers' Plan, denounces Lang as a "revolutionary," and in every way acts up to its position as the official party of the bourgeoisie in Queensland, whereas elsewhere the A.L.P. is the second party of the capitalists, and an alternative Government at stressful moments for the bourgeoisie. One instance will suffice to illustrate its attitude towards the masses. No less than 9000 Police Court convictions were recorded last year against the unemployed for taking rides without a ticket on the "people's own railways," as the A.L.P. terms them. There is not an atom of Socialism in the legislation of the Queensland Labor Government. The Queensland Labor Party scored its success by blaming the Moore Government which came to office as a result of the crisis and the inability of the Labor Government to assist the masses, and had a brief life of one Parliamentary term, for

the crisis, and by claiming the slight easing of the situation since then as its own handiwork.

When we ask the question "What effect will the election results have on the A.L.P.?" it is clear that it will contribute to its further decline. It will have serious repercussions for the A.L.P. in N.S.W. The followers of Lang were fed with daily pap about the great victory that was approaching, and how "the great leader," Lang, was about to vindicate himself, and lead the stricken masses out of the conditions of poverty encompassing them. If we glance at the pre-election agitation of the "Labor Daily," we see how the Lang Party leaders attempted to bluff their supporters (and perhaps themselves) into a belief in an election victory:

"Labor will win to-day and save Australia."—"Labor Daily," May 11.

"Stevens wages a hopeless battle."—"Labor Daily," May 10.

"Marching to great victory."—"Labor Daily," May 7.

"Nothing can now prevent Labor win."

"Position impregnable. Last-minute reports from electorates throughout the State show that Labor is in an impregnable position, and it is confidently expected that the swing will result in an even greater number of members being returned than at the 1930 elections."—"Labor Daily," May 9.

The severe defeat has undoubtedly disappointed large sections of the A.L.P. workers, and lent force to the agitation of the Federal Labor Party that the A.L.P. cannot win an election whilst Lang remains leader. The result will lead to a further decline of the A.L.P.'s influence over the masses, who have been misled by the A.L.P., and to undoubted disruption within the Lang Party. The anti-Lang elements within will feel encouraged and strengthened in the fight to remove Lang and seize the plums of office for themselves. That the controllers of the Lang Party fear the revolt within their ranks is evidenced by the rushing through of resolutions endorsing Lang's leadership and congratulating him on "his wonderful fight" in a number of the craft unions under their dominance and in the A.L.P. branches, the moment the defeat of Lang became apparent. The petty and futile excuses proffered by Lang & Co., which blamed the unemployed and claimed that they "only needed 6000 votes for victory," cannot stave off the struggles within the Lang Party. This latter plea is certainly somewhat original, and arrived at by taking the electorates where the contest was close and the U.A.P.

majorities less than 1000. This, of course, could be applied to most bourgeois elections, but the real test is the aggregate vote, and this did not increase, decisively, for the Lang Party.

A further and most significant indication of the decline of A.L.P. influence in the trade union movement is provided by a study of their "Shilling Victory Fund," as published in the "Labor Daily," the day before the elections. They fixed quotas of shillings to be contributed by the unions. The Bricklayers were allotted 100 shillings, but had given nothing the day before the elections, thereby dead-heating with the Builders' Laborers, Tanners, Wickerworkers, Stonemasons, and Saddlers. Engine-drivers and Hospital Employees, who were given a quota of 500 shillings, likewise contributed nothing up to that date. Timberworkers, who were allotted 1000 shillings, also contributed nothing. The Tobacco-workers, assessed at 2000, also had contributed nothing, the day before the elections, together with the Loco. Engine-drivers and Postal-workers, whilst the Waterside-workers had sent in only 100 of their 2000, and the A.W.U. 10 shillings. The Shop Assistants, on 3000 shillings, also had sent nothing to the Shilling Fund. The Engineers, on 4000, contributed 563; the Miners, on 5000, 10 shillings; and the A.B.U., on 6000, in the "Labor Daily" "Victory Shillings" table, recorded a donation of 21 shillings.

This was a complete defeat for the A.L.P. in the trade unions, and depicts the growing indifference of the mass of unionists towards the A.L.P.

On the other hand, there was much support financially for the Communist Party in the unions and workshops. Several miners' lodges levied themselves for the C.P. of A., and our collections in some important factories were equal to, or better than, those for the Labor Party.

The result of the election will quite likely have a detrimental effect on the personal political fortunes of Lang and his immediate group in the leadership of the Labor Party. The undoubted ambition of Lang was the Prime Ministership of Australia at the head of a Labor Party administration. This was one of the reasons for the long struggle between the factions of the A.L.P. But Lang's entry into Federal politics was delayed, awaiting the Premier of N.S.W., in order that he could enter as the triumphant Premier of N.S.W. The bourgeois and A.L.P. press, other than that controlled by Lang, however, were suggesting the A.L.P.

Premier of Queensland (Forgan Smith) as the "strong man" who could prevent Lang attaining his goal. It is now practically officially admitted that Forgan Smith will soon enter the Federal Parliament, undoubtedly to replace Scullin as leader of the A.L.P. That is the line that will probably be taken to attempt the reconstruction of the Labor Party, in which the bourgeoisie is vitally interested, as stated by their chief organ, the Sydney "Herald," which some time back declared that it was in the national interest to have a strong Labor Party [to fight Communism.—L. S.]. This means the eclipse of Lang and his eventual passing from politics.

The further decline of the A.L.P., and the amount of success that the bourgeoisie and the reformists will have in reconstituting the A.L.P., is conditioned by the use that the C.P. of A. can make of the existing situation to win the workers away from the A.L.P. and for the revolutionary programme; is conditioned, in particular, by the success our Party can achieve in mobilising the workers for mass struggle against the capitalists and still further exposing the A.L.P. leaders in the course of such struggles. The decline of the A.L.P. is accompanied by a quickening of the activity of the working class. The decline of faith in the Labor Party, which is one of the reasons for the "quiet elections," because of little enthusiasm on the part of the workers because there is no really vital question at issue between the major parties (indeed, Lang and Stevens accused each other of stealing each other's election policies), but merely minor differences as to the policy which capitalism should adopt in its present circumstances, is accompanied by a growth of rank-and-file activity from below, which is expressed in the expanding Communist vote, in the growth of the shop committee movement, in a greater interest in trade unionism, the wide endorsement of the united front proposals of the Communist Party, and a strengthening of the strike movement.

If the Communists can succeed in placing themselves at the head of, and organising, mass struggles against the reactionary Governments, this will lead to the rapid further disintegration of the Labor Party and the rapid growth of the Communist Party and its influence among the masses, and prevent the rehabilitation of the Labor Party and its gaining a further lease of life and the strengthening of its treacherous influence among the workers.

The Federal Labor Party candidates in N.S.W. can be dismissed as a serious force in the election. Only where there was no official U.A.P. candidate and where in actual fact the Federal A.L.P. candidate was the U.A.P. candidate, did they poll a decent vote. They had the support of the major part of the bourgeoisie as against Lang.

An important feature of the election was the appearance for the first time in an Australian election of definitely Fascist candidates and the nucleus of a Fascist Party, in the shape of Colonel Campbell's "Centre Party" ("New Guard"), which has as its objective Mussolini's Corporative State. Here is an excerpt from the "Centre Party's" programme, as contained in their election manifesto:—

The Centre Movement is a movement of Reform.
We do not merely promise reform—our plans make that change and improvement inevitable.

1. The objectives of the Centre Movement are to secure—
 - (a) Representative Government.
 - (b) Social and Industrial Justice.

2. PARTY POLITICS:

Our first objective can only be attained by the complete elimination of the present sordid, corrupt, and inefficient method of governing this State. The Member of Parliament who signs a pledge to obey the orders of the Party instead of serving the interests of his electorate should be held guilty of a treasonable conspiracy against the public good. Centre Movement Candidates are solely responsible to the voters in their electorate. That is the first step towards reform.

3. VOCATIONAL REPRESENTATION:

The second step towards reform and efficiency in government is to allow workers and employers in industry to control their own affairs by combining in vocational groups, and to elect members to Parliament to represent the workers and employers in each of these groups. Women voters, when not included in such vocational groups, will have their own special members in Parliament through Housewives' Associations and other special groups.

Under the Vocational System all shades of honest political opinion are free to express their views on national affairs; in fact, the very structure of Corporatism is designed for that purpose.

4. CO-OPERATION:

Our second objective can only be obtained by removing the whole cause of social and industrial unrest, viz., the unjust division of profits at the point of production.

This can be achieved by the introduction of the Corporative organisation of Industry. This system provides that groups of kindred industries shall manage their own affairs. Capital and Labour are equally represented in all matters relating to Industry. Profits are shared. Labour receives its Basic Wage, Capital its Basic Dividend, Management its Salary, and the balance is equally divided between Capital and Labour after a reasonable bonus to management.

Also is a statement to the effect that payment of members of Parliament is to be abolished. The demagogic statement about abolition of "unjust division of profits at the point of production" will be noted. Evidently, this revised programme for Australian Fascism results from Campbell's visit overseas, where he consulted with Mussolini and Hitler. The "Centre Movement" ran four candidates and polled more than 6000 votes. They also received the first preference votes of the United Australia Party. The Communist Party organised a counter-demonstration to Campbell in Arncliffe, where he was speaking, during the course of the election campaign.

A number of candidates styling themselves "Douglas Credit" stood, but by no means polled the vote that they obtained in the recent Federal election.

COMMUNISTS ADVANCE

The Communist Party in N.S.W. received a blow when the Government decided upon the nomination fee of £25 for each candidate within a fortnight of the election, but, despite this, we succeeded in collecting from the workers sufficient finance to enable 17 Communist candidates to stand in N.S.W. and 11 in Queensland. The vote recorded was satisfactory, and showed a great increase over any previous vote for the Party, particularly in N.S.W. This is the third State election contested by the Party since the decision to oppose the Labor Party with Communist candidates was taken at the end of 1929. Our 17 candidates polled more than 20,000 votes in these electorates.

The Communist vote increased particularly in the N.S.W. coalfields, in the mining electorates of Cessnock, Kurri, Bulli, Hartley, and Sturt. Our comparative figures for these electorates are:—Cessnock, 1930, 1200; 1932, 877; 1935, 1611. Kurri, 1930, 816; 1932, 1820; 1935, 2754. Bulli, 1932, 404; 1935, 1971. Sturt, 1930, 685; 1932, 656; 1935, 1185. Hartley, 1930, 400; 1932, 275; 1935, 1168.

In the city of Sydney, which is the fortress of the "Left" Social-Fascists, Lang, Beasley & Co., and where, although the Party wields a big influence and is organisationally stronger than

anywhere else in Australia, we have been faced with a severe task in fighting the Lang Party, we increased our vote in all the electorates contested. Our best advances in Sydney were made in Paddington, Redfern, and Bankstown. In Paddington we polled, in 1930, 227; 1932, 305; 1935, 1207. Redfern, 1932, 170; 1935, 1373. Bankstown, 1930, 91; 1932, 314; 1935, 959. The Communist vote doubled in each electorate contested, and trebled and quadrupled in a number. The bourgeois press preserves complete silence on the Communist election advance, whilst the Lang press weakly suggests that the Communists received their £25 deposits from the U.A.P.

In Queensland, the Communist Party received greatly improved votes, with the exception of Toowoomba and Fortitude Valley. The poll was especially good in Bowen, where, out of a total enrolment of 8111 voters, our candidates received 1102 votes, and in Herbert, where, with an enrolment of 10,137, the Communists received 1511 votes, and in Bremer, where, with an enrolment of 8890, we received 1026 votes, whilst Maryborough, with 9106 electors, recorded 782 for the Communists. Queensland comrades often claim that they will return the first Communists to Parliament in Australia, and with a careful approach and good mass work and the consistent exposure of Forgan Smith's Government they should succeed in the near future. Big possibilities open up before the Party in Queensland.

A further feature of the campaign was the good reception everywhere by the workers of the Communist Party and its programme. There was no hostility from workers under reformist influence, as has been the case in the past. The Party's election organisation was on a much better level than previously, and a number of recruits were made to the Party.

The election barometer thus recorded a decided growth of the influence of Communism in the chief Australian States, and showed that the radicalisation of the Australian proletariat and their turning away from reformism towards revolutionary Communism has not been stopped by the passing from the lowest point of the crisis to the depression of a peculiar kind.

Australian capitalism, like world capitalism, is not passing into a boom period. The reduced prices for wool, the difficulties in finding a market for exportable primary products, as evidenced by the abortive visit of Latham to Japan last year and the haggling of the Prime Minister (Lyons) with the representatives of British imperialism in London, the evidences of an approach-

ing drought period, show that the much lauded "improvement" and march to "prosperity" have been severely checked, and the conditions for a sharp decline for Australian capitalism are maturing. This means further attacks upon the working class, attacks which are already planned, as instanced by the attempts to extend relief work rates into various industries.

The tasks of the Communists are to organise the resistance of the workers, to unleash mass struggles against the attacks of the capitalists and their Governments, to organise the struggle against the war danger, in defence of the U.S.S.R. and against Fascism. In the course of these struggles the Communists must further expose the reformists and draw the workers away from the treacherous policy of the Labor Party. The conditions are very favorable for the fulfilment of these tasks and the winning of mass support for the Australian Communist Party.

—oOo—

BRITISH POLICY AFTER THE BERLIN MEETING

By R. PALME DUTT (London)

As before 1914, British policy, under cover of a heavy veil of reticence and apparent uncertainty, holds a key role in the gathering war situation. The Berlin and Moscow missions are preparing the ground for weighty decisions in the immediate future. The question of these decisions is giving rise to sharp conflicts in British capitalist circles between the powerful war-forces in the National Government, driving forward the anti-Soviet line in unity with German Fascism, and the more cautious elements which see sharply the danger to British interests of giving free reign to German expansion.

Since the advent of Hitler up to the Berlin meeting of Hitler and Simon, the British national Government has consistently and continuously supported, both diplomatically and also materially, German Fascism and its rearmament. The success of German Fascism in tearing up the military clauses of Versailles and carrying through its accelerating programme of rearmament and war preparation has been mainly and primarily due to the

support and patronage of the British Government, which has paralysed the opposition of France and other Versailles Powers. The aims of German Fascism in Eastern aggression have been open and unconcealed. Influential circles in Britain have openly supported these aims. Behind the German-Polish-Japanese alliance for war on the Soviet Union has continuously appeared the British hand.

At the same time British imperialism has had to take into consideration complicating factors. First, it was essential to maintain co-operation with France and to draw France into the Western imperialist front which Britain has continuously sought to build; and this has required a formally friendly attitude to France's indispensable condition of the Eastern Pact, which in practice British policy has consistently manoeuvred to weaken. Second, it was essential to prevent the menace of German aggression to the West or in directions not intended by British imperialism. These objects governed British policy at the London Conference of Britain and France in February. The essence of the London Agreement, from the British viewpoint, was the decision to annul the military clauses of Versailles and carry through the proposed Western Air Pact; at the same time a very vague allusion was added to the Eastern Pact, but only, as explained in the "Times" of February 6, as a concession to Laval of doubtful practical possibility. A campaign in the British press immediately followed, exactly parallel to the German line, to carry through the first two proposals at once, while delaying the Eastern Pact in view of German opposition.

The Berlin meeting was designed as the next step in this process. The preparations for the Berlin meeting marked the highest point of the open British-German co-operation. It had been preceded by the semi-official missions of Lothian and Allen to Berlin. Germany met the London Pact by the demand to negotiate with Britain alone. When it was proposed that Simon should go, not only to Berlin, but to Moscow, the British Cabinet, which had unanimously approved the Berlin meeting, by a majority rejected Simon's going to Moscow. When Germany delayed the visit for a fortnight in order to carry through its conscription coup of March 16, the alignment became even sharper. Britain immediately dispatched a Note without consultation with France and Italy, in practice condoning under cover of a formal protest, this military coup and humbly requesting if the visit might still take place. This British Note

caused jubilation in the German press, and consternation in France and Italy. The tone of the semi-official "Times" in condemning France's appeal to the League of Nations and hailing the Berlin visit ("A Good and a Bad Decision," 21/3/35) was so glaringly pro-German and anti-French in character as to arouse the unusual symptom of a direct letter of protest from Sir Austen Chamberlain and others, voicing the elements of opposition to the official policy. Thus the Berlin meeting was prepared under the signal of the most extreme British-German co-operation.

What were the British aims at Berlin? First, under cover of a merely "exploratory" visit (in fact there was nothing new to learn that was not already known), to rivet still closer the British-German co-operation. Second, to secure a suitable statement of German demands which Britain could then support as "reasonable and just." Third, to persuade Germany to modify its merely negative attitude on the Eastern Pact (too openly proclaiming its aggressive anti-Soviet aims) and accept a "compromise" put forward by Britain for replacing the Eastern Pact of Guarantee by some type of vague "consultive" pact which would be in practice valueless.

What was the outcome of Berlin? The actual Berlin negotiations have passed in a secrecy which is only partially diminished by the many semi-inspired and speculative reports. Despite, therefore, the many reports of an irreconcilable antagonism of view points, and Simon's own subsequent admission of a "considerable divergence of opinion," we need, in view of the National Government's record, to maintain an attitude of strong suspicion with regard to the results that may none the less have been reached. Nevertheless, it is clear that the public reports of Berlin so far available reveal a certain set-back in the British policy so far pursued and have strengthened the opposition forces in Britain.

From the reports of Berlin available two facts stand out:—
First, the anti-Soviet war aim was brought fully into the open.

Hitler

"declared it to be the mission of Nazi Germany to stem the tide of Bolshevism, and urged that Western Nations should unite for self protection." ("Daily Telegraph," 26/3/35.)

The Eastern Pact was not only ruled out, but the proposed British "compromise" was also ruled out. It was made clear that

Germany would consider no collective settlement for Europe that included the Soviet Union.

This too open declaration of the anti-Soviet war aim is highly embarrassing to British policy. It is true that the "Times" (26/3/35), after the first day, when Hitler had made these declarations, found the results highly "encouraging." But this flagrantly aggressive line came as a shock to the majority of British opinion, which, after the pacific professions of the National Government, was not yet prepared for such an open proclamation of anti-Soviet war aims.

Second, the maximum expansion programme of German imperialism, both military and territorial, was openly proclaimed. According to the "Daily Telegraph" report, the German official demands included (1) an army of 550,000, superior to France; (2) a navy of 400,000 tons; (3) an air force equal to France and Britain; (4) absorption of the Polish corridor; (5) absorption of the 3,500,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia; (6) Anschluss of Austria; (7) eventual expansion of the German frontier to the East; (8) restoration of German colonies.

This programme is fully alarming to British imperialism. There is no longer a question of merely using a subordinate rearméd Germany as a subservient tool against the Soviet Union. Britain is faced with the full demand of German imperialism for the redivision of the world. British diplomacy may well now be alarmed at the consequences of its own policy of rearming Germany.

This outcome of Berlin has enormously strengthened the opposition elements in British policy, which see sharply the danger of giving free reign to German expansion, and are conscious of the necessity in the interests of British imperialism to maintain close relations with France and check the menace of German aggression by a collective guarantee system, even including for the moment the Soviet Union. This line has been represented by an important section of Conservative and Foreign Office elements, voiced by Chamberlain, Churchill, the "Daily Telegraph," etc., as against the MacDonald-Simon-Baldwin line of the National Government majority, voiced by the "Times," and most brazenly proclaimed by the Rothermere chauvinist press, by the militarist service organs (e.g., the "Aeroplane") and by the open fascists (Mosely's Albert Hall speech calling for alliance with Germany to war on the Soviet Union).

The peace diplomacy of the Soviet Union, carried forward at the Moscow meetings with Eden, will put strong weapons in the hands of the more cautious elements which hesitate at the risks of the pro-Fascist war policy. But the war offensive in British imperialist circles is strong and dangerous. It is important to note that the "Times," even after the Berlin meeting, continues the old line. Its editorial of March 29 still finds "the credit side of the negotiations" at Berlin "by no means negligible," and while finding certain aspects of the German line "discouraging," nevertheless comments on the central question of the Eastern Pact and the anti-Soviet line:—

"The proposed Eastern Security Pact had—perhaps mistakenly—come to be regarded as the central point of a general European settlement. . . . It may be admitted that Herr Hitler not unnaturally regards himself as a defender of Western institutions against Bolshevism, and cannot therefore contemplate an arrangement which might automatically place him side by side with Russia in repelling the aggression of a third country."

The strong sympathy with the Hitler line is here still open, even after Berlin and its direct threat to British interests.

The pro-fascist anti-Soviet forces of British imperialism are still pressing their fullest offensive, even though the contradictions of imperialism have now brought them face to face with unexpected difficulties. We need to beware of letting these difficulties and the consequent fluctuations of policy and pacific speeches that may result lull our vigilance for a moment. The strongest fight needs to be carried forward against the anti-Soviet forces and their policy of the British-German alliance, and for the peace proposals of the Soviet Union, above all at the present critical moment, when far-reaching decisions for the immediate issue of war or peace are about to be taken by British imperialism.

THE INCREASED VOTE IN HARTLEY

By R. CRAM

The Party vote in the industrial electorate of Hartley has shown an increase of more than 300 per cent. over the figures of the last State elections. In the midst of the Western coalfields, covering the important railway centres of Lithgow and Wallerawang, embracing the Commonwealth Small Arms Factory and large lime and cement industries, the vote is both important and significant.

Let us analyse the present figures and see why it has been possible for the Party to make such rapid progress in the short period since the last Federal elections. Comrade Walsh in the 1932 State elections polled a total of 275 votes. At that time there were 11,383 electors enrolled for Hartley. Walsh's opponents were H. Knight (Lang Labor), 7080; Bracey (U.A.P.), 2440; and Dooley (Independent Labor), 1585; making a total poll of 11,380. ("Truth" figures, May 12, 1935.)

It will be seen from the above figures that there were 2440 Nationalist voters in the electorate in 1932. The other 8665 opposition votes were made up of the supporters of the "left" and the "right" wings of the A.L.P. It is important that Lithgow and Section 2 comrades note these figures, because the Labor Party, in an effort to recover its waning influence with the Hartley workers, is attempting to "prove" that the Communist vote increased by the votes of a section of the class enemy and its supporters.

In the election on May 11, 1935, the returning officer claims that there were 11,340 electors enrolled for Hartley. This is a reduction of 43 since 1932, and indicates, when we consider the number of young people who were entitled to their first vote in this election, that large numbers of workers have of recent years left the district. The explanation of this is to be found in the removal of the steel works to Port Kembla and the decline in the coal industry.

Only two candidates were in the field. Hamilton Knight (Lang Labor), who polled 7918 and R. Cram (Communist), with 1169. This vote is complete with the exception of a few odd postal and

absentee votes, so no material change will take place in the final result. In any case, the figures are complete enough to prove that the Communist vote is almost 100 per cent. working-class.

If you add the figures of the two candidates and the 1168 informal votes, the great majority of which were deliberately mutilated, you arrive at the total of 10,255. This total subtracted from 11,340 shows that 1085 electors did not vote, despite the fact that they are threatened with a penalty of £2. Taking the informal votes and the number that refused to vote, we get the large total of 2253 electors. Can we assume that this big total of electors were principally workers? Of course not. It is true that there is quite possibly a fair number of misguided and disgrusted toilers amongst the total, but we would be quite safe in saying that the overwhelming majority of those who made their votes informal, or refused to vote at all, were members of the U.A.P. and their supporters. In fact, the non-voters and vote emasculators almost equal the entire Nationalist vote at the 1932 elections! In analysing the voting from this angle, we see clearly that the Labor Party has very little cause to be jubilant over its "great victory."

It is quite obvious that the big increase in the Party vote took place at the expense of the Labor Party, which would seem to indicate the beginning of a large swing from the Lang Labor demagogues. Yet, despite this fact, Mr. Knight increased his vote by 838 when compared with 1932. In addition to this straight-out increase, he had to also make up the 800 (approximately) votes that he lost to our Party, making in all a total of approximately 1600. Where did these votes come from? Obviously from the Federal Labor supporters who voted for Dooley in 1932 and a section of the Nationalists.

This will need some explaining to the workers, Mr. Knight, after your screechings about a "united front of the U.A.P., U.C.P. and Communist Party" ("Clarion," May 11, 1935), and the refusal of the united front offer of the C.P. of A. We leave you to celebrate your "grand victory," but we will continue with Communist persistency to build and strengthen the workers' organisations, to weld the united front of struggle, and to go forward to victory over capitalism in the interests of our class.

The great improvement in the Party vote has taken place only over the last six months. This can be proved when we compare the present figures of 1169 with the last Federal election vote of 876. In the Federal electorate of Macquarie, which incorporates Hartley, there are over 50,000 electors enrolled. Out of this big

total the Party only recorded 876 votes, whereas in the recent State poll with only 11,340 electors, 2376 of whom did not register a vote, our Party increased its vote over the Federal election total by 293. Hartley is certainly the most industrialised section of the Federal electorate, but even allowing for this fact, the returns from the sectional polling booths within the confines of Hartley, for both Federal and State, reveal a big increase. To give one example: the main booth count in Lithgow for the last Federal election revealed approximately 405 votes for the Party, as against 700 in the recent State count. This increase is reflected in the other booths.

To what can be attributed this improvement? There can be no doubt that the economic crisis, combined with the treachery of the A.L.P., has played a big part in the radicalisation of the workers, but this cannot wholly explain the rapid increase in the prestige and the authority of the Party. We must look for other factors as well.

One of the chief reasons for the increased support can be found in the improved mass work of the Party in Section 2. Over the last three months a real turn has been made to the question of trade union work, the factories and the mines. Particular attention has been paid to the minor trade union officials, sectarianism has been avoided, and the case for the united front put logically and simply, and in a manner that has won ready response from the workers.

The result of this improved work was revealed in many ways during the course of the election campaign. The Lithgow Valley Miners' Lodge struck a levy of 1/- for the Party campaign funds. In the past such requests received very short shrift. Then again, in the most powerful lodge in the West, the State Mine, we were defeated for a levy of 1/- by only six votes! The Oakey Park Lodge rejected our request for a donation by the small margin of two votes. All these factors, coupled with the wide permission given the Party by the unions and miners' lodges to address their branch meetings, reveal the growing influence and support for the Party amongst the lower trade union officials.

Why did we pay so much attention to the question of addressing the trade union branch meetings? Simply because at the branch meetings you meet the trade union activists, the men who have the decisive influence amongst the workers in industry. Although, in the main, the attendance at the union meetings left a lot to be desired, the politically and industrially active workers were there, and that's the important thing.

By the above remarks we do not wish to imply that no other meetings and campaigning were undertaken. A most energetic campaign was developed on the relief jobs, many street meetings were held, and thousands of leaflets were distributed. But we placed the trade union connections in the forefront of the work.

Finally, there is another factor that had a big bearing on the increased vote and the improved mass work. Here we wish to speak of the recent cleansing of the Party which took place in Section 2. Alien elements and demoralised workers had been allowed by a weak leadership to creep in and around the Party. True, some of these people were willing workers. But this is not the point. Every Party member must realise that the proletariat, our class, has a standard of decency, cleanliness and culture, and Communists, who claim to be leaders of their class, cannot afford to sink below the standard of the average worker. They must in fact set the standard for our class. A Communist on the dole or relief work, or on meagre wages, is undoubtedly poor, but that cannot be offered as an excuse for bodily filth and untidy and greasy clothes. Nor can it be offered as an excuse for individual petty thieving and continual drunkenness kept up by "nipping" Party contacts for money. After all, one can be extremely poor and yet keep himself clean and presentable. Perhaps some comrades will say: "But these poor unfortunates are only products of capitalism." That is true. But the Party is not a philanthropic society for the rehabilitation of demoralised and declassed elements on the basis of sickly sentiment. To waste time on such degenerates, who will make no effort to help themselves, at the expense of the mass connections with the real proletarian cadres, so necessary to overthrow capitalism and end such degradation for ever, is stupidly petty-bourgeois and actually assists in perpetuating the cause of their demoralisation—capitalism itself.

The District I Committee realised this fact and took drastic action. A number of the disreputable elements were expelled and exposed with other elements who were close to the Party and posed as Communists. Members who were beginning to become demoralised due to long periods of unemployment were disciplined and given certain work to do and a time limit in which to make a radical alteration in their personal appearance and habits. A leaflet was issued to the workers explaining what the Party had done and asking them for support. The response was almost immediate. Compliments commenced to come in to the Section Committee from the best types amongst the workers. Many

backed up their remarks by joining the Party and others contributed freely to the election funds. And this cleansing, led by the Central and District Committee, is in no small measure responsible for our increased vote during the recent elections.

Stock must be taken in all Districts and Sections of the Party, and where it is found that somewhat similar conditions exist, a Party cleansing should be undertaken. But here we wish to sound a note of warning. Extreme care will be necessary before any action is commenced. A complete analysis of the given locality will need to be undertaken. Broad contact with the masses will have to be established to gain a correct opinion of the reactions of the workers to the behavior of this or that Party member. Cleansing the Party in the sense that it was undertaken in Section 2 does not mean a wholesale purge, an elimination of good but backward Party members, those lacking understanding of how to work, and incorrectly described by some of our "left" heroes as "right" opportunists, squibs, and other such epithets. No, it does not mean mass expulsions, nor does it mean the setting of a high standard of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism which must be reached before a worker can enter the Party. It means that the Party must present itself to the masses minus demoralised or degenerate elements. It means that the members of our Party must be courageous and self-sacrificing, that they set a standard of political and moral conduct which will gain the confidence of their class, and enable them to mix freely as leaders and equals with the best sections of the workers.

If we can do this, without excesses of any kind, the progress of the Party will be more rapid and substantial than ever.

—oOo—

HITLER'S WAR POLICY & THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

[REPRINT FROM "INPRECOR"]

In his conversations with Sir John Simon, Hitler again gave aggressive expression to the demands of German imperialism.

It is rumoured that he demanded a great standing army fully equipped with the most modern weapons, and air fleet equal in strength to the largest in Europe, and a navy equal to one-third of the British Navy and destined to attack the Soviet Union from

the Baltic. He stated that Germany would favour a "Danube Pact" putting German imperialism in a position to dominate Austria and barring other nations from interfering. He rejected the Eastern Pact and offered the services of the Third Reich as the advance guard in a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. It is alleged that he also put forward other demands of the Third Reich concerning territorial changes, especially the incorporation in the Third Reich of Memel and the Sudetic territories of Czechoslovakia. The Hitler dictatorship, having reintroduced conscription, is now taking the next step in the series of its war-mongering provocations.

This aggressive attitude taken by Hitler is dictated by considerations of both foreign and domestic policy. In his foreign policy Hitler reckons on taking advantage of the contradictions existing between the other great Powers and also within the British and the French bourgeoisie. In his home policy, he is attempting to overcome the increasing difficulties of the Fascist regime, i.e., of monopoly capitalism, by pursuing a policy of war.

The Hitler Government took power at a time when the economic crisis was passing into a depression of a special character. On this basis the Hitler dictatorship, by armament orders, State-assisted "work schemes," wage-cuts, and increased taxes, achieved a certain increase in industrial production, which, however, was limited to the home market. Since the autumn of 1934 the contradictions inherent in this revival are beginning to show more and more. During the winter, employment figures have declined by 1.2 million. Industrial production—owing to considerable armament orders—remained at the same level or increased somewhat during the last months; but the industries producing commodities for immediate consumption show a fall in their production. The balance of foreign trade is strongly on the adverse side and the excess of imports over exports in January and February reached 60 per cent. of the corresponding figure for the whole of the past year. The scarcity of raw materials is considerable. There is a shortage of foreign means of payment, and the financial situation is unfavorable. The agricultural crisis continues unmitigated. The total picture of German economic life shows no prosperity and no prospects of it, but rather a standstill, with a tendency towards deterioration.

The living standards of the masses are deteriorating more and more. The cuts in wages and benefits, the "voluntary contributions" and rising prices have considerably lowered the

standard of the living conditions of the workers during the last two years. The deterioration is still progressing; even the official figures of retail trade returns show a falling off since the autumn of 1934, thus indicating the growing poverty not only of the workers who consume less, but also of the peasants and small tradesmen who sell less. The decline is strongest in foodstuffs, proving that the masses of the people are approaching nearer and nearer to starvation. The discontent of the workers is universal and on the increase. It extends to the workers who formerly supported the Nazis, and narrows the mass basis of Fascism.

Opposition is strongest in the shops and is manifested sporadically in acts of resistance. In the villages resistance to and sabotage of Nazi decrees occur sporadically, as in the case of the Hessen fruitgrowers. In several meetings of small tradesmen, especially in industrial areas, there have been very stormy scenes.

The economic difficulties and the discontent among the masses lead to conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the Fascist leaders. There is a conflict of interest between the industrial employers who oppose increased food prices because they want to pay lower wages, and between the landlords who want to pocket higher profits by increasing the price of their products. This conflict finds expression, for instance, in the conflict between Schacht and Darre, Minister for Agriculture. Differences exist between the exporting industries and other groups as to the degree of economic self-sufficiency. There exist—concealed for the time being—differences between the Reichswehr Generals and the leaders of the S.A., the S.S. and the Nazi Party about the distribution of power in the State machinery. Finally, there are differences between the churches, who do not want to lose their influence with their working-class parishioners and are collaborating with certain groups of the bourgeoisie, and the Hitler dictatorship, which, representing the interests of monopoly capital as a whole, extends its claim of total control of the churches, and is attempting to incorporate them completely in the Nazi apparatus.

The Hitler regime is seeking a way out of all these difficulties by armaments, chauvinist incitement, and by a war for an imperialist redivision of Europe at the expense of the U.S.S.R. and of the smaller States.

Years of clandestine rearmament have now been followed by the proclamation of Hitler, reintroducing conscription. Arma-

ments and the militarisation of the population are now proceeding in the Third Reich at an increased pace and with increased vigor. The armament factories have received numerous new orders and the rapid rise of armament shares on the German stock exchanges conveys an idea of the pace at which aircraft, tanks, and guns are being manufactured day and night. A "German Zeppelin Shipping Company" has just been formed, under the chairmanship of Goering; it is disguised as a limited liability company with a paid-up capital of 9.6 millions, and destined to facilitate the construction of a fleet of military airships and the military training of the crews needed to man them. The recruiting lists for the 36 army divisions are quite ready. In addition, a hundred thousand young people will be pressed into the Labor Service to replace the young men and women who are due for discharge at the beginning of April. Frick, Home Secretary of the Reich, declared at a meeting of the German Labor Front that the Labor Camps are preliminary training camps for the army. This applies also to the Hitler Youth, to the S.A., which is now in a process of reorganisation, to the Steel Helmets and students' corps, and to the Air Defence League, which is now being turned into a pre-military training school. As to military leadership, the best forces are being assembled to form a great General Staff, which is to include Ludendorff and, if one is to believe persistent rumors, General von Seeckt, who is returning from China.

Armaments and military training proceed parallel with an unceasing chauvinist-militarist propaganda intended to turn the workers from their opposition to the Fascist regime and to harness their discontent as a motor to the war-chariot of Hitlerism. The Saar result gave a mighty impulse to this chauvinist incitement. This is now backed up by the slogans, "Hitler smashes Versailles" and "Military supremacy brings work and wages," and carried on with the greatest intensity. The War Ministry has recently joined in with the Propaganda Ministry to carry on this propaganda. The Generals held a "Heroes' Commemoration Day" and made speeches in praise of conscription. Blomberg has issued a manifesto to the youth of Germany, and the Reich Defence Ministry publishes articles in the press describing actual or fictitious instances of "enthusiasm for conscription" in order to whip up feeling. The main point in the chauvinist propaganda is hostility to the Soviet Union. The lying campaign of slander of the Nazi newspapers is backed up by

anti-Bolshevik lectures and by a spate of anti-Bolshevik books crammed with lies and the most infamous libels on the U.S.S.R.

Chauvinist incitement and militarisation are accompanied by a fresh wave of terrorism. Fiete Schultze, an intrepid fighter against Fascism and leader of the Red Front Fighters, has just been sentenced to death in Hamburg after a farcical trial. Raids and round-ups are going on continually; thus 400 workers were recently arrested in Wuppertal and two of them foully murdered. The trial of Ernst Thaelmann is to take place soon, and without due warning. This terrorism is meant to intimidate the working class and the anti-fascists to such an extent that the war policy of Hitler may be carried on without a hitch. In order to enable the employers more easily to rob and oppress the workers and make use of them for Fascist war adventures, the employers' organisation has been linked up with the German Labor Front, putting the latter in a position of complete subordination to Schacht and monopoly capital.

What is the effect of all these measures of the warmonger Hitler on the political situation at home?

The increase in armaments, of course, gives a temporary further impulse to economy and, together with the spring season, can for the moment cover the previous decline in the home trade at various points. But on the other hand, the increased armaments lead to an increased tension in the finances in a financial situation already difficult. The increased requirements in raw materials necessary for armaments will have the effect of increasing the shortage of raw materials, of throttling still further the import of important staple foods, of increasing the cost of living and worsening the trade balance and reducing the reserves of foreign bills.

Armaments and the great conscript army demand huge sums. Who is to pay them? Naturally, the working people. The Hitler dictatorship is already taking measures for increased plundering of the people. The attack on wages by the employers is strengthened, and in this connection a comprehensive offensive against wages is being prepared after the election of confidential councils. A new "Gift collection" for the army has been planned. New fraudulent financial operations on the model of the last Reich loan of 500 million marks, which will simply be imposed by decree on the Savings Banks at the cost of the liquid reserves, are being prepared.

The Hitler dictatorship was able, by means of chauvinist ex-

Railway. It looked as if Japan intended to make the long-expected attack on the Soviet Union. The Third Reich already saw its dreams being realised, and drew up the notorious memorandum, which Hugenburg later submitted to the World Economic Conference in London and which demanded the dismemberment of the Soviet Union.

One cannot help recalling these facts now, when, according to the whole of the world press, the diplomatic action of Mr. Eden, the Lord Privy Seal, in Moscow consisted mainly in convincing the Soviet Union that Great Britain had no intention whatever of encouraging the enemies of the Soviet Union, but, on the contrary, honestly desired to co-operate in the system of securing peace, which Soviet diplomacy is endeavoring to realise. This took place at the same time as the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway was settled, and thereby the danger of war threatening the Soviet Union in the Far East has been considerably reduced, at least for the time being.

What a change in the international situation in the space of two years, and, before all, what a tremendous strengthening of the situation of the Soviet Union.

This strengthening of the situation of the Soviet Union is further emphasised by the fact that she has become the leading Power among those States which wish to establish a system for securing peace, that she is marching at the head of all the nations which wish to prevent a repetition of the horrors of 1914-1918. And this is the most decisive factor at the present moment in judging the international situation of the Soviet Union.

The world to-day is on the edge of an abyss. Fascism—driven by the contradictions of its situation—is working systematically at letting loose a fresh world war. On March 16, Hitler declared that in introducing general conscription he only wished to restore the honour of the German people, and that after this had been done the world would have nothing to fear from Germany. But in the Berlin conversations with Sir John Simon, Hitler elaborated a programme of world conquest, for the achievement of which he is prepared to sacrifice the lives of millions of Germans and millions and millions of non-Germans.

The measures proposed and consistently propagated by Soviet diplomacy for averting a war of aggression have now suddenly come to be recognised even by the threatened capitalist countries

as the only means of saving humanity. After Mr. Eden's visit to Moscow and M. Titulescu's visit to Paris, it would appear that the system of security guarantees is approaching realisation. At the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that there are still exceedingly influential bourgeois circles outside of Germany and Poland which are working in a contrary direction. Sir Henry Deterding, Lord Rothermere and their agents in Paris are intent on frustrating the Soviet's work for peace. It is necessary to launch a tremendous movement in favour of peace in order that the will of the enormous majority of the people for peace shall be realised.

This fight for peace, however, is not only a fight to avoid the terrible destruction of life and property which a modern war would involve; it must also have quite other consequences. If Fascism is compelled to abandon its war plans, then it will no longer be able to justify the tremendous financial sacrifices connected with armaments.

In addition, the artificial economic revival resulting from the powerful stimulus given the war industry will collapse. The resultant intensification of the economic crisis, however, is bound to have serious inner-political consequences. Thus the fight against war is, in a double sense, a fight against Fascism. It is not by chance that the Soviet Union is at the head of those countries and peoples which are fighting to secure peace. The Soviet Union is the only country which has no need or desire for foreign conquest, which has no unemployment, and no economic crisis, and where the prosperity of the population is increasing from day to day. The Soviet Union does not need to make war in order to capture new markets; it does not need war in order to divert attention from conditions at home. In our fight for peace we must again and again point to these facts in order that the working people of all countries shall see in the Soviet Union the example which they must follow, if they wish finally to abolish the causes of war.

If the example which the Soviet Union sets all countries were followed, it would mean not only the end of war, but the end of exploitation of man by man, the end of poverty and misery in general.

The fight for peace, the fight to avoid the tremendous sacrifices which war demands, will, if we act correctly, develop into a fight extending far beyond its original scope and become a fight for the emancipation of humanity.

We see, therefore, what enormous consequences the strengthening of the international situation of the Soviet Union has for the working people, provided, of course, that we on our part fulfil our duty to the utmost and make full use of every given opportunity in order to realise the united front against war and Fascism.

Is it worth while, in this situation, engaging in a controversy with those Social-Democratic papers which wish to make use of the visit of Mr. Eden to Moscow as an occasion to demand the liquidation of the Communist International, in order to cover up their own treacherous policy, and to deride the Soviet Union for observing international diplomatic usages? Does it really require such great intelligence in order to realise that it is quite another thing when the chairman of the Second International, M. Vandervelde, goes to the King of Belgium—the chief representative of the exploiting class—in order to take the oath that he will carry out his orders, than when a Soviet diplomat, as representative of a workers and peasants' Power, has an interview with a foreign ruler in order to submit to him his credentials. Do not the social-democrats realise that they only serve the Fascists and the war-mongers with their sophistry?

The international working class, including the social-democratic workers, fortunately view the successes of the Soviet Union from quite another standpoint. They will take their place in the ranks of those forces which are fighting against war and Fascism. They will help to prevent war, to overthrow Fascism, to abolish imperialism and capitalism, and set up a world Soviet Union which will put an end to oppression and exploitation of the whole of humanity.