

VOL. 3, No. 12

DEC., 1936

17 DEC 1936



# THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

## Principal Contents:

NEWS BEHIND THE  
NEWS  
TWO MONTHS OF  
FIGHTING IN SPAIN  
QUESTIONS OF THE DAY  
TRADE UNION NOTES  
LIFE OF ENGELS  
STRUGGLE IN CHINA  
INDICTMENT OF THE  
TROTSKY - ZINOVIEV  
TERRORISTS (Concl.)

DECEMBER 1936 : PRICE SIXPENCE



# The Communist Review

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

Vol. 3, No. 12

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

December, 1936

## NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

### Lord Elphus an Australian Peer

By E. W. CAMPBELL

Was it not Mark Twain that entertained us with the doings of a Yankee at the court of King Arthur? We believe it was, and, whilst we might not lay claim to possessing a humorist of Mark's calibre here, nevertheless, if certain rumors that are circulating in authoritative quarters are not without foundation, a golden opportunity will exist for a Lower or a J. McC. to get busy in regaling us with what happened to an Aussie in the House of Lords.

A certain weekly journal claims to be in a position to announce that all arrangements have been completed for the elevation of Stanley Melbourne Bruce to the peerage. So it seems that the visions of the squattocracy of the eighteen-forties may, after all, belatedly materialise.

What title the august Mr. Bruce will take is still in doubt. Will it be Lord Stinker of Footscray or Viscount Woolloomooloo? Whatever it is, if it does eventuate, it will be an affront to the democratic traditions of Australia and an insult to the memory of those pioneers who fought so well, if not at all times wisely, for free and independent democratic institutions for this country. Bad enough that we should suffer a financial aristocracy, bad enough that our organs of administration should be cluttered up with antediluvian remnants of the past in the shape of governors, etc. But, worse, if this shall be given the appearance of stability by the creation of an Australian peerage.

With the immaculate carcass of Mr. Bruce disposed of, it is said the way is open for a Cabinet re-shuffle. Menzies is being tipped for the Prime Ministership, Casey is to be High Commissioner, and Stevens is to step into his shoes as Federal Treasurer.

The present verbal duel between Casey and Stevens on financial policy seems to corroborate the likelihood of something along these lines being in the wind. Mr. Lyons at one part was offered the High Commissioner's job, but is said to have declined for family reasons. Work it out for yourself—if Tubby Stevens's brief jaunt ran into about five thousand, how would Joe Lyons

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS, by E. W. Campbell ..	1
TWO MONTHS OF FIGHTING IN SPAIN, by Vicente Arroyo ..	9
THE QUESTIONS OF THE DAY, by L. Sharkey ..	16
TRADE UNION NOTES, by Tom Wright ..	22
AUSTRALIA'S FIGHTS FOR DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM, AND PROGRESS, by J. N. Rawling ..	25
THE LIFE OF FRIEDRICH ENGELS, by "Student" ..	36
FIFTEEN YEARS OF STRUGGLE IN CHINA, by Wan Min ..	41
THE INDICTMENT OF THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV TERRORISTS (Concluded) ..	54



and his Australian eleven go on a High Commissioner's pittance in London? Interesting developments loom large on the political horizon. The split in the Labor Party is only rivalled by the disension within the U.A.P., to say nothing of the friction between it and the Country Party.

Let the A.L.P. once unite its own ranks, and enter into joint action with the Communists in mobilising the masses around a programme of improved living standards, and there is no reason why the Lyons den should not be very quickly cleaned out.

### *The Keelung Incident*

On October 7, there took place a little incident that caused Vice-Admiral Sir Chas. Little, Commander-in-Chief of the China Station, to postpone a visit to Japanese waters. What could this tiny happening have been that so perturbed this high personage? It must have indeed been serious. Anything which detained the Commander-in-Chief of the China Station from a cruise in Japanese waters would be almost disastrous enough to restrain our own dear ships of the line from churning up Melbourne waters at Cup time. Can it be that some breath of scandal about Edward's doings on the "Nahlin" has been circulating in the Mikado's court and has been wafted eastward to the outraged admiral?

No. The facts are that three British naval ratings were beaten up by Japanese policemen for allegedly evading payment of a taxi fare. "What?" you ask. "Is that sufficient to cause all this to-do?" "Is the beating up of ratings so unknown to the British Navy as to give rise to so much bother?" Shades of the "Bounty"—No. But the fact that it was Japanese that administered the hiding makes all the difference. You see relations between the two countries are somewhat strained at present, and things that otherwise would be passed over as trivial assume an importance warranting diplomatic exchanges.

You will remember that earlier in the month Japanese marines were landed in Honkew, the Japanese quarter of the International settlement at Shanghai, whilst Jap. warships stood by in the harbour.

All over the matter of a few demands that Nippon has served upon the land of the Dragon.

These demands only amounted to the five northern provinces of China becoming independent a la Manchukuo, and Japan assuming virtual control over the whole economic life of the country, by having advisors appointed to the Chinese Government.

If your memory is very good, you might also recollect that in 1922 there was born the Washington Nine-Power Treaty, purporting to guarantee the territorial integrity of China and establish the principle of the Open Door.

When Japan barged rudely into Manchuria in 1931, this jolly old treaty was well on the way to being interred, but only because Johnny Bull signified a willingness to aid in the performance of diplomatic funeral rites.

The collective security chicken, thus betrayed, is now coming home to roost. Britain had hoped that the door, whilst no longer remaining open, would at least be left ajar. That Japan would be content with her conquests in Northern China and would still leave British interests dominant and intact in the centre and the south. The gamble now shows some signs of having gone astray. Japan is proving not so keen as some people would like her to be in tackling the Soviet Union, and if she succeeds in enforcing the demands mentioned, then the dear old British lion's tail will be given an awful tweak. This, more than concern for the physical welfare of its sons, caused the roar over the Keelung incident.

### *An Inter-American Peace Conference*

No, this does not mean that a halt has been called to the civil war being waged against the Pacific Coast strikers. Neither does it mean that energetic measures are being taken to disarm the fascist Black Legions.

It refers to the gathering in Buenos Aires of 21 nations of the American continent to "show the world's war-weary people that the scourge of war can and will be eliminated." At least that is what the U.S. Secretary of State claims. We forgot to add "in the western hemisphere."

This must mean that little "ball games" like that between Paraguay and Bolivia, which almost entirely decimated the population of both states, will not be allowed in future. The avowed object of "maintaining peace" is laudable enough in itself, but when it is coupled with "stimulating the progress of the Americas," we have an insoluble contradiction. The progress of the Americas (read the U.S.A.) can only be stimulated at the expense of other great powers in the epoch of imperialism, and we are wondering what the reaction of Britain will be. There is quite a tidy wad of British capital sunk in some of the components of the "Americas" of the conference. Particularly the Argentine. And anything that will draw these states closer around Uncle Sam is sure to offend J. Bull, Esq.



The fact that the world-wide antagonism between Britain and the United States sinks out of sight sometimes, or is paled by the glare of more immediately flaming contradictions in Europe and the Far East, by no means signifies that it has sunk into limbo. Now and again we are given a sharp reminder of its existence.

The Washington Treaty expires in December and Britain has communicated with the United States proposing that Article 19 be renewed. This article is the one prohibiting the fortification of new insular fleet bases in the Far East and Pacific and the modernisation of existing bases. The proposal was curtly turned down. It is the intention of the United States to go ahead and fortify Guam, and possibly the Philippines, although the effectiveness of the latter is now in some doubt, due to Japanese entrenchment in the Marshall and Caroline islands. The little matter of a clause in the mandate which prohibits fortifications is not thought to have deterred the gentlemen of Nippon from having already furnished their nest in this quarter with eggs of steel and concrete.

Japan is just as much against a renewal as the U.S.A., and is desirous of adding the Bonin Is., the Loo Choo islands and Formosa to her string of "vital defence links." The U.S. Secretary for the Navy (Mr. Swanson) adds point to the spurning of Britain's suggestion by stating that "fortifications must be met with fortifications. One menace must be met with another menace."

And so the race in naval armaments, which was given an impetus by the breakdown of the London Conference, promises to become a stampede in the near future, when attention is turned to island bases.

Ruling the waves is getting to be a pretty expensive business for old lady Britannia. The £300,000,000 recently allotted for armaments will need some additions if Hong Kong and Singapore are due to be refurbished. The Labor Party might say, "We should worry." But give ear to this. Lord Rothermere, after a visit to Singapore, said "unless British Ministers resolutely determined to make Singapore an air and naval fortress as strong as Honolulu, the money now spent would be thrown away. The Australian, New Zealand and Indian Governments should frankly be asked to contribute not less than 60 per cent. of the cost of maintenance. There is needed 25 to 30 Air Force squadrons, some 10,000 men and 30 or 40 submarines, to say nothing of other naval craft."

In view of this, and seeing that Australia is already bound to co-operate in measures of imperial defence, what becomes of the

government assurances that recruits will not be utilised for service outside Australia?

How much of the £8,876,000 "defence" vote, which the Labor opposition failed to vote against on the ground that they "could not oppose their own policy" (vide Mr. Curtin) will go in this direction?

### *An Olive Branch on Bayonet's Point*

This is what Mussolini recently proffered the world. And an olive branch is just as convenient a camouflage as anything else, we should say. Although less and less care is being taken by the fascists to conceal their aims. And the dove of world peace is in danger at any minute of being dished up on a gleaming platter of steel. Following closely upon his tirade about bayonets and olive branches, the black-hearted bully of Rome delivered himself of provocative ideas on the Mediterranean and the future of Europe.

The League of Nations had been shipwrecked, collective security had never existed, thus ran the tenor of his remarks. Coming to relations with Great Britain, Mussolini declared: "While the Mediterranean for Britain was only a road, a short-cut to her outlying territories, for Italy it was a matter of life itself," but, he went on, "Italy would not menace, nor cut the road, at the same time it demanded that its vital rights and interests must be respected." "There must be a reciprocal recognition between the two countries of their individual interests." "A rapidly concluded and clear-cut Italo-British entente is absolutely necessary and indispensable to the peace of Europe and the future of the Mediterranean."

In all of the foregoing Mussolini by inference says he has the upper hand in the Mediterranean now and is urging Britain to recognise the same without further fuss, and come to terms. However, the terms envisaged by Mussolini would leave Italy in the stronger position. This is indicated by the strong insistence on the fact that the Mediterranean is a matter of life for Italy and only a road for Great Britain. Once this was recognised, it would follow naturally that the country whose "life" depended upon it would have the "right" to maintain superior forces to a country for whom it was merely a convenience.

When he spoke about Hungary and the accord with Germany, Mussolini was even more outright in fanning the flames of war. "Italy recognises Hungary's courage and spirit of sacrifice; it is the most mutilated country in Europe. Four million Hungarians live outside its borders, but Italy's sympathy will soon find ex-



pression with them." In these pointed terms does Mussolini encourage Hungary to push ahead with the revision of its borders to include the 4,000,000. Even as Hitler is bent upon embracing German nationals. Such revision can only accrue from war, and Hungary, if not in so many words, then at least by inference, is being told she can rely upon Italy's support.

Regarding Germany it was said: "The meetings in Berlin have resulted in an understanding on specified urgent problems. The vertical line between Berlin and Rome is not a dividing line, but an axis round which all peaceful European States can collaborate."

In case there is any misunderstanding of what Mussolini means by peaceful, let us quote him further: "Our marching orders are peace, but it is armed peace." In other words, preparation for war, for redivision of the world, and any other similarly peaceful states in Europe, like Germany and Hungary, for instance, are invited to collaborate. Thus does fascism function as the chief instigator of war in the world of today.

### *Little Man, What Now?*

General Goering, speaking at the Sports Palace in Berlin, followed up the recently coined slogan of one of his colleagues about "Guns Before Butter," by appealing to all patriots to eat much less, because "too much fat makes the stomach too greedy." Goering was hardly a judicious choice on the part of the Nazis for leading such a campaign. He is reputed to be one of the fattest men in the land himself and weighs in the vicinity of 20 stone. It would be poetic justice if his continued braying about the shortage of fat in Germany gave rise to the idea among his followers about boiling down his own carcass. Not such a fantastic idea after all, having in mind some of the maniacal deeds already standing to the credit of the Nazis.

Continuing his harangue, Goering declared, "We want a share of the world's raw materials and we shall get them." He didn't say how, but he gave a broad hint. "Though the density of population in England and Germany was approximately the same, Britain had one-third of the world as colonies, while Germany had none."

The celebrated four-year-plan of Germany was also mentioned. We've been reading up a little about this plan. It seems that the dictatorship having sunk so much money in armaments, has no small change left whereby to purchase necessary raw materials abroad. What can't be got outside Germany, therefore, must be obtained within. So the chemists and scientists

have been set to work to discover synthetic products. Truly some of their achievements are remarkable. Sugar is converted into motor spirit to drive tanks and armored cars. This leaving into motor spirit of sugar, it becomes necessary to transform wood into same. We're not up to the part yet where they find a substitute to make up the deficiency of wood, but we did learn that a way has been found to make grass an edible foodstuff.

We do hope this secret is as carefully guarded as those of the War Office. Otherwise temptation might be placed in the way of Joe Lyons and Tubby Stevens.

Goebbels also spoke at this meeting in the same strain as Goering. "Germany is now a great power," he claimed, "which cannot be ignored by the world." "Germany will never renounce her colonial claims. We must share in the world's treasures."

Surely the masses of Germany must be asking themselves to an ever-greater extent, "What's wrong with us sharing in our own country's treasures, by ridding ourselves of fascism?" Hitler himself exposed the price paid by the toilers for Germany's restoration to Great Power status. "Thirty million Germans," he said, "are in need of assistance from the Winter Help Fund."

### *The Garden of Eden*

We are not here referring to the legendary domicile vacated by Adam and Eve at the point of a fiery sword, whereby a precedent was created for latter-day evictions. But the domains of empire and their immaculate tender, Mr. Anthony Eden.

This gentleman, idol of Bond Street, and British Foreign Minister, found it incumbent to relieve himself of a few remarks upon the international situation, in the House of Commons, on November 5.

The inspiration for his talk derived from some previous words let fall by one, Benito Mussolini. We have elsewhere mentioned this oration, part of which referred to England's interest in the Mediterranean.

The gallant Anthony was quick to correct Benito's error of formulation. "For us the Mediterranean is not a short-cut, but a main arterial road," quoth Eden. "We welcome the assurance given by Signor Mussolini that Italy does not mean to threaten this route, nor propose to interrupt it. Nor do we. Our position is the same."

Why so much play upon words? you might ask. What difference does it make whether the Mediterranean is called a short-cut or a glance to leg?

Actually it makes a whale of a difference. If Mussolini was allowed to get away with his definition uncorrected, it would be



a stepping-stone to more ambitious claims. A short-cut is usually a route of convenience, traversing the property of someone, whose goodwill alone tolerates its use by others. Naturally the someone has the right at any time to close down the short-cut. Hitherto, Britain, by her superior strength and advantage of strategic positions, has laid claim to the title deeds of the Mediterranean.

But the successes in Abyssinia and the anticipated gains from assisting the fascists in Spain, have sent a few trumps the way of Italy, and a little bluffstakes now and then being relished by the wily men, Mussolini tries to run a blazer on Britain and establish his supremacy in these waters.

That is why Eden was so emphatic about insisting that the Mediterranean was a "main arterial road." You see, a main road remains open for common use at all times, and if any one of the users cares to open a little pie-stall along the route, like Gibraltar, Malta, etc., well it's their business, and anyone asking them to move on is out of court.

Mr. Eden also deprecated the sneering remarks in some quarters against the League of Nations, and intimated that his country would never do that. It would have been a far, far better thing to do if the Hon. Anthony had tried to analyse just how much Britain was responsible for the disrepute into which the league is falling. He could have gone back to 1931, when Britain gave diplomatic support to Japan's invasion of Manchuria. He could have reviewed the Abyssinian events and the happenings behind the scenes, a glimpse of which was revealed in the Hoare-Laval plan. He could, in short, have shown in a thousand ways how British policy, whilst giving lip service to collective security, step by step in its practice betrayed this principle and objectively encouraged the fascist countries in their aggressive aims.

Goering and Goebbels came in for a gentle chiding and received a hint to tone down on the colonies racket.

The tendency in Germany to blame Britain for her economic difficulties was not in accord with fact and could not be accepted, said Mr. Eden. He went on to draw attention to the Anglo-German payments agreement of 1934, which left £45 out of every £100 spent by Britain on German goods at the disposal of Germany herself. Rather strange, don't you think, Britain conveniently provides Germany with a large part of the wherewithal to re-arm, and then the statesmen tell the people of Britain that the terrible menace of the dictators must be met by being prepared—to arm to the teeth.

## Two Months of Fighting in Spain

By VICENTE ARROYO (Madrid)

(Reprinted from "Inprecor," September 26, 1936)

**TWO** months have passed since the day on which the whole of the Spanish reaction, under the leadership of the traitorous generals, sought by a coup de main to destroy the liberties which the Spanish people have gained in hard struggles, to plunge Spain into the blackest reaction, drown the democratic system in the blood of the people and, on mountains of corpses and ruins, set up a regime of terror and misery. Two months of hard fighting the like of which is hardly to be found in history, during which the Spanish people, in spite of palpable inferiority in regard to weapons and equipment, have day after day added glorious pages to their history; two months of fighting which has compelled the admiration even of the fascist criminals themselves and won the sympathy of the whole of the civilised world. Two months of life-and-death struggle between an obsolete society based on a praetorian militarism and boundless exploitation, and a society which is coming into the world in the course of struggle and is born out of the courageous elan of its best sons.

### The Result of the Two Months' Fighting

And what is the result of this two months of fighting?

The fascist generals, who for two years had made careful preparations for revolt, hoped for a speedy and easy victory over the unarmed people. They were so sure of victory that they had already prepared and arranged everything for the future: the new government, the monarchist colors, lists of men who were to be immediately "removed," and even the renaming of the streets. They had at their disposal millions which the bank magnates had stolen from the people. The plutocracy, the army, the clergy, the defence organisations of the state, such as the police and various treacherous governors (for example the governor of Toledo) were on their side or acting in collusion with them. They reckoned not only on the sympathy, but on the active support of international fascism. And against all these forces there stood the unarmed people, whom they intended to take by surprise by means of a rapid, well-organised coup de main, in order then, by a regime of terror, to push it back into slavery.

But their first plan miscarried, for they reckoned without their host—the people.

The Spanish people—the workers, the peasants, the middle class, all those who love freedom and justice, all anti-fascists—



the people whom they thought they could subjugate because they were without means of defence, without weapons to which they could reply to the attack, rose like one man in heroic elan and not only withstood the attack, but in several places gained the victory.

In a few days, in fact in a few hours, the people in several of the most important towns defeated the fascists and broke the insurrectionary movement. This was the case in Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia, Malaga, Biscaya.

The first surprise attack, with the help of which the fascists hoped to establish their rule, was not only repelled, but was frustrated. The Spanish people have added a magnificent page to their history and concluded in a brilliant, triumphant manner the first stage of this cruel struggle, which was not of their seeking, but in which they have played their part with magnificent courage.

After this first encounter, after the people had achieved victory on half of the territory of Spain, the task arose of examining and studying the whole extent of the movement. The Spanish people, the parties of the People's Front, and above all the Communist Party, clearly realised that what they had to deal with was not a classic military coup d'etat, such as has been so frequent in Spain, but a real war, which had been prepared down to its smallest detail. It was recognised that nearly all the cadres of the army (eight divisions out of a total of nine) had broken their oath of loyalty and risen in arms against the constitutional government. The few honorable exceptions among the higher officers who remained true to the Constitution and the people only served to reveal more clearly the extent of rottenness and corruption which had seized the praetorian army.

Only a few sections of the regular forces—air force and navy—ranged themselves from the first moment on the side of the people; but here, too, it was the non-commissioned officers, petty officers and sailors who, like the brave sailors of the Black Sea, rose against their treacherous leaders, threw them overboard, and placed the ships at the disposal of the people in its fight against the criminal counter-revolution.

Glorious and historic pages in the history of our navy and our air force!

But in a struggle such as this heroism is not enough. It had to be supplemented by the organisation of the fighting forces of the people.

The military leaders of the fascists, who had a regular war organisation at their disposal, were to see how, in the most important towns of Spain, this military organisation was swiftly

vanquished by the workers, although they had no military technique or training, with the weapons they had managed to seize by storming the barracks.

But the rebel generals, determined to carry on the fight to the bitter end in order to attain their criminal purpose, made every effort to strengthen their forces, and to banish their fear of the heroism of the workers by means of the bloody assistance of fierce and blindly loyal mercenaries; the moors entered Spain as a conquered land; wherever they passed they left painful memories of their uncontrollable and bloodthirsty savagery.

But this was not sufficient. The fascist leaders had forced the soldiers, sons of the people whom they had basely deceived, to fight on their side. They had the Moorish mercenaries, whom they bought with money stolen from the people. They had the weapons, entrusted to them by the people for other purposes. But every day more and more of these weapons fell into the hands of the people. The fascist criminals were faced by the impossibility of replenishing their arsenals, for in the districts over which they maintain their bloody rule the workers refuse to work for them. Thus weapons had to be obtained from somewhere at all costs.

The fascist leaders, "100 per cent. patriots," who wage war, they say, in the name of "nationalism," have entered into criminal transactions with fascist imperialism in other countries. They promised tracts of our native soil in exchange for weapons and munitions. And international fascism, the governments of Germany, Italy and Portugal, placed at the disposition of the Spanish fascists anything they desired—aeroplanes, machine-guns, munitions, even military technicians. For they are just as anxious for fascism to triumph in Europe as are the fascist leaders of Spain themselves.

All this is nowadays no longer a secret. German and Italian 'planes are wiping out our villages, Portugal has become the provisions centre of Spanish fascism and the transit-route of the mercenary armies. Without this disgraceful and open assistance the fight would long ago have ended with the complete defeat of the fascists.

In face of this open assistance, which several states are rendering Spanish fascism, we see the isolation of the lawful government of Spain carried out by other governments in the name of so-called neutrality, which is in reality a direct aid to the fascists.

Yet neither open assistance of the enemies of the people, nor the "neutrality" of the other countries, has been able to force the Spanish people to retreat.



### The People's Army

Completely isolated, counting only on its own forces, the whole of the Spanish people set resolutely and with boundless self-sacrifice and enthusiasm about the task of organising first resistance, and now victory.

The thousands who rose in the first days to defend freedom, to struggle against fascism, armed simply and solely with the force of their enthusiasm, without weapons, without military co-ordination, have today at their disposal weapons, and military technique and organisation. The thousands of isolated fighters now form a regular army, a People's army, which, though very mixed as regards its composition and the ages of its members, is nevertheless filled with complete unity of spirit. Socialists, Anarchists, Communists, Syndicalists, Republicans, and those without political party, anti-fascists, workers of all shades of opinion and callings, men and youth, go to make up this People's Army, in which many women also fight, and which goes into battle to the strains of the "International," confident of victory. Deeds of heroism without precedent were performed in the first days of the struggle, and are still being performed every hour. Heroic achievements, too, in matters of organisation, not only at the front, but in the interior, too.

Work is being carried on in a fever of activity, so that the fighters for freedom shall lack nothing, neither weapons nor food nor clothes. Munition works and factories adapted to production of war materials are working day and night. The peasants are fighting not only with weapons, side by side with the town workers, but in the fields, too, to speed up agricultural production. Spanish women are making warm clothes for the anti-fascist fighters. Everywhere a magnificent spirit of competition reigns, inspiring every single person to exert his utmost effort in the great fight which the Spanish people are waging against international fascism.

The front is being organised for the final destruction of fascism, and behind the lines everything is arranged to ensure that those at the front are in need of nothing. A decaying army is being broken up, and a new People's Army created, and at the same time the foundations are being laid for a new society, which the Spanish people are beginning to build with weapons and blood.

Churches, sources of fanaticism, aristocratic clubs where only a short time ago the idlers frittered away their time, are being transformed into creches and centres of culture for the youth. The fascist criminals mercilessly destroy hospitals, sanatoriums, orphanages—the people under arms are creating new hospitals,

sanatoriums, creches where the children of the brave fighters for freedom are cared for and educated.

In the first period of the struggle the Spanish people were able, thanks to their heroism, to check the brutal attack of the fascists. In the second period they have forced them into the position of prisoners in those places which they had been able to capture by surprise. In spite of superiority in war materials, in spite of the assistance of international fascism, in spite of the ferocity of their mercenaries, they were not able to break through the ring which had been formed around them. Again and again their desperate efforts proved in vain against the steel wall, against the unconquerable resolve of our courageous fighters.

Oviedo, Saragossa, Granada, the Alcazar fortress in Toledo are nothing but gigantic prisons in which the Cabanellas, Arrandas and other traitors rage like wild beasts. If their people are still alive, they owe it not to their resistance, but to the humanity of the lawful government and the fighters for freedom who have done everything in their power to save the women and children whom the fascist leaders have dragged with them into these besieged towns, in order to make them into a living rampart. And if tomorrow the bodies of women and children are buried under the ruins of the destroyed fortresses, this will be yet another crime on the part of those men who, though they saw the inevitability of their defeat, preferred to condemn the members of their families to death at the same time, instead of surrendering.

### The Third Stage of the Struggle

The second phase of the struggle has ended, like the first, with the victory of the people under arms. With iron will and boundless enthusiasm we enter now on the **third** stage: the organisation of the victory.

After two months of fighting the situation is completely transformed. With the support of their accomplices abroad, the fascists announced loudly through their broadcasting stations to the whole world that the old liberal, democratic Spain was in a state of chaos. The whole world today recognises that at the moment order reigns only in those parts of Spain which are under the control of the lawful government, the people's government; and disorder, chaos and the most bestial excesses have become law in the regions upon which the fascists have forced their reign of terror.

The whole liberal and democratic world is on the side of republican Spain. It knows what is at stake in this struggle. It understands that here it is not a question of the struggle for power between two fractions of a people, but a fight which will



have international repercussions, a fight between civilisation and barbarism, freedom and slavery—in short a fight between democracy and fascism, a fight in which the armed people of Spain occupy an outpost position. Hence the awakening of the conscience of the world, embracing the cause of the workers of Spain in their struggle.

In the whole world, just as in Spain, the best men of science, art, labor, politics, even of the religious communities (for example, the Catholic priests **Ossorio, Gallardo** and **García Morales**), are on the side of republican Spain. They condemn the crime of the fascists against Spain and demand that active aid be given to the Spanish people.

The money collections of the workers of the whole world for the Spanish anti-fascist fighters, above all the magnificent sums contributed by the workers in the Soviet Union; the great demonstrations of the Paris workers with the slogan: "Aeroplanes, artillery and machine-guns for Spain!" the magnificent gesture of the Portuguese sailors who rose against their fascist government, the accomplice of the fascist criminals in Spain; the silent but heroic struggle of the workers in such lands as Germany and Italy, which are the chief allies of the criminals as **la Franco** and **Mola**, their efforts to help the defenders of freedom in Spain in some way, in spite of the regime of terror under which they suffer—all these things are factors of enormous importance in the third stage of the struggle, the organisation of victory.

### The New Government

Another favorable and vitally necessary condition for the organisation of victory is the formation of the new Spanish government. The new situation, the importance of the struggle, demand the creation of a government which is really a government of the people, a government representing all those groups fighting at the front.

The present government fulfils these conditions: a People's Front government in the truest sense of the word, consisting of Socialists, Communists and Republicans, certain of the honest support of the trade union organisations, the U.G.T. as well as the C.G.T., and of all democratic forces. The people feel that this government is really the expression of itself. Its formation was greeted by all sections of the population not only with sympathy, but with enthusiasm. The people had been waiting for this government to lead it to victory over fascism. With complete unanimity it was designated by the press as a government of victory. And it is indeed the government whose task it is to organise the victory over fascism, at the front, as well as behind

the lines, and which is prepared to carry out this task.

The measures which it has already taken during its short period of office prove that the government is resolutely and zealously tackling the task of organising victory: a ruthless clean-up in all the organs of state, and the dismissal of all disguised fascists who remained; confiscation of all the lands of the large landowners who have become traitors to the people, and the distribution of this land among the poor peasants; restoration of order both civil and moral in the interior, measures which led to the unification of command in the front and behind the lines, and by means of which the government got into its own hands all strategic positions necessary for the organisation of peace. Organisation of peace, that is the task which the government has undertaken to fulfil, a task which the Spanish people understand and appreciate, and therefore afford to the government their whole sympathy and support, so that an end can be made forever to the fascist scourge in Spain.

After two months of fighting a period begins, under the leadership of a powerful government, which has the support of the whole people, amid the enthusiastic sympathy of the peoples of the whole world—a sympathy which considerably disquiets the bandits—amid the ever-growing enthusiasm of the struggling population itself, which fully understands the significance of the fight and its international repercussions.

The Spanish people know what is at stake in the struggle. They know, too, that the fight will be long and bitter, that the enemy is not conquered, that he is receiving considerable aid from certain foreign governments; but they know, too, that after this fight is over, which will certainly end in the victory of the people, a new life will begin, a freer and happier life; they know that their victory will be a deadly blow for international fascism. Confident of themselves, and counting firmly on international solidarity, the Spanish people begin the organisation of victory, a victory which they will certainly achieve, for they enter the fight with the unshakable will to win.



## The Questions of the Day

By L. SHARKEY

INDICATIONS at the present time are that the Lyons Government will not propose an early Federal election. Such a proposal was apparently toyed with for a while by members of the Lyons Cabinet, who have their eyes glued on a trip to London for the Coronation ceremonies of Edward VIII., when it is expected that the imperialist bourgeoisie will display, as never before, the opulence won from the agony and sweat of its hundreds of millions of colonial slaves, the wealth derived from the exploitation of the British working class. Some members of the Cabinet, speculating on the effects of the split in the A.L.P. caused by the machinations of the "inner group" in N.S.W., among other things saw themselves parading in London as the election victors, secure in office for another four years. But, despite the heavy burden that the labor movement has to carry in the Lang dictatorship in N.S.W., the majority of the members of the Lyons Government estimated that the growing opposition to their rich man's government, which has increased the profits of the capitalists whilst refusing any real amelioration of the burdens which the toilers have to carry, the great volume of opposition to their clownish, fascist bannings and censorings, rendered an election an extremely hazardous proceeding for them. They apparently have decided to hang on to the Coronation trip and face the deluge afterwards.

This gives the labor movement time to consolidate its ranks, rid itself of disruptors and establish the united front between the two main political parties within the Australian labor movement: the A.L.P. and the Communist Party, which is the foremost condition for victory of the workers over Lyons.

In addition, the demand of the masses for increased wages and the 40-hour week is growing, the war danger is acute. The problem of achieving higher wages, shorter hours and successful mass mobilisation against war and fascism cannot be shelved until such time as a (problematical) election victory is achieved. Those who preach quiescence on the part of the workers, a policy of "wait till a Labor Government is returned," must be repudiated and their fatal advice consigned to the waste-paper basket.

The struggle on these immediate issues must be intensified, and the working-class roused, organised and brought into action as the most effective means of hastening the end of the Lyons administration and securing its defeat in the next elections. Struggle on a real mass scale in the coming months can bring down the Lyons, Stevens and similar reactionary governments.

Already there are welcome signs that the unionists understand the need for the throwing off of passivity and engaging in struggle. Strikes have begun, the metal unions in Sydney and other smaller stoppages, for wage increases. These strikes have achieved partial success, the ironworkers, for instance, winning an increase of 3/- a week, the demand of the strikers being 5/- a week.

The Miners' Council has decided to wage a big campaign to increase rates of pay in the industry, and many other unions are moving in the same direction. The time is plainly ripe, then, for an intensive campaign and action to secure wage-raises, especially as the balance-sheets of the big capitalist concerns show enormous and rapidly expanding profits. Linked with wages is the ever-growing mass demand of the workers for the 40-hour week. The governments, including the A.L.P. ones, such as Forgan Smith's, of Queensland, are playing shuttlecock and "passing the buck" in connection with the vital demands of the workers. All are in favor of the shorter week, in words. The Lyons Government agreed to it at the League of Nations International Labor Office Convention, but repudiated its representative, Sir Frederick Stewart, who is still campaigning for the shorter week. The Lyons gang declare that they cannot interfere with the States, but the recent High Court decision of Justices Evatt and McTiernan gives the Federal Government the power to legislate to give effect to international agreements entered into by the Commonwealth. On the other hand, Labor Party Premier Forgan Smith, loudly protesting his support for 40 hours, declares that it would interfere with Queensland trade, that it would place too big a competitive burden on the industries of his State as against the other States where 44 and 48 hours are the rule. So, between them, blaming each other, the various governments, Federal and State, U.A.P., A.L.P. and the Country Party in Victoria, are preventing the introduction of the shorter week and are likely to continue to do so. How can the workers cut this Gordian knot? The only possible reply is, mass pressure, action by the workers on such a scale that the governments won't dare to continue with their flimsy excuses and sham concern about 40 hours, but will be compelled to agree, along with the capitalists, to the 40-hour week. The same pressure is necessary, too, in regard to the Arbitration Court, as the recent arbitration decision in regard to the efforts of the Sydney County Council to give its employees the benefit of the shorter hours shows. The arbitration authority gave short shrift to the council, refusing to endorse its 40-hour decision.

All past experience proves that nothing will be



gained from the Arbitration Court, or from parliament, or from the capitalists, without mass activity and struggle. It is an old, old theme, but loses none of its correctness because of that, but is once more demonstrated in regard to the 40 hours and the demand for increased wages. Mass action is just as necessary to pave the way for favorable legislation by a Labor Government also, if such is returned at the forthcoming elections. The experience of France and Belgium proves that. The "stay-in" strikes on a tremendous scale were the decisive factor in winning the demands of the Popular Front for 40 hours, wage increases, collective agreements, payments for holidays, etc. In Belgium also the convincing argument was the nation-wide strikes. In New Zealand many are apt to overlook the tremendous mass discontent, the repeated mass unemployed revolts, such as the great struggle when Auckland was over-run by the unemployed and others, numerous strikes, and other symptoms of the determination of the workers to struggle, which are determining the present course and legislation of the Labor Government in that dominion.

All of this proves the point that the workers must be up and doing, that success in the winning of the immediate demands and the defeat of the Lyons Government hinges on the stimulation of mass action.

The year 1937 must witness a much higher level of activity on the part of the workers than was the case in 1936 if these victories are to be won. Victories did not come automatically in other countries, in France, New Zealand, etc., but were prepared and organized, and resulted from mass activity. In Britain, where passivity under the Citrines is the order of the day, there are no victories, only defeats, the setback in the recent municipal elections being the latest of a long series, resulting from the policy of a rotten leadership that opposes the united front and mass struggle, and substitutes co-operation in practice with the Baldwin "National" Cabinet instead.

The lesson is to follow the example of the People's Front in France, and not the disastrous policy of Citrine, Bevin and Co., of the Trade Union Congress, and the anaemic example of the majority of the British Labor Party parliamentarians.

In order to assure victory in the struggle for the immediate demands in the struggle against war and fascism, as well as for the defeat of the Lyons Government in the elections, the united front of the working-class is essential. The united front of the working-class can be secured by the united front between the two political parties, the Labor Party and the Communist Party. In many places much misunderstanding has already been broken down and a firm basis is being laid for a real united front

agreement. On the other hand, the Right-wing leaders of the A.L.P. are strenuously fighting against the united front. Particularly is this the case with the disruptive clique in N.S.W., the "inner group," who not only oppose by every means, including the most scandalous slandering, falsification and misrepresentation, the united front with the Communists, but are engaged in cutting the heads off those A.L.P. members and leaders who protest against the stifling of democracy and the false and ruinous policies pursued by the present controllers of the N.S.W. Labor Party. And in Victoria there are certain reactionary cliques, both in the A.L.P. and the trade union movement, who are attempting to develop a similar vicious campaign against the united front to that in progress in N.S.W. In Queensland there is the furious campaign of gutter abuse, forgery and slander conducted by Fallon and Co. in The Queensland Worker. These groups are the main ones among the A.L.P. leaders at present conducting the fight against unity. These groups also control, although divided among themselves on other issues, the Federal Executive of the Labor Party. It will be seen at a glance that the opposition to the united front within the Labor Party is a particularly powerful one at the moment and that much strenuous work and struggle is needed on the part of the Communists and the workers if the aim of establishing unity is to succeed in the near future. It will be seen that unity is essential to the success of the mass struggle around the immediate aims, the 40-hour week, wage increases and the fight against the outbreak of war, and that likewise mass struggle is essential to building the united front from below and establishing a lasting united front agreement between the A.L.P. and the Communist Party. Mass pressure, sustained pressure from below, is necessary if the groups of splitters are to be frustrated. It is in the mass struggles around the immediate demands that unity will be built from below and finally confirmed above. Unity will be welded in the common struggle of the whole working-class. Unity is essential if the Lyons Government is to be defeated, and the months before the elections must be used for intensive work to raise the whole fight for unity on to a much higher level, in order that the labor movement will be in a position to face the urgent problems confronting it and to successfully conduct an election campaign.

Some people are of opinion that the victory in the elections is a foregone conclusion, that the "swing of the pendulum," that is, the accumulating discontent with the Lyons Government, alone will do the trick. That this is not so, surely the position in Britain proves. Before the last elections to the House of Commons, a Labor Party victory was regarded as most



likely, but, owing to the weak reformist leadership which allowed Baldwin-Eden and Co. to pose as the great defenders of world peace, especially in connection with the Abyssinian war, because the reformist leaders tailed behind Baldwin on all the big important issues of the day, just as they are doing in connection with British re-armament, because in contrast to what happened in France and Spain, the leaders of the British Labor Party, who refused the united front with the Communists in order not "to scare away the middle-class voters" they said, failed to attract the petty-bourgeoisie or anyone else with their milk and water politics, and the result was a disgraceful defeat, when all the objective conditions were ripe for a Labor victory in the elections. And yet it is this example, the example of the British Labor party, whose anti-united front policy has just resulted in another severe defeat in the municipal elections, that is held up to the Australian workers as an example to follow. "British Labor won't have unity with Communists," shrieks The Labor Daily, day after day. But the British Labor Party will have nothing left if the present policy continues of excluding the Communists, the most active, self-sacrificing and energetic section of the labor movement, and at the same time continue the policy of capitulation before Baldwin and the bourgeoisie.

In France historic victories have been won in the past couple of years. Here the united front was achieved on the basis of a class policy of action, we reply to The Labor Daily and others who are fond of quoting Britain as an example against the united front, and it was precisely because of this that fascism has received severe defeats and the main demands, 40-hour week and 10 per cent. wage increase, etc., have been achieved. The examples of Britain and France prove the contention that waiting for the swing of the pendulum is by no means sufficient in the present difficult times; it proves that "smouldering discontent" must be fanned into a flame, that the working-class must be aroused to action, that unity of the working-class must be established, that a fighting programme capable of attracting all non-capitalist elements is needed and energetic action by the working-class is necessary to show to the non-proletarian strata that a united working-class movement is capable of defeating the forces of capitalism.

As a proof of its sincerity in the task of uniting the working-class for the struggles that lie ahead, the Communist Party is prepared to affiliate to the Labor Party and will make such an application shortly. A big campaign must be waged in the trade unions, on the jobs, and in the A.L.P. branches, in favor of Communist Party affiliation. Affiliation to the Labor Party

is the correct application of the united front in the present conditions. It concretises and gives aim to the whole united front struggle that we have conducted in the immediate past. It demonstrates the sincerity of the Communists in the pursuit of the task of uniting the working-class. It is an essential part of our election tactics. It destroys the canard of the A.L.P. Right-wing to the effect that the Communists only enter the elections "to assist the U.A.P." and similar widely broadcasted stupidities. It is a step towards the unification of the Australian working-class in one political party. Experience already shows that unity will only be won in battle against the Right-wing of the A.L.P., by the victory of the A.L.P. Left-wing. In N.S.W. the issue of struggle against the "inner group" has a direct bearing on the problem of unity. It is plain that the defeat of the "inner group" is essential, and every support and assistance must be given to the A.L.P. and members and unionists who are struggling against the bureaucratic dictatorship of the "inner group," with Lang at its head. Further, the split in the N.S.W. Labor Party must be healed as quickly as possible in order that the labor movement be in a position to enter the coming battles with the maximum unity and strength.

These, then, are the main tasks, the establishment of labor unity through the ending of the "inner group" disruption in N.S.W., the securing of the affiliation of the Communist Party, the rousing of the toilers through mass action on the basis of a fighting policy of achieving 40 hours, higher wages and other pressing demands, of intensifying the struggle against the war preparations of the Lyons Government and against all legislation of a fascist character. It is only by the active pursuit of such a policy, we would remind our A.L.P. fellow-workers that the masses can be roused to the necessary pitch of enthusiasm and activity that will assure the victory we all desire in the elections.



## Trade Union Notes

By TOM WRIGHT

### The 40-Hour Week

A STRONG growth of the movement for a 40-hour working week is the outstanding development within the Australian trade union movement in recent months. Around this demand the entire forces of trade unionism are uniting, and everywhere there is an eager seeking of means to bring added pressure upon the employers.

The 40-hour week has become a reality for many workers employed by municipalities, and has become general in Broken Hill, but the strong resistance of the State Governments and by the Federal Government, despite its promises at Geneva, has shown that only by the use of all means of struggle, including strike struggle, can a general 40-hour week be achieved.

An interesting revelation in the true character of the system of "conciliation and arbitration" was given in the recent refusal of the Conciliation Commissioner in N.S.W. to agree to a 40-hour week, in the case of the Sydney County Council, although the latter body, as the "employer," had agreed to its introduction.

The excuse of "no jurisdiction," given by the Commissioner, was an attempt to use the machinery of compulsory arbitration to prevent an improvement in conditions, where agreed to by individual employers, but opposed by the employers generally.

Enthusiastic mass meetings of building workers in Victoria gave promise of a strike struggle to enforce the 40-hour week, but, apparently through lack of decision among the leaders, action has been deferred for a further period.

The central trade union organs, the labor councils and the Australian Council of Trade Unions are giving special attention to the 40-hour campaign, but in the case of the A.C.T.U. there is a lack of that force and militant guidance which the present situation demands.

A meeting of the A.C.T.U. Executive will be held on February 9 to discuss the advisability of convening a trade union congress to deal with the 40-hour week, among other questions. The question of the organisation of the A.C.T.U. itself will be discussed. This will include such matters as the appointment of full-time officials and the setting-up of a stronger apparatus, which are long overdue.

But this apparatus will not play the role required of it unless a radical break is made with the Monk-Crofts policy of confining the struggle to narrow legal channels leading to capitulation in the courts. All forms of trade union struggle must be developed

to force the 40-hour week and other concessions from the employers.

### Against Overtime.

An important development connected with the 40-hour week struggle has been the strong and successful opposition to overtime working. Arising out of a ban on overtime, enforced by the Amalgamated Engineering Union on the Sydney waterfront, the Federal Arbitration Court was forced to agree to the principle of no overtime where additional workers could be employed or shift work introduced. This policy of opposition to overtime is now receiving increasing support from the trade unions, especially in the metal trades. The moulders and ironworkers, in introducing a ban on overtime in foundries, definitely linked their action with the demand for the 40-hour week. The ban on overtime is to operate until the 40-hour week is conceded.

### For Higher Wages

The fight for restoration of wages received a splendid impetus in the successful strike of moulders and ironworkers, in three Sydney foundries, which ended on November 2.

The strikers demanded an increase of 5/- per week over the rates given in the Federal Metal Trades Award. The metal trade employees as a whole called for strong resistance to this demand, and sought to bind the particular employers concerned in the strike not to grant the demand. Notwithstanding this strong opposition, the determined attitude of the workers led to the granting of a 3/- per week increase over the Arbitration Court Award.

Since the strike victory, a number of successes have been achieved in forcing a similar increase from other employers.

### Better Organisation Needed

These developments have shown that the Australian working class is on the offensive for improved conditions. The immediate task is to plan and organise this struggle.

The value of the shop committee has been proven in the struggle. Prior to the successful struggle in the Sydney foundries a strong shop committee movement with central leadership had developed. If serious difficulties occurred at Metters Ltd. during the strike, it could be attributed to the fact that the shop committee movement had not developed to embrace all sections of the workers on the job. In the present period a broadening and strengthening of the shop committee movement is urgently necessary.

### Union Democracy and the A.W.U.

As the result of a legal test, some of the rules of the Aus-



tralian Workers' Union have been disallowed and an increased measure of democratic rights restored to the members.

This is a powerful blow against the controlling bureaucracy, which, by means of the rules in question, had been able to entrench themselves and defy the entire membership. These rules had been formulated to give the officials power to remove all likely opponents from the ballot in union elections, so that their defeat became impossible.

It can be anticipated that strenuous efforts will be made to offset this new-won democracy within the organisation. The forged documents published by Fallon against the Communists in Queensland is an indication of what can be anticipated in the way of misrepresentation. But a genuine movement amongst the rank and file has increased opportunity for expression, and conditions can be established which will make corrupt ballots dangerous and impossible for the bureaucrats.

#### The Miners' Elections

When the trade union opposition to the Lang "inner group" in N.S.W. first developed, a threat was made that the officials supporting this opposition would be opposed and defeated in the elections.

The weakness of the "inner group" in the trade unions was soon exposed in the re-election of N. Burke as secretary of the Postal Workers' Union, although he had played an outstanding part in the opposition movement.

However, the "inner group" hatred was centred particularly on Bill Orr, who, as general secretary of the Miners' Federation, brought great strength to the trade unions in their fight against the domination of the Lang gang. The Labor Daily reserved its most poisonous misrepresentation for Bill Orr, while the "inner group" heelers used all and every means to undermine his prestige with the workers.

In his runaway victory over his opponent for secretary in the miners' ballot, Bill Orr has brought confusion to the "inner group" and shown that the miners have confidence in his fighting leadership.

#### J. B. King Returns

On Thursday, November 5, delegates of the Sydney Labor Council had a rare treat, when J. B. King, returned after six years in the Soviet Union, reported on the trade union movement in that country and the progress of the workers.

The keen interest and enthusiasm displayed by the delegates presaged a new period wherein the trade unions will give much greater attention to establishing official relations with the Soviet trade unions and follow more closely their glorious achievements.

## Australia's Fights for Democracy, Freedom and Progress

By J. N. RAWLING

### XIV.—The Right to Work (Continued)

#### (d) Early Unemployment in N.S.W.

THE first settlement was virtually a slave community—and slave communities do not have unemployment. All the work done was done by the convicts, who were employed not only by the government of the colony, but also by the free settlers, who were given land and convicts to work it. As late as the 'forties, we see in the local papers advertisements announcing sales of land and that so many convicts go with the land! Early New South Wales had its serfs, just like any feudal country of mediaeval Europe. The difference was, of course, that the convicts in N.S.W. were serfs only for a limited period. When they had served their sentences they became free. They, therefore, formed the basis for a free working population, which was added to by streams of immigration that became broader with the years.

It was the convicts in the first place, and the immigrants in the second, who were used to bring down and to keep down, the wages of the free workers. The squatters and government circles were opposed to the stoppage of transportation, because it provided them with free labor. The small business man, the capitalist class—as industries were established—to whom slave labor meant a small local market, and the free workers united to demand the cessation of transportation. With that cessation and with the further growth of industry, there came a split. The capitalists wanted cheap labor and favored immigration in order to obtain it. The workers saw the spectres of unemployment and starvation wages as the result of immigration, and, therefore, opposed it—an opposition that has persisted for over a hundred years.

It is quite obvious that, as free immigrants and emancipated convicts increased in numbers and as the system of assignment of convicts was continued and extended, unemployment would become a problem. That poverty early made its appearance in the colony is shown by the fact that the Benevolent Society of N.S.W. was founded in May, 1813. It is still with us—it and its yearly report constituting an epitome of our boasted progress! The figures given each year for the last 122 years of the number of the "objects" (as they were called) of its "bounty" furnish an index of the amount of poverty at various periods.



Even after the growth of a class of emancipated convicts, unemployment was kept down as a result of the anti-combination laws passed in England and applying here, and of the regulations of the early governors, rigidly enforced, making it compulsory for laborers to accept the wages offered. Unemployment, however, comes to be noticed in the 'twenties, especially in 1827-9, when the seasons were bad for two years in succession. Even so early, glowing reports of high wages were appearing in the English papers in efforts to attract immigrants. To counteract these efforts a "Committee of Emigrant Mechanics" (formed in 1833) sent to England an account of the actual conditions—an account that was published in pamphlet form in England and in the newspapers.

Towards the end of the 'thirties, as we have already seen, unemployment was assuming a mass basis; while immigrants continued to stream in. Sir Henry Parkes, who came out as an immigrant in 1839, says (in his "Fifty Years of Australian History"): "For many weary days following weary days I searched in vain for suitable employment in Sydney. A severe drought had just passed over the country; the price of bread rose as high as 2/8 for the 4lb. loaf, and the other necessities of life were correspondingly dear. **The first public meeting I attended was a meeting held in the market to raise subscriptions to establish a soup-kitchen for the poor and destitute.**"

In 1841 immigrants streamed into New South Wales. The weekly average for the last quarter of that year was 1000. Many of them were housed in barracks and worked two days a week for the government—for rations for themselves and families. Today the single man works one day a week for his rations. Figure it out and gauge our progress. Today our public works are being carried out by work-for-rations. In the 'forties, our public works, including the wharves at Circular Quay, were carried out in the same way!

In 1843 a committee of the Legislative Council reported that there were 1243 unemployed men in Sydney and that 804 women and 1701 children depended on these. The population of the whole of Australia then was just over 150,000. Taking then the number of unemployed of the whole colony as 1500 (a conservative estimate), this figure would be equivalent to an unemployment of about 20,000 in the N.S.W. of today! The years of 1843, 1844 and 1845 were periods of great unemployment. Relief work was stopped in 1844 and the unemployed besieged Government House, forcing the governor to issue them with tickets on the Benevolent Society for rations. He then gave work building a dam in the Cook's River—work so arduous that only a few could do it. So that he was able to point to the few as proving the

non-existence of an army of unemployed. In 1846 the census showed that there were 1580 "almspeople, pensioners and paupers" in the colony. Of these 987 were in Sydney. Immigration ceased during 1845, 1846 and 1847—thus easing the position. The discoveries of gold in 1850 and 1851 brought a boom. But they brought, also, an immense increase in population, thus making the inevitable depression that followed more grievous for the workers.

After the boom of the mid-fifties, the inevitable depression came. Unemployment began to be acute again early in 1858. Wages sank. Farm laborers who received £50 per year with rations in 1854 were, in 1858, working for £25 per year. The unemployed again began to organise and agitate. Meetings were held which demanded that relief works be initiated. The government hesitated, since relief works were against its policy. As a result, the unemployed threatened to march on parliament. On April 22 they carried out their threat. The next day Premier Cowper moved the following motion in the Legislative Assembly:

"That this house, having considered the correspondence in reference to the number of unemployed in the city of Sydney, is willing to vote such sums as may be deemed necessary for defraying the charges of employing them in the interior upon any of the public works, or of removing to the country, that they may obtain private employment, those men and their families for whose labor there is not at the present time any demand in Sydney."

Some of the unemployed agreed to go to the country to work. The big majority preferred to remain in the city. Then, towards the end of the year, gold was reported discovered in large quantities at Port Curtis. This took some more away from Sydney. But there still remained there a large number of unemployed.

In December, 1858, and in the new year, the unemployed were again demanding the opening up of relief works. Work was offered on the Southern Railway, then being constructed, but on contract rates. The men demanded payment at daily rates and refused to go. They held mass meetings every day and marched the streets of Sydney in hundreds. These demonstrations went on for over six months—and the government refused to begin relief works. In the meantime, the flow of immigration was kept up: 7000 assisted immigrants arriving during 1858, in addition to between 700 and 800 German immigrants. Nearly all the immigrants found work!

In September, Henry Parkes moved in the Assembly that a committee be appointed to enquire into the conditions of the working class. This committee reported in the following April.



In the interim conditions had become worse, in spite of a fresh gold discovery at Kiandra. The following facts are culled from the report:—

There were 1039 unemployed.

Seven hundred of these had been out of work for from one to six months.

The unemployed had solidly refused to accept work at low wages.

The housing of the unemployed was very bad.

Remedies suggested amounted to the inauguration of protective tariffs.

Henry Parkes presented the report, but the free trade majority refused to adopt it. Some days later the unemployed held a mass meeting in front of Parliament House. A deputation was appointed to interview a sympathetic M.P., and the police at the gates agreed to allow it to go into the House. But when the deputation began to go through the gates, the whole of the unemployed tried to follow them, and a free fight began. Police reinforcements arrived and drove the unemployed away. Their leaders were arrested and sent to gaol.

It sounds like a description of Sydney in 1931: the unemployed asked for bread or work and received police batons. The winter of 1860 was very severe—it rained nearly the whole time—and poverty was widespread. In 1858 the Benevolent Society had 1337 destitute persons on its books; in 1859, 2499; and in 1860, 3276. These figures, of course, furnish only a relative index—not an absolute barometer of the amount of poverty and unemployment.

Conditions improved and unemployment decreased—until the next time. That next time was 1865. In October of that year we find another unemployed deputation demanding the beginning of public works and the cessation of State-aided immigration. The government “had no money” for the former, and refused the latter. The following year saw conditions much worse. Immigration continued and unemployment increased—not only in Sydney, but also in the other towns. Mass meetings of unemployed began again. The economic and financial crisis in England, the spread of it to Australia, the financial collapse in Queensland and the stoppage of public works there—all these increased the poverty and unemployment of the working classes. Armies roamed the countryside and paraded Sydney streets seeking and demanding work.

In October, 1866, another deputation, asking for employment, is told by the Works Minister to give him a list of the names of the unemployed. In three days he is given a list of 2230 names. He asked the police to investigate, and they found that not only

was the list one of genuine cases, but that they (the police) had found numbers of unemployed whose names were not on the list! The government, Micawber-like, lived in hopes of another gold-rush. Mass unemployed meetings continued. In October it was agreed that relief works be started. A parliamentary committee reported that there were 3000 unemployed in Sydney alone. Conditions were worse than ever they had been in the history of the colony. Immigration continued, and the employment of women (hardly ever thitherto employed outside of domestic service) increased. **Women were breaking stones at Pennant Hills, in 1866, to support their families!**

The year 1867 was a repetition of 1866. Men still tramped looking for work, and the Benevolent Society was looking after **5880 families!** In addition to that relief, a city night refuge and a soup kitchen had been opened.

Conditions slightly improved in 1869, but there were still many unemployed. In April, 1870, a parliamentary committee's report in favor of the continuance of assisted immigration was the cause of a number of meetings of protest of the unemployed. A deputation of over 50 waited on the Premier, “Slippery” Cowper, who was armed with a police report, which he had given instructions to have prepared, to the effect that there was “no evidence of a number of persons being without employment who were able and willing to work.” The delegation maintained that there were 2000 persons in Sydney “in utter destitution.” The Benevolent Society's figures again serve as an index and prove that the police report was a fake. Nevertheless the government refused to begin relief works.

Just about this time the governor received inquiries from the British Government agent the prospects for immigrants in New South Wales. The governor replied that he had counselled the employers of the State, and that it was their opinion that wages were too high and that immigration would be beneficial, even if it were only to reduce wages! We here have an official admission about one purpose of State-aided immigration!

Poverty increased rather than decreased, and in October the government had to commence relief works. But these absorbed only a small percentage of the unemployed. Another deputation waited on “Slippery” Charlie. They were offered tickets for the soup kitchen! Work on building military roads near Sydney was offered, but on contract rates, which most of the men refused. During the next two or three years wages were cut wholesale—the government leading the way. Strikes, however, were able to maintain wages, in, for example, the case of the shipwrights, who struck in May, 1871. Again, the depression lifted and conditions began to improve—again until the next time.



The next period of boom, as far as Sydney was concerned, was prolonged a little by the preparations for the International Exhibition, the construction of the Exhibition Building, during 1878, calling for the employment of many builders and laborers—some coming from the other colonies. But 1879 saw mass unemployment again. Wages dropped as soon as the building operations were concluded—laborers receiving 7/- per day. Again Sydney saw mass meetings of unemployed, and again immigrants were arriving in large numbers. The number of unemployed increased as the year progressed. In December, Premier Parkes received a deputation from 1100 unemployed and refused to accede to their demand that relief works be started. Conditions became worse in 1880 and, in order to get rid of numbers of the unemployed, the government provided free train passes to those who "wished to seek employment in the country"—an expedient that has often been tried by various governments.

To a Select Committee of Parliament, in 1880, trade union officials gave figures of unemployment. Three hundred out of 500 stonemasons were out of work in Sydney, said the secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. The secretary of the A.S.E. said there were 20 per cent. of engineers unemployed. The chairman of the Miners' Union declared that the average time worked in the coal-mines was five and three-quarters days per fortnight.

After an industrial recovery during 1881 and 1882, unemployment again increased during 1883. In that year the government again distributed tickets to the country to those who wanted to catch rabbits—or work. Work was the more elusive. There was a good deal of agitation also during this year against immigration—immigrants were still coming in broad streams.

The year 1884 again saw mass unemployed meetings. Relief works were started and 700 were employed making roads—at 5/- per day! Others were granted shelter and a meal a day in an old police barracks, while many refused to work for the miserable pittance offered. In June, at a registration office for unemployed, over 600 registered in the first few days. Four hundred of these were given work in the country and at Bankstown—clearing land and making roads—housed in tents—for wages somewhat better than those that Stevens is paying today in his slave camps. The relief works did not last for very long.

During 1885 and 1886, unemployment increased still more. Again more meetings, again more relief works, again more passes for the country. In October, 1886, Colonial Secretary Dibbs was informed by an unemployed deputation that there were nearly 3000 men wanting work. Relief works were started

and, during November, 800 rations were issued each day. In January of the following year over 1200 men were on relief work. Premier Parkes promised a deputation in February that he would begin some public works. When food relief was given, 245 married and 1355 single men received rations in one day. Parkes was determined that pay for relief work should be at piece rates, and rejected a demand from an unemployed deputation that day wages be paid. Only a small minority of the men accepted work under these conditions. The rest held huge meetings demanding a minimum 6/- per day wage. To another deputation Parkes not only reiterated his determination to pay piece rates, but also announced that the distribution of rations to those who would not accept the government conditions of work was to cease. His reply produced a demonstration of indignation. The unemployed marched to Government House, but were unable to see the governor. They marched back to the office of the Premier, who called out the police to disperse them.

But things got worse, instead of better. A Central Relief Board was set up and, by June, 4200 men were being employed by it doing useless work. About 10,000 men were employed on relief in Sydney during this period—the highest number at any one time being 5700.

Since the 'eighties, we can say that unemployment has been permanent. In 1888 the cutting of the government public works expenditure in half threw 15,000 men on to the labor market. Relief works were again started by the Dibbs Government (January, 1889), but, when Parkes came into office again, a little later, he reversed the policy and would have nothing to do with relief works. But he was forced to give food relief. Coghlan (in his "Labor and Industry in Australia") gives figures to show how poverty grew: £138,941 was spent on public charities in 1877—£247,591 in 1889; 13,402 were in charitable institutions in 1877—23,893 in 1889; recipients of outdoor relief in 1877 numbered 10,318—in 1889 they numbered 42,270. **And all this in addition to the relief given to the unemployed!**

The 'nineties continued the story of the 'eighties. In 1891: food and shelter for many hundreds; no relief work. Thus they began—in the way with which we are now familiar. Then, 1892: conditions much worse. On the day that a government labor bureau was set up (in February), 1300 men registered, and in the first six months of its existence 14,000 men were registered. After the mining strike in Broken Hill in 1892 there were 3000 unemployed in that city alone. In May, 1893, there were more than ever registered at the bureau in Sydney. In 1893 came the bank smashes, and unemployment reached its highest peak. The Sydney Morning Herald in June said that unemployment



"as a burning question has comparatively disappeared."—"But," says Coghlan, "unemployment existed as acutely as ever, though it was for the time acquiescent and unaggressive." In July there were 7000 men registered.

In 1894—"Depression": agricultural laborers working for 10/- per week; in Sydney, mass unemployment. A building trades meeting was held in January. The chairman of the Painters' Union said that, out of 15,000 who had been apprenticed to the building trades, 5000 had had to seek work in other directions, 6000 were unemployed, and the other 4000 working an average of three days a week. Practically no building was being done. For the year, 13,575 were registered at the bureau whose principal task was to get men away from Sydney. Unhappily for its peace of mind, however, as fast as it got men away to the country—to fossick for gold, to trap rabbits, or to slave for their mere rations—others flocked to the city to fill their places.

In February, 1895, a public meeting was convened in Sydney. Delegates from many labor organisations attended, including the Labor Party, the Socialist League and the northern and southern miners. Figures given by trade union officials showed that there were nearly 30,000 unemployed workers in N.S.W. During the year unemployed processions were almost a daily sight in Sydney. To get them out of sight the government set them to work shifting sand and in cutting down all the flowering native shrubs that were still around Sydney.

In 1896 an attempt was made to solve the unemployment problem by setting up labor colonies. One was at Pitt Town. In Sydney, at the beginning of the year, 2500 men were working on relief work in Centennial Park—for one day per week. Compare Stevens's scheme of one week in five for single men and two for married, and gauge our progress!

Relief works were closed down in the latter half of 1896, but were reopened the following year, owing to pressure from the Labor Party. Sixteen hundred men were again working in Centennial Park—one week every two months! And so things continued until the end of the century, when the bells could toll the death of the old century and ring in the new. "Ring out the old, ring in the new"—and lo! the new was as the old! But the new century is still young, and before it is out we shall have banished unemployment from the face of the earth!

#### (e) Unemployment in Victoria

We come across indignant mass meetings in Victoria as early as 1855, when the colony had just reached its majority, and just after tens of thousands had flocked there from all over the world, drawn by the gold discoveries. Relief work was started, but here, too, men refused to work at the starvation wages offered.

Immigration added to the ranks of the unemployed, and, in April, 1857, a huge meeting protested against the system of State-aided immigration. A deputation to the Minister for Works, later on in the year, told him that there were thousands out of work. A similar programme was entered upon in Victoria to that in N.S.W.—relief works and tickets to the country.

Turning the pages of Victoria's history to 1863, an exactly similar picture confronts us: meetings of unemployed discussing the necessity to put a stop to immigration. At a meeting in September, it was stated that poverty was "so great as to render private charity incapable to cope with it." The Immigrants' Aid Society was assisting 6515 persons in 1862, 9576 in 1863 and 20,000 in 1864!

Again in 1875 unemployment was extensive—and in 1877. In May of the latter year unemployed demonstrations were held and the Chief Secretary, Graham Berry, received a deputation from the unemployed on May 20. He promised to investigate. His investigation showed a great amount of unemployment, with which his relief works were not able to cope.

Another decade is here as we again turn the pages, and 1886 saw, again, an army of unemployed. In the following year men were employed stone-breaking (as the result of unemployed meetings and demands), although the government was spending more on public works than ever before in the history of the colony. The year 1889 saw unemployment becoming a permanent feature. The distress of that year was added to in the following, while in 1891 poverty and unemployment were greater than ever before. Because of the neglect, by Trades Hall officialdom, of the unemployed, the pastoralists were able to recruit batches of them as scabs on the stations of New South Wales and Queensland. We have already dealt with the conditions in Melbourne during 1892. As in N.S.W., poverty, despair and unemployment were the workers' lot for the remaining years of the century—and in the new one as well.

#### (f) Unemployment in the Other States

We have no space to consider in any detail unemployment in the other States. And it would be a mere repetition.

In South Australia unemployment was early in evidence. When Grey became governor in 1840, four years after its foundation, South Australia had one-eighth of its population supported by the government. Grey discharged about half of the people on the administrative staff and stopped public works—creating a small army of unemployed. These were supplied with relief work—living in a compound, under strict supervision and making roads for 1/2 per day, plus an allowance for wives and



children. Thus did Grey carry out orders and reduce the cost of government.

In 1854 workers who had gone to seek their fortunes on the gold-fields of Victoria began to return. Immigrants also were coming in large numbers. As a result unemployment increased. Relief works were opened, but poverty and destitution grew worse in 1855.

In 1866 a "Workingmen's Political Association" was holding public meetings demanding the cessation of immigration. At the beginning of 1867 the government was forced to suspend State-aided immigration and, a few months later, introduce relief works. But unemployment did not disappear and poverty grew. In 1870 unemployed men were offered work trenching at 1/6 per rod. They refused to work at these rates and assembled en masse in front of the Treasury Building. The mounted police had to be called upon to disperse them, but they reassembled in front of the Town Hall, where they held a meeting and passed a resolution demanding a minimum of 5/6 per day. Again they were dispersed by the mounted police. They next assembled at the post office—and from here, too, they were driven by the troopers wielding their swords—the answer of the government to their demand for the right to live! However, they gained a partial victory—the piecework rates were considerably increased.

Unemployment continued, being a most pressing problem in 1878 and 1884. A mass meeting, for example, was held in the Adelaide Town Hall, in 1884, and demanded government relief. The relief that was forthcoming was utterly inadequate, and the increasing unemployment during the following year was instrumental in bringing down the wages of those employed. In 1885 and 1886, South Australia's population decreased by emigration—mainly to Broken Hill. The revival of 1888 was followed by another slump and further unemployment.

Just as in N.S.W. and Victoria, the early 'nineties saw strikes, poverty, unemployment and crisis in South Australia. In February, 1892, there were mass demonstrations of unemployed in the streets of Adelaide. They were refused relief work by the Premier, Kingston, early in 1894, but he offered to give them rations for stone-breaking! In June there were further processions and demonstrations. Things would have been far worse in the immediately following years than they really were, if it had not been for the discovery of gold in W.A., which drew away many men seeking their fortunes. But we see, even from this brief glance, that in South Australia also unemployment has been a spectre haunting the worker and his family!

We haven't, here, space to tell of the struggles for the right

to live in the other States. On some other occasion the story is to be told. It is similar to what has been related. In Queensland, West Australia and Tasmania, too, men have faced the future with their wives and children, full of confidence—generation after generation—and have seen their hopes turn to ashes. It is nothing new—this reserve army of capitalism—a hundred years, at least, it has been with us in Australia: a scourge to be fought always. In the twentieth century it was with us, too—in the decade and a half before the war and during the war. Today we have our slave-camps. During the war there were slave-camps, too, where conditions were made vile in order to force men to enlist. For, during the war, the reserve army of capitalism had another reason for its existence: to gather recruits for that other army of capitalism, the army of destruction. Since the war, the story is well known to all. Ever since the war unemployment has been on a mass basis—to reach heights during the economic and financial crisis never before dreamed of. And, today, in the midst of "prosperity," we are told that the continued existence of an army of unemployed is the workers' lot—as long as capitalism exists. On this point, at least, we and our enemies agree.

\* \* \* \*

In this series of articles we have endeavored to tell the story of some of Australia's struggles for freedom and progress. We have realised, as perhaps the reader has done, the inadequacy of the space that we have been able to give. The whole story has to be given—and given more adequately. It will be given, not only in *The Review*, but through other channels, too. It is not, therefore, to put a full-stop to our story that we finish this series and begin a new one: "Figures of the Past." This series will begin in our next issue and will seek to make live again many people who have helped to make our people's history. Some of these will be known to most, some known not at all and most not known as they should be known.

[Concluded]



## The Life of Friedrich Engels

By "STUDENT"

FRIEDRICH ENGELS was born on September 28, 1820, in Barmen, Germany, of a prosperous commercial family. Although reared in an intensely pious Protestant manner, he soon broke completely with his religious traditions. In 1842, he came to Manchester, England, to occupy a position in a cotton-spinning firm, in which his father had shares. About this time he was already a student of Hegel, a writer who was to profoundly influence him. At this period he wrote for Owenite and Chartist papers. In autumn, 1844, while in Paris, Engels met Marx, and then began that friendship of the two great leaders of the working class.

"The Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844," that Engels wrote at that time, is a classic on the subject. From 1845 to 1850 he was in France, Germany and Belgium, forming underground revolutionary bodies and working together with Marx, contributing articles to the revolutionary press.

In 1847, at the Congress of the Communist League held in London, Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare for publication a complete theoretical and practical party programme. Drawn up in German in January, 1848, the manuscript was sent to the printer in London a few weeks before the French Revolution of February 24.

Thus was given to the world "The Communist Manifesto," that historic document which has inspired all subsequent leaders of the working class, including Lenin, and which is still the most concise statement and the most important single document of Marxism.

In 1870 Engels was corresponding secretary of the International Workingmen's Society for Belgium, Italy and Spain.

Engels always admitted that Marx was the teacher, he but the pupil, as his statement shows in a footnote to "Feuerbach." Referring to Hegel he says:—"Out of the dissolution of the Hegelian school, however, there developed still another tendency, the only one which has borne real fruit. And this tendency is essentially connected with the name of Marx." Then follows the footnote:—"Here I may be permitted to make a personal explanation. Lately repeated reference has been made to my share in this theory, and so I can hardly avoid saying a few words here to settle this particular point. I cannot deny that both before and during my forty years' collaboration with Marx I had a certain independent share in laying the formulations, and

more particularly in elaborating the theory. But the greater part of its leading basic principles, particularly in the realm of economics and history, and, above all, its final, clear formulation, belong to Marx. What I contributed—at any rate with the exception of a few special studies—Marx could very well have achieved without me. What Marx accomplished, I would not have achieved. Marx stood higher, saw farther, and took a wider and quicker view than all the rest of us. Marx was a genius; we others were at best talented. Without him the theory would not be what it is today. It therefore rightly bears his name."

Also, Engels wrote of Marx: "Genius is such an exceptional thing that we who have it not always know that we cannot attain it."

In the third preface to the Communist Manifesto, Engels writes in 1888:—

"The 'Manifesto' being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus belongs to Marx. That proposition is: that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and the oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and, once for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles.

"This proposition, which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we, both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed toward it, is best shown by my 'Condition of the Working Class in England.' But when I again met Marx at Brussels in the spring of 1845, he had it ready worked out, and put it before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here."



The standpoint of dialectical materialism is explained jointly by Marx and Engels in "German Ideology," and by Engels in "Feuerbach" and "Anti-Duehring," of which latter book Lenin says: "Here are analysed the most important questions in the domain of philosophy, natural science and social science . . . a wonderfully rich and instructive book." Lenin, also, valued "Feuerbach" very highly.

Engels, in his contributions to the study of dialectical materialism, did yeoman work. Dialectical materialism is "the science of the general laws of movement," as Engels states, and recognises nothing but motion, movements and processes.

The books written by Engels include the third volume of "Capital" (arranged by him after the death of Marx), "Feuerbach," "Anti-Duehring" and "The Peasant War in Germany." He also edited Marx on "The Eastern Question." His book "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" has long since become a classic.

Engels was a profound student of military science. In the republican insurrection in Baden in 1849, he was an active participant and was aide-de-camp to Colonel Willing (later a general in the American civil war). Forced to flee the country and there being no hope of an immediate revolution in Europe, he made his home in England.

He materially contributed to Marx's upkeep for many years, showing in no uncertain manner his sterling friendship.

Friedrich Engels married Elizabeth Burns, an Irishwoman, in 1864.

During 1867-68, the house of Engels in Manchester was the safest refuge of the Fenian fugitives from Ireland, the police having no inkling of their hiding place.

Possessed of the ideology of dialectical materialism, Engels was able to analyse current conditions and events and forecast the future. He brilliantly forecast the terrible conflict of 1914, as thus the following extracts show:—

"The menace of a European war is becoming serious . . . This will be an unprecedented blood-bath, a laying waste of territories, and in the long run an unprecedented exhaustion . . . But we may say in advance that if this war takes place it will be the last. It will bring with it the final breakdown of class government—in a political, military, economic (including financial) and moral sense. It may come to the point that the military machine will mutiny and refuse to continue this mutual slaughter over some Balkan people or other. The motto of class govern-

ment is—After us, the deluge! But after the deluge we come in, and only we." (Letter of Engels to Bebel, November 17, 1886, Marx-Engels Archive of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, 1932.)

This is Engel's forecast of the world war, given as far back as 1886:—

"The importance of England will grow as the war lasts . . . In Germany, a defeat could transform the whole system . . . Briefly, there will be chaos, with only one certain result: mass butchery on an unparalleled scale, the exhaustion of all Europe to an unparalleled degree, and finally the complete collapse of the old system."

In 1890 he forecasted: "If Wilhelm crosses the Rhine, he will destroy a great empire."

Engels also states:—

"The Kaiser seems to have been specially created to shatter the apparently stable system in Germany; but I could not expect that he would have managed to do it so quickly and brilliantly. The man is worth twice his weight in gold" [to a revolutionary party]. "It would not be only a crime to shoot him, but a gigantic blunder. We ought to give him a bodyguard against anarchistic tomfooleries."

Engels paid tribute to Marx's genius and his historical role, at Marx's graveside. He said:—

"On March 14, at a quarter to three in the afternoon, the greatest of contemporary thinkers ceased thinking . . .

"It is impossible for us to measure what the struggling European and American proletariat and historical science have lost in his person . . . Marx discovered the law of the development of human history . . . Marx discovered also the special driving law of the contemporary capitalist method of production and of the bourgeois society created by it . . .

"To Marx science was a historically-driving revolutionary force . . .

"But Marx was above all a revolutionary. His life's vocation was—to contribute to the overthrow of the capitalist society . . . Struggle was his element. Few have struggled so passionately, stubbornly and successfully as he . . . His name will survive centuries, and so will his work."

Gustav Mayer's book on "Friedrich Engels," now available



in English, should be studied by all Communists. A recent review states:—

"Professor Mayer held till recently the chair of Social-Democratic History in Berlin University, and is naturally an authority on his subject. This new biography, giving us a long, keen, candid look at half-forgotten things, is 'written for the English-speaking world; it deals with the man and the politician and leaves the theorist in the background.' Thus it is quite unexpectedly 'readable'."

Friedrich Engels died in London on August 5, 1895.

Friedrich Engels, the co-partner of Marx, will always be remembered for his magnificent, self-sacrificing work in the cause of the proletariat.

## *Fifteen Years of Struggle for the Independence and Freedom Of the Chinese People*

By WAN MIN

[The following is an extract from a speech delivered by Wan Min on the occasion of the Fifteenth Anniversary of the Foundation of the Communist Party of China, July-August, 1936.]

\*

### The New Situation and the New Policy of the Party

THE foreign political situation as far as China is concerned has changed first and foremost by reason of the fact that Japanese imperialism, by the aggressive actions in China, has not only on its own account torn up the Washington Nine-Power Pact of 1921, which at one time established in China the division of the spheres of influence of Japan, the U.S.A., and Great Britain and other countries, but has also created a direct menace to the interests of the U.S.A., Great Britain, France, and other imperialist states which dominate the Philippine Islands, India, Indonesia, Australia, Indo-China, and the whole of the Far East. This has led to a sharpening of the struggle between Japan and the U.S.A. and Great Britain, for China and the markets of the Pacific Coast.

The aggression of Japanese imperialism is changing the situation inside China. The Chinese people are faced with the alternative of either offering resistance to Japanese aggression, which will mean life, or else not to offer this resistance, which will mean death for the whole nation and the whole of the state. This is calling forth a regrouping of the class forces fighting in China and an urge for the unification of the various classes and sections of Chinese society, of political parties and groupings as well as their armed forces for the struggle against the common enemy.

This new foreign political and internal historical situation demands of the Communist Party that it applies new tactics in the struggle for the independence and freedom of the Chinese people. The new situation faces the Communist Party of China with the most important, pressing, and great historical task of uniting the whole of the Chinese people for the struggle against Japanese imperialism, and to save their native land.

As is well known, the Communist Party, on the basis of the political line of the 7th Congress of the Comintern, drew up its



new political line, which was expressed in the appeal of the C.C. of the Party and of the Central Soviet Government, dated August 1 of last year, and addressed to all the Chinese people, regarding resistance to Japanese aggression and the salvation of the fatherland.

In this appeal the Communist Party pointed to the only correct path of organising this struggle, i.e., **the tactics of establishing a united national front against Japanese imperialism.**

In the same appeal the Communist Party proposed concrete forms of the establishment of a united national front of struggle against Japanese imperialism, beginning with joint partial action, and going as far as the joint formation of an all-China united anti-Japanese army, and an all-China government of national defence.

The idea of the need to establish such a united front as the most effective means for organising resistance to Japanese aggression, and for the salvation of China, is finding more and more recognition among all sections of the Chinese people. This, however, does not mean at all that the line for the establishment of a united anti-Japanese national front has not met, and is not now meeting with serious opposition and objections from various sides. Facts go to show that not only various kinds of opponents oppose, from the right and "left," the slogans of the Communist Party regarding the organisation of a united anti-Japanese national front, but even within the Communist Party itself this new policy is far from having been correctly understood by all comrades.

What is the essence and nature of the new political line of the Chinese Communist Party, directed towards the establishment of a united national front against the Japanese robbers?

**First, the Party openly declares that it is striving to establish a united national front against Japanese imperialism, and not an anti-imperialist united front in general.**

This means that the struggle of the Chinese people is directed exclusively against its mortal enemy at the given stage, the Japanese invaders.

There are some people who criticise this policy of the Party "from the 'left.'" They base their arguments on the decision of the last, Sixth Congress of the Communist Party, about the struggle against all imperialists, while others shout about "the need for simultaneously carrying on a national revolutionary war of the Chinese people against all imperialists," or that the "national revolutionary war of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism must be the beginning of military action against all the imperialist powers in China."

We have to reply as follows to the arguments of these "left" phrasemongers: The Sixth Congress of the Party took place in an entirely different situation from the present. At that time, in spite of the contradictions among the imperialist powers, they came forward in a united front against the Chinese people and the Chinese Revolution, whereas today the Japanese invaders are menacing not only the national existence of the Chinese people, but at the same time the vital interests of the imperialist states competing with them.

In general the slogan as to the struggle against all imperialists is one thing, while the slogan of the **armed defence** of the Chinese people against the Japanese and all other imperialists is something different. The armed struggle against imperialism is one, and only one, of the various forms of the struggle of an oppressed people, and what is more, it is only an extreme form of this struggle.

Not a single people, including the Chinese people, desire war. If the so-called Japano-Chinese problems could be solved peacefully, the Chinese Communists would be the first to declare for the solution of these problems in this way.

But when an attempt is made to deprive the Chinese people of their most elementary rights to an independent existence, they are compelled to defend themselves.

Hence it is clear that "left" phrasemongers, who shout about the need for carrying on an armed struggle of the Chinese people simultaneously against the Japanese and all the other imperialists, are, whether they like it or not, playing **into the hands of the Japanese invaders** whose interests require precisely the isolation of the Chinese people from all possible direct and indirect allies in their anti-Japanese struggle.

**Secondly, the Chinese Communists consider that the establishment of a united national front in China must concretely be expressed in the conclusion of a political agreement between the Communist Party, Kuomintang and other organisations on the basis of a joint platform of struggle against the Japanese aggressors, while preserving their full political and organisational independence.**

For us Communists, this means that while fighting for the establishment of a united national front, we not only must not allow the slightest weakening of our Party, and its organisations, but must strengthen it still further ideologically, politically and organisationally, and still further rally its forces and strengthen the unity in its ranks.

A determined struggle must, therefore, be carried on against the tendencies which may actually lead to the dissolution of the Communist Party in some sort of general political alliance of



anti-Japanese forces, against the proposals to accept without discrimination into the Party all those who want to join, merely on the basis of the declaration of their desire to participate in the anti-Japanese struggle. The Party must carry on a determined struggle against those who are repeating the right opportunist mistakes of Chen Du-Su and others who in 1927 regarded the participation of the Communist Party in the united anti-Japanese national front as the abandonment of our own Communist ideas and programme, as the abandonment of all criticism of our allies and temporary followers, and thereby as the abandonment of the independence of the Communist Party, and the transformation of the working class and its Party into an obedient tool of the national bourgeoisie.

The all-round strengthening of the Communist Party of China is especially necessary now, because in the present situation the enemies of the working class and the Communist Party may attempt, and are attempting, to creep into the ranks of the Party so as to do their dirty work there, and undermine the unity of the Party from within. It is especially necessary to strengthen the Party for the further reason that the success of the policy of the united anti-Japanese national front, the **success of the liberation struggle of the Chinese people, depends first and foremost on the strength, unity, discipline and fighting power of the Communist Party itself.**

The stronger and firmer the Communist Party is, the easier and quicker it will be to establish a united anti-Japanese front, and the more assured will be the success of the national liberation struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders. Hence it is clear that the further consolidation and strengthening of the Communist Party are demanded by the interests not only of the Communist Party itself and also of the working class, but also by the interests of the whole of the Chinese people.

Some people say that the policy of the Communist Party, which is directed towards the establishment of a united anti-Japanese national front, is unreal and impracticable, since there are actually two big political parties in China, namely the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, between which an historical hostility exists, and that therefore there can be no talk of any sort of united front whatsoever.

The Communist Party of China sets the interests of the Chinese people above all other considerations. Now, when a tremendous national crisis exists, what is needed is the unification of all forces for the struggle against the common enemy. It is untrue that only an historic hostility has existed between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang. Actually

there have been not only nine years of hostility between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang, but almost nine years of close collaboration (from 1919 when the first Communist groups arose in China, until the spring and autumn of 1927).

The Communists should not place the Japanese invaders, since Kai-shek in the same category as the Japanese invaders, since the Japanese fascist military clique are the main enemy of the Chinese people, and it is the struggle against them to which everything must be subordinated at the present stage. In addition, we cannot regard the whole of the Kuomintang and all its groups as allies and hirelings of Japanese imperialism. It is clear to the Chinese Communist Party that a real and serious armed resistance to the Japanese invaders requires the participation in it of the Kuomintang groups, or the decisive majority of them.

The Chinese Communists do not propose to fall into the trap set by the Japanese invaders who are provoking fratricidal war among the Chinese people for their own mercenary ends. They are honestly and truly striving to unite all the forces of the people for the struggle against the foreign oppressors. The line of the Party, therefore, of establishing a united anti-Japanese national front with the Kuomintang and other organisations is **not a manoeuvre or an empty declaration, but a sincere, honest and real policy of saving the people and the fatherland.**

As regards the attitude of the Kuomintang to the policy of the Communist Party, which is directed towards the establishment of a united anti-Japanese national front, we must note, first and foremost, that it is untrue to assert that the whole of the Kuomintang does not desire to establish such a united front with the Communists. The Kuomintang is an organisation whose influence covers millions of people, and, of course, among these millions there are tremendous numbers of honest people and honest patriots who really love their people and their native land, who are really faithful to the best traditions of Sun Yat Sen and his behests regarding the need for a struggle for equality and liberty for China, patriots who cannot but feel the oppression and shame inflicted on the Chinese people by the Japanese invaders, and who cannot but incline towards the idea of establishing a united anti-Japanese front of the whole of the Chinese people.

Among the followers of the Kuomintang there are tens of thousands of students in the **Wang Poo** and other military colleges; many of them remember the glorious traditions of the Revolution of 1925-27, and to this day dream of a struggle in defence of the interests of the state and the people. Among the commanding officers of the troops, among the party and



state officials of the Kuomintang, there are many honest people and patriots who hate the Japanese robbers, and are prepared to undertake a life and death struggle against them. And even among important Kuomintang politicians, military and public men, there are quite a number of people who, for decades, fought together with Sun Yat Sen in the ranks of the national revolutionaries, people who proudly remember the revolutionary past and who are grieved by the present policy and state of the Kuomintang, and the position of the country and the people. Among certain Kuomintang officials there are quite a number who make their starting point the simple but correct argument that the Communists are sons of the Chinese people, while the Japanese are not only foreigners, but also oppressors—and who consider that it is better to fight alongside the Communists of their own country against the foreign oppressors, than to tolerate the foreign yoke and the scorning of their people and their country, and all the more, of course, do they consider that one ought not to fight together with foreigners against the sons and daughters of the Chinese people, even though they be Communists.

Some local organisations of the Kuomintang and certain groups of the Kuomintang outside and inside China, have already begun to adhere to the united anti-Japanese front, along with the Communists and the supporters of the Chinese National Revolutionary League and other organisations. And especially important is the fact that in Manchuria and Jehol, the followers of the Kuomintang frequently fight shoulder to shoulder with the Communists in partisan warfare against the Japanese occupationists. The tendency towards the establishment of a united anti-Japanese front with the Communists and the Red Army, and particularly towards the restoration of the so-called three revolutionary political instructions of Sun Yat Sen (i.e., an alliance with the U.S.S.R., an alliance with the Chinese Communist Party, and support for the workers and peasants' mass movement), is developing with ever-growing strength among the followers of the Kuomintang, both among the leadership and the rank and file.

It is true that along with this, we are aware of the following other facts and tendencies. A section of very influential leaders and officials of the Kuomintang are still wavering, and are still afraid of establishing a united front with the Communists for the struggle against Japanese aggression. And we regret to state that it is precisely this tendency which still has predominating influence in the Kuomintang, and therefore the united anti-Japanese front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party has not yet been established.

But history teaches us that the fate of nations is decided not by the will and desires of individual personalities, but by the interests and will of millions of people. There are not a few examples in the history of nations, where the will of the millions has compelled individual leaders to act in spite of and against their own personal desires, by facing them with the choice of either going with the masses, and then remaining at their posts, or else of becoming isolated from the masses, which means an end to their political life. As regards the above-mentioned Kuomintang officials, we Communists not only place our hopes on the effective power of the law of history, but would like that they themselves, in their own interests and in the interests of the people, change their attitude to the question of the establishment of a united front against the Japanese invaders.

There are some people who will object to the line of the Communist Party for the establishment of a united national front, by declaring that we allegedly are desirous of repeating the old opportunist mistakes committed by Chen Du-Su in the revolution of 1927, which were one of the main reasons for the defeat of the revolution, and which were condemned by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of China.

In answer to such an attempt to make a blind comparison, which is characteristic of sectarians and hair-splitters, the Chinese Communists give the following reply:

It is incorrect, because the tactics of the united national front at the first stage of the revolution in the colonial and dependent countries in general, and at the first stage of the revolution in China in particular, when the point of the revolution is directed against imperialism, and when the national bourgeoisie still support the revolutionary struggle against imperialism, are **necessary and indispensable tactics**. The experience and very fact of the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 go to prove that it is precisely due to these tactics of the young Communist Party, that China has succeeded in educating and organising millions and tens of millions of workers and peasants, and in leading the peasantry into the agrarian revolution.

The Sixth Congress of the Comintern, and the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of China not only did not condemn the tactics of the united anti-imperialist national front, operated by the Communist Party in the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27, but on the contrary, endorsed them, and recognised the valuable lessons arising from them. They only condemned the mistakes of Chen Du-Su and his supporters, who in opportunist fashion distorted the tactics of the united anti-imperialist front and



transformed them from tactics of joint action with the national bourgeoisie against the common enemy, imperialism, in the interests of the Chinese people, into tactics of subordinating the proletariat and the working people to the interests of the national bourgeoisie—one of the reasons of the defeat of the Revolution of 1927 in China.

In 1928, when the Sixth Congress of the Comintern and the Sixth Congress of the C.P. of China took place, the revolutionary wave in China died down. The national bourgeoisie seized hold of the Kuomintang Party, abandoned the revolution and passed over into the camp of the counter-revolution. The petty-bourgeoisie temporarily abandoned the active revolutionary struggle. The Communist Party based itself and only could base itself on the workers, peasants, and urban poor. The united front was destroyed not by the Communist Party but by the national bourgeoisie and the Kuomintang Party, which hoped to arrive at an agreement with the imperialists.

Now, however, Japanese aggression threatens not only the toilers and the petty-bourgeoisie but also a considerable section of the national bourgeoisie in China. In this state of affairs, while continuing to base itself on the working class and the peasantry, the Communist Party is in duty bound, at the same time, to make use of every effort at resistance maturing among other sections of Chinese society.

Besides, the united front at the present time is being created on an entirely new basis. The Party, which has become a mass Party, bases itself in its struggle for the united front on the Red Army and the Soviet regions.

This is why the Communist Party, in adopting the tactics of establishing a united anti-Japanese front with the Kuomintang and other organisations, is by no means repeating the mistakes of Chen Du-Su in the Revolution of 1927.

Thirdly, the united national front presupposes the establishment of a united All-China anti-Japanese army, which must be established on the basis of a political agreement between the Red Army, the Kuomintang, and other troops, as to the joint armed defence of the country against Japanese imperialism.

While each body participating in this army will be responsible for a definite sector of the common front, and will subordinate itself to the general command in the carrying out of the general military plan, it will wholly and completely maintain its political and organisational system, its commanding and political officers. In the interests of the liberation struggle, the Chinese Communist Party cannot agree to dissolve the Red Army among the Nanking troops, for this would mean the liquidation of the most reliable

armed force of the Chinese people, and would only be of benefit to the Japanese robbers.

The Chinese Communists must take clear account of the fact that in the struggle to establish a united all-China army to defend China against the Japanese military clique, the Communist Party must not only not allow for one minute any weakening to take place in the fighting power of the Red Army, but on the contrary, it must strengthen and consolidate its power, its monolithic character, and discipline to a greater extent than at any time before. **The stronger the Red Army is, the easier and quicker it will be to achieve success in regard to the establishment of a united all-China anti-Japanese Army.**

The first necessary condition for the formation of such an army, and for the organisation of serious armed resistance to the Japanese invaders is the cessation of the civil war between the Nanking troops and the Red Army in China. Unless war is stopped between these two biggest military forces there can be no question of a really united all-China anti-Japanese army, or of serious and successful armed resistance to Japanese imperialism. For it should be borne in mind that if the Nanking Government and the Kuomintang continue to send the majority of their troops and spend the lion's share of their income on war against the Red Army, then what sort of really serious preparation for a war on Japan can they carry on? And if the Red Army is compelled to repel the endless military drives of Chiang Kai-shek, then from whence can it take the forces and means for an armed struggle against Japanese imperialism? And if these two big military forces in China carry on warfare between themselves, whence can the Chinese people secure sufficiently strong armed forces to resist the Japanese invaders? Proceeding from this practical situation and the interests of the Chinese people the Chinese Communists are energetically opposed to the ruinous policy of certain Kuomintang leaders, who say that "an end must first be made of the enemy at home, and then we shall settle accounts with the enemy from without," and who insist on the continuation of the civil war, thereby in fact giving up resistance to the aggression of Japan in China.

The Chinese Communist Party determinedly puts forward the slogans of "Clean the Japanese robbers out of China!" "Cease all civil war and all internecine war and unify all the forces of the Chinese people for resistance to Japan!" "The Chinese do not fight against the Chinese!" and "Chinese troops do not fight against Chinese troops!"

Proceeding from the need for unifying all Chinese troops for the struggle against Japanese aggression, the Red Army and its leaders, Comrades Mao Tse-dun, Chu De and others, have



repeatedly, since 1933 and especially in August, 1935, appealed and now appeal to the Kuomintang troops and their commander-in-chief, Chiang Kai-shek, to cease their offensive on the Soviet regions, and to conclude a militant agreement for a joint struggle against Japanese imperialism. And in spite of the fact that in reply to these proposals made by the Red Army, Chiang Kai-shek and the command of the Nanking troops continue their military operations against the Red Army, the latter is striving at all costs to bring about the establishment of a united anti-Japanese national fighting front with the Nanking troops of the Kuomintang and other troops in China.

Like the whole of the Chinese people, the Red Army of China is honestly desirous of putting an end to all internal warfare. The Communist Party and the Chinese people not only desire immediately to put an end to the war between the Red Army and the Kuomintang troops, but also demand an end to the internecine warfare between the various groupings within the Kuomintang, as for instance between Chiang Kai-shek and the South-West. In the present circumstances all internecine warfare in China facilitates the obscure and dirty action of the Japanese invaders. Witness of this is most clearly provided by the openly provocative action of the Japanese invaders in the armed conflict between Nanking and the South-West.

Some people object to the establishment of a united anti-Japanese front between the Red Army and the Nanking troops, by pointing out that the Chinese Communists cannot have anything in common with their old enemy, Chiang Kai-shek. In reply to this argument we have to state that Chiang Kai-shek and we are not personal enemies. Our enmity arises out of the difference in our views on all main questions of the political life of China. The Chinese Communists defend the interests of the people, while Chiang Kai-shek is pursuing a policy to the detriment of those interests. In this connection, if Chiang Kai-shek were today to come to an agreement with us to carry on a joint struggle in the defence of the Chinese people against the foreign invaders, then why should not the Chinese Communist Party establish a united front with Chiang Kai-shek in the interests of the struggle against the common enemy?

Fourthly, the united national front presupposes the establishment of an all-China government of national defence which should be representative of all parties and organisations belonging to the united anti-Japanese national front. This means that such a government must really be an all-China state authority, taking serious care of the defence of the country, defending its land and people against the encroachment of a

foreign state, and fighting to drive the Japanese invaders out of China. This government must be a government not of any single party or grouping, but a government of the national front, i.e., a government which includes all parties and organisations belonging to the anti-Japanese national front, or a section of these parties and organisations, as necessitated by the general conditions and interests of the liberation struggle of the Chinese people, or the desires of each of these parties and organisations.

#### The Slogan of a United All-China Democratic Republic

In this connection the question logically arises as to what should be done in the future with the existing authorities in China, such as for instance, the Central Soviet Government, the Nanking Central Government, and the formally local governments, which are really not subordinate to any central authority. In reply to this, the Communist Party of China states that it will only be possible to put an end to the political and administrative dismemberment of China and to do away with all the existing local governments in the country, if an all-China democratic republic is established, and an all-China Parliament is called together which will organise a real all-China government.

The question may be asked as to whether in this case Chinese Communists will pursue their struggle for Soviets and a Soviet Government in China.

The Chinese Communists are firmly convinced that only Soviets can save the Chinese people and the whole of mankind. The practical experience of the U.S.S.R. wholly and completely proves that only Soviets can transform a country which is economically, politically and culturally backward, into an advanced, rich, free and cultured country. Only Soviets can give the people a real socialist democracy such as the draft of the new Stalinist Constitution is giving the U.S.S.R.

The best sons and daughters of the Chinese people have laid down their lives in the struggle for Soviet power in China. The practical experience of the Soviet districts has shown the superiority of Soviet power over all feudal, monarchist and militaristic-bureaucratic regimes, such as the thousand-year history of China has known.

In spite of all this the Chinese Communists, who make their starting-point the interests of the Chinese people, take account of the fact that the Soviet districts as yet occupy a comparatively small section of the territory of China, that a considerable section of the Chinese people are not yet won for Soviet power, and especially take account of the point that the unheard-of menace of enslavement which hangs over the Chinese people urgently demands that ways and means be found of uniting the



national and democratic forces of the whole of the Chinese people for a joint struggle against the common enemy, the Japanese invaders, taking all this into account the Chinese Communist Party declares its readiness to support the establishment of a united all-Chinese people's democratic republic with an all-China parliament, called together on the basis of universal suffrage, and an all-China government of national defence. In the present circumstances this will be the best way of uniting all the national and democratic forces of the Chinese people to resist the aggression of Japan and to save the fatherland.

What is meant by a really united all-China democratic republic? It is a republic which will be able to lead China out of its condition of political and administrative dismemberment, of militarist wars, and will be able to do away with feudal oppression, and establish order and peace in the country. Such a republic can serve as a basis for unifying, rallying and organising all the material and human resources of China and of the great Chinese people for the struggle against the external enemy. It is a republic which really defends the interests of the people and not the interests of merchant-parasites, a republic in which the will of the people should predominate and not the arbitrariness and self-assumed power of military dictators.

The Communist Party of China is for a really democratic republic in which the people enjoy democratic rights and liberties—the right to work and education, the inviolability of the person, property and dwelling, freedom of speech, the press, organisation, strikes, demonstrations, religious belief and anti-religious propaganda, etc.

The all-China parliament, elected on the basis of universal suffrage, must be really representative of the whole of the Chinese people without any racial, national, class, political, party and religious limitations. It will thereby be distinguished from the advisory and legislative organs of the Kuomintang, which are in fact appointed by its Executive Committee (the so-called National Assembly in Nanking in 1931, or the National Assembly which it is proposed will assemble in November, 1936, in Nanking). It will thereby also be distinguished from all the previous parliaments in China, particularly from the parliaments under the government of Huan Shi Kai or Tsao Kun and Wu Pei Fu, when the parliamentary elections took place in circumstances of unheard-of bribery, trickery and violence.

An all-China parliament of a united all-China democratic republic is necessary because this parliament, as the most authoritative and generally recognised representative organ of the whole of the Chinese people must examine, discuss and adopt the corresponding decisions and laws regarding the main

questions of foreign and domestic policy, and must draw up and adopt the fundamental law, the constitution of the united all-China democratic republic. The Chinese people today really need a constitution, but they do not need the sort of constitution such as, for instance, will be presented by the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang at the National Assembly called for November, which both formally and in fact is not the constitution of the Chinese people, but only the constitution of the Kuomintang itself.

The Chinese people need a constitution which guarantees the interests and rights of the whole of the Chinese people.

The Chinese Communists declare that if a united all-China democratic republic is established, if Parliament is called together, elected on the basis of universal suffrage, and if an all-China government of national defence is formed, then the Soviet Districts, respecting the will of the majority of the Chinese people, will become part of this united democratic republic, will participate in the all-China parliament, and be ready to introduce the same kind of political and administrative regime on their territory as will be established for the whole of China.

However, prior to the establishment of such a republic, the Chinese Communist Party will not only not permit for one single moment any weakening of the power of the Soviets as the power of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, a power directed in the first instance against the Japanese imperialists, but will strive with all its forces to strengthen its authority and fighting power by extending connections and contact with the widest masses of the people. Prior to the establishment of such a republic, the Chinese Communists will strengthen the Soviets, because the Soviets today are the only power of the people and centre of democracy, because the Soviets today are the unifying centre in the struggle of the Chinese people to establish a united anti-Japanese national front, to establish a united all-China people's democratic republic, and therefore they belong to the most reliable supporters of this republic.

On learning of the line of the Communist Party for the establishment of a united all-China democratic republic, certain bourgeois intellectuals and liberal bourgeoisie in China are beginning to talk about the "victory of democracy over Communism." In reply to this we have to say the following: Gentlemen, you do not understand, or you pretend that you do not understand, the attitude of the Communists towards democracy. You are absolutely mistaken if you assert that the Communists everywhere and at all times are in principle against any kind of democracy, and that they are only in favour of



dictatorship. It is true that the Communists criticise bourgeois democracy, and declare themselves in favour of Soviets as being real democracy for the overwhelming majority of the people, but at the same time the Communists are in the front ranks of those who defend the conquests of bourgeois democracy against attacks and encroachments by the forces of mediaeval obscurantism and fascism. And our glorious brother parties in France and Spain have given, and are continuing to give, incontestable proof of this by their heroic struggle for the People's Front and in defence of the republic against fascism.

We tell these bourgeois intellectuals and liberal bourgeoisie the following: If you really are democrats, then cease your naive chatter about some sort of "victory of democracy over Communism," and let us fight together with all the democratic forces of the Chinese people for the establishment of a united all-Chinese people's democratic republic.

## *The Indictment of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Terrorists*

[Continued from November Issue]

The investigation has also established that the terroristic group headed by MOSES LURYE, whom TROTSKY sent into the U.S.S.R., was actually organised by the active German fascist FRANZ WEITZ, the representative of HIMLER, who at that time was the leader of the fascist Black Shirt Detachments and is now the director of the German Secret Police (Gestapo).

On this point, M. Lurye, examined on July 21, stated the following:

"NATHAN LURYE replied that he was still, as before, a convinced Trotskyite, and he reported that a terroristic group, small in number, but very reliable in its composition, had been organised here in Moscow in April, 1932.

"... When I asked on whose instructions and at whose initiative this militant group had been organised, N. LURYE answered that the militant group was created by a certain FRANZ WEITZ. . . ."

"... When I asked who was FRANZ WEITZ, N. LURYE, at first very unwillingly, answered as follows: FRANZ WEITZ is an active member of the National Socialist Party in Germany and a trusted man of HIMLER (the present director of the Gestapo in Germany); at that

time HIMLER was the leader of the 'SS'—Blackshirt Guards. . . ."

"... The main task of the group, according to WEITZ, was to prepare terroristic acts against STALIN, KAGANOVICH, VOROSHILOV, and ORJONIKIDZE. . . ." (Vol. XXXII, files 243, 244.)

The accused M. LURYE reported N. LURYE'S communication to ZINOVIEV, desiring to ascertain ZINOVIEV'S attitude towards having connections with the fascists and the German Secret Police.

After listening to M. LURYE'S communication, ZINOVIEV replied:

"What is there in this to disturb you? You are an historian, MOSES ILYICH; you know the case of Lassalle and Bismarck, when Lassalle wanted to use Bismarck in the interests of the revolution."

"... By means of this historical parallel"—added M. LURYE—"ZINOVIEV wanted to prove the possibility and the necessity of utilising an alliance with the National Socialists in the fight against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government." (Vol. XXXII, file 252.)

M. LURYE'S testimony was fully confirmed by N. LURYE, who, during examination on July 21, stated the following:

"I must admit that from the autumn of 1932 to the end of 1933 the militant terrorist group of which I was the head actively prepared for a terroristic act against the People's Commissar of Defence, VOROSHILOV. . . ."

"... I was commissioned to do this by FRANZ WEITZ, a German engineer-architect, member of the National Socialist Party of Germany, representative of HIMLER, now director of the Gestapo."

"... In August, 1932, during my vacation in Germany, FRANZ WEITZ put me in charge of the active terrorist group and commissioned me to prepare for and carry out terroristic acts against STALIN, KAGANOVICH, and VOROSHILOV." (Vol. XXXIII, files 141-142.)

Thus the accused M. LURYE and N. LURYE, establishing direct organisational connection with the German fascists and the German Secret Police, betrayed the interests of the Soviet Government and committed treason against their country.

Finally, the circumstances established by the investigation prove that L. TROTSKY, ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, and others, the leaders of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc, in their fight against the Soviet Government sank so low that their ethics proved to be more contemptible than those of the most hardened



gangs of criminals. While organising terroristic acts against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet State, the leaders of the united centre simultaneously prepared to exterminate their own agents, the terrorists, in order utterly to wipe out all traces of their crimes.

On this point the accused REINGOLD testified as follows:

"ZINOVIEV and KAMENEV did not preclude the possibility that the O.G.P.U. was in possession of the threads of the conspiracy against the state which they, ZINOVIEV and KAMENEV, were preparing. Therefore they regarded it as their most important task to remove every possible clue to the crimes committed. For this purpose it was proposed to appoint BAKAYEV chairman of the O.G.P.U. Upon him was imposed the function of physically exterminating the persons who directly carried out terroristic acts against STALIN and KIROV, as well as those workers of the O.G.P.U. who might be in possession of the threads of these crimes." (Vol. XXVII, files 163-164.)

## II. The United Trotskyite-Zinovievite Centre and the Assassination of Comrade S. M. Kirov

It was already established in the case of NIKOLAYEV, RUMYANTSEV, KOTOLYNOV, and others shot by sentence of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. on the charge of murdering Comrade S. M. KIROV on December 1, 1934, that direct connections existed between the group of Zinovievites in Leningrad who committed the murder and the accused ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, and BAKAYEV, who were convicted in the case of the so-called Moscow centre.

At the present time, the investigating authorities are in possession of undoubtedly established facts proving that the murder of S. M. Kirov was committed on the decision of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre.

This was admitted at a preliminary investigation by the majority of active members of various terrorist Trotskyite-Zinovievite groups, including the accused ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, YEVDOKIMOV, BAKAYEV, MRACHKOVSKY, and others.

The accused YEVDOKIMOV fully confirmed this by declaring at the examination on August 10 as follows:

"... During the trial of the Kirov murder case, I—YEVDOKIMOV, with ZINOVIEV, KAMENEV, BAKAYEV, GERTIK, and others, deceived the government authorities and the court by concealing that the murder of Kirov was prepared for and carried out by us, the members of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc.

"The murder of Kirov was committed by the Leningrad terrorist centre on the direct instructions of the united centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc." (Vol. XXXVI, file 6.)

"... In 1934, ZINOVIEV, acting in the name of the Trotskyite - Zinovievite organisation, gave BAKAYEV direct instructions to organise the murder of Kirov.

"Those taking part in the decision to murder KIROV, in addition to ZINOVIEV and KAMENEV, were I—YEVDOKIMOV—and BAKAYEV, and also representatives of the Trotskyites in the persons of MRACHKOVSKY and TER-VAGANYAN. In order to prepare for the murder, BAKAYEV went to Leningrad in the autumn of 1934, and there established contacts with the active members of our organisation: KOTOLYNOV, LEVIN, RUMYANTSEV, MANDELSTAM, and MYASNIKOV, who comprised the so-called Leningrad terrorist centre. The Leningrad centre had an active group of terrorists, directly engaged in making preparations for the murder of KIROV." (Vol. XXXVI, file 6.)

After obdurate equivocation, the accused ZINOVIEV, unmasked by the testimony of others of the accused, had to admit that as far back as 1932 the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre had decided to organise terroristic acts against Comrade STALIN in Moscow and against Comrade KIROV in Leningrad.

"In the autumn of 1932," stated the accused ZINOVIEV, "in my villa at Ilyinskoye, in the presence of KAMENEV, BAKAYEV, YEVDOKIMOV, and KAREV, I instructed BAKAYEV to organise a terroristic act against STALIN, and KAREV to organise a terroristic act against KIROV." (Vol. XII, file 36.)

The accused ZINOVIEV stated:

"In 1934, I do not remember the exact month, in the middle of the year, YEVDOKIMOV informed me that GERTIK had gone to Leningrad and had established contacts with KOTOLYNOV; at this meeting KOTOLYNOV informed GERTIK that he was taking a direct part in the preparations for the murder of KIROV." (Vol. XII, files 37, 38.)

This was also testified by the accused KAMENEV, who confirmed the fact that a conference had taken place in Ilyinskoye at which it was decided to commit terroristic acts against Comrades STALIN and KIROV. The accused KAMENEV stated:

"I must admit that before the conference in Ilyinskoye,



ZINOVIEV informed me of the intended decisions of the centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc to organise terroristic acts against STALIN and KIROV, declaring that the representatives of the Trotskyites in the centre of the bloc, SMIRNOV, MRACHKOVSKY, and VAGANYAN, insisted on this decision, that they had direct instructions on this point from Trotsky, and that they demanded the practical adoption of this measure in fulfilment of the basic ideas of the bloc." (Vol. XV, files 15-16.)

To this the accused KAMENEV added:

"I associated myself with this decision because I agreed with it entirely." (Vol. XV, file 16.)

As the investigation has established, the practical fulfilment of the plan to organise the murder of Comrade KIROV was assigned by the united centre to I. P. BAKAYEV, a member of that centre.

Direct evidence on this is given by the accused ZINOVIEV, who admitted that it was precisely BAKAYEV who had been instructed by ZINOVIEV, in the name of the united centre, to organise the terroristic acts against Comrade STALIN in Moscow and against Comrade KIROV in Leningrad. (Vol. XII, file 36.)

Detailed evidence on the role played by ZINOVIEV, BAKAYEV, and the whole of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre in the murder of Comrade S. M. KIROV was given by the accused REINGOLD, who stated the following:

"I learned personally from ZINOVIEV that the murder of Kirov in Leningrad was prepared for on his direct instructions and on the instructions of the centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc. During this conversation with ZINOVIEV, which took place in his apartment in August, 1934, he, as I have already stated, reproached the Moscow militant organisation for being slow and not sufficiently active.

"In giving the reasons for the necessity of committing terroristic acts against KIROV, ZINOVIEV said that KIROV must be physically destroyed as STALIN'S closest assistant. He also added: 'It is not enough to fell the oak; all the young oaks growing around it must be felled too.' Another argument ZINOVIEV used in support of the necessity of murdering KIROV was that KIROV was the leader of the Leningrad organisation and was personally responsible for the rout of the opposition in Leningrad.

"As I have already stated, the Leningrad militant organ-

isation was under the direct leadership of BAKAYEV. Organisational connection with this organisation was also maintained by FAIVILOVICH." (Vol. XXVII, file 70.)

Persistently denying his participation in the organisation of the murder of Comrade KIROV, the accused BAKAYEV, under the weight of evidence brought against him, stated:

"I admit that ZINOVIEV personally instructed me to organise the murder of STALIN in Moscow, and KAREV to organise the murder of KIROV in Leningrad. For this purpose I instructed KAREV to establish contact in Leningrad with the members of the organisation, VLADIMIR LEVIN and ANISHEV, while ZINOVIEV instructed me to put KAREV also in touch with RUMYANTSEV in Leningrad." (Vol. I, file 89.)

Evidence on the role played by BAKAYEV as one of the principal organisers of the murder of Comrade KIROV was also given by N. A. KAREV, who is under arrest in connection with another case. At the examination held on July 5, 1936, N. A. KAREV stated:

"ZINOVIEV said that BAKAYEV had been instructed to prepare terroristic acts against STALIN and KIROV and that for this purpose he was to utilise his connections with the ZINOVIEV groups in Leningrad and Moscow." (Vol. III, file 11.)

To this KAREV added:

"In conversation with BAKAYEV, I learned that the latter intended to utilise the Zinovievite groups of RUMYANTSEV and KOTOLYNOV in Leningrad with which he, BAKAYEV, had contact, for the organisation of a terroristic act against KIROV." (Vol. III, file 11.)

This was also fully confirmed during the investigation by the accused YEVDOKIMOV, who stated the following:

"I learned from BAKAYEV that in the autumn of 1934 he, BAKAYEV, together with a Trotskyite terrorist, whose name I do not know, went to Leningrad to establish connections with the Leningrad terrorist centre and to organise the murder of KIROV.

"While in Leningrad, BAKAYEV and the above-mentioned Trotskyite terrorist met NIKOLAYEV and came to an agreement with him about murdering KIROV." (Vol. XXXVI, files 7, 8.)

And further:

"BAKAYEV stated that the terrorists had expressed confidence in the success of their terroristic act; they con-



sidered themselves to be safe. The reason for this was that all of them, including such active Zinovievites as RUMYANTSEV, LEVIN, MYASNIKOV, MANDELSTAM, and others enjoyed the confidence of a number of leading workers in Party and Soviet organisations in Leningrad. This ensured them every possibility of pursuing their preparations for a terroristic act against KIROV without the least fear of discovery." (Vol. XXXVI, file 9.)

The investigation has established that after the united Zinovievite-Trotskyite centre had adopted the decision to murder Comrade S. M. KIROV, KAMENEV made a special journey to Leningrad in June, 1934, to investigate the progress of the work of organising the terroristic act against Comrade KIROV.

ZINOVIEV also pressed forward in every way the murder of Comrade KIROV and, as N. M. MATORIN, formerly ZINOVIEV'S private secretary, who is now under arrest in connection with another case, testified, ZINOVIEV reproached the members of the terroristic group for being slow and irresolute.

MATORIN stated:

"ZINOVIEV told me that the preparations for the terroristic act must be pressed forward to the utmost and that KIROV must be killed by winter. ZINOVIEV reproached me for not displaying sufficient determination and energy. He said that on the question of terroristic methods of struggle prejudices must be dropped." (Vol. XIV, files 63, 64.)

### III. Organisation by the United Trotskyite-Zinovievite Centre of Terroristic Acts against Comrades Voroshilov, Zhdanov, Kaganovich, Kosior, Orjonikidze, and Postyshev

The materials of the investigation have established that the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite terroristic centre, after it had killed Comrade KIROV, did not limit itself to the work of organising the murder of Comrade STALIN only. The terroristic Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre simultaneously carried on work to organise the murder of other leaders of the Party, namely, Comrades VOROSHILOV, ZHDANOV, KAGANOVICH, KOSIOR, ORJONIKIDZE, and POSTYSHEV.

The accused REINGOLD stated that ZINOVIEV, in speaking of the necessity of murdering Comrade KIROV as Comrade STALIN'S immediate assistant added:

"It is not enough to fell the oak; all the young oaks growing around it must be felled too." (Vol. XXVII, file 70.)

According to REINGOLD'S evidence:

"ZINOVIEV'S main instructions amounted to the following: the blow must be directed against STALIN,

KAGANOVICH, and KIROV." (Vol. XXVII, file 63.)

The accused REINGOLD confirmed that:

"The united centre calculated on causing full panic in the Party and in the country by a stunning simultaneous blow in Moscow and Leningrad." (Vol. XXVII, file 163.)

Various terroristic groups operating under the general leadership of the united centre attempted to carry out the murder of VOROSHILOV, KAGANOVICH, ZHDANOV, KOSIOR, ORJONIKIDZE, and POSTYSHEV.

Thus the organisation of the terroristic act against Comrade VOROSHILOV was the work of the DREIZER group, which received instructions to murder VOROSHILOV directly from TROTSKY, and of the group of the Trotskyite M. LURYE, which was sent over from Germany for the same purpose.

In regard to the preparation for the murder of Comrade VOROSHILOV, the accused MRACHKOVSKY, one of the members of the united centre, stated:

"In the middle of 1934, E. DREIZER reported to me that simultaneously he was organising the murder of VOROSHILOV, for which purpose Dimitri SCHMIDT, who was a commander in the army and was under no suspicion in the Party, was to be prepared. It was presumed that he would kill VOROSHILOV either while reporting to him on service matters, or during the next manoeuvres at which VOROSHILOV would be present." (Vol. XVIII, file 49.)

The accused DREIZER, examined by the State Prosecutor of the Soviet Union on July 31, stated on this point:

"For the purpose of committing the terroristic act, I recruited ESTERMAN and GAYEVSKY, and in 1935 SCHMIDT and KUSMICHEV. The latter undertook to kill VOROSHILOV." (Vol. X, file 195.)

The evidence of MRACHKOVSKY and DREIZER was also confirmed by the accused REINGOLD, who stated the following:

"I learned from MRACHKOVSKY and DREIZER that in the summer of 1933 a Trotskyite group of military men was organised under the leadership of DREIZER. The group consisted of SCHMIDT, commander of a brigade of the Red Army, KUSMICHEV, chief of staff of a military unit, and a number of other persons whose names I do not know. I learned from DREIZER that SCHMIDT and KUSMICHEV were to carry out the terroristic act against VOROSHILOV and that they had agreed to do so. It was planned that for this purpose they would either take advantage of an official visit to VOROSHILOV, or of



VOROSHILOV'S visit to one of the military units." (Vol. XXVII, files 165, 166.)

The investigation has also established that in the same period, a number of terroristic groups (DREIZER, M. LURYE, and others) were organising attempts on the lives of Comrades ZHDANOV, KAGANOVICH, ORJONIKIDZE, KOSIOR, and POSTYSHEV.

#### Formulation of the Charge

Analysing the above, the investigation considers it established:

(1) That in the period of 1932-1936 a united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre was organised in the city of Moscow, the object of which was to commit a number of terroristic acts against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government for the purpose of seizing power.

(2) That of those accused in the present case, G. E. ZINOVIEV, L. B. KAMENEV, G. E. YEVDOKIMOV, and I. P. BAKAYEV of the Zinovievites and I. N. SMIRNOV, V. A. TER-VAGANYAN, and S. V. MRACHKOVSKY of the Trotskyites, were part of this united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre.

(3) That during this period, the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre organised a number of terrorist groups and prepared a number of practical measures to murder Comrades STALIN, VOROSHILOV, ZHDANOV, KAGANOVICH, KIROV, KOSIOR, ORJONIKIDZE, and POSTYSHEV.

(4) That one of these terroristic groups, operating on the direct instructions of ZINOVIEV and L. TROTSKY and of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre, and under the direct leadership of the accused BAKAYEV, foully murdered Comrade S. M. KIROV on December 1, 1934.

The accused in this case: G. E. ZINOVIEV, L. B. KAMENEV, G. E. YEVDOKIMOV, I. P. BAKAYEV, V. A. TER-VAGANYAN, S. V. MRACHKOVSKY, E. A. DREIZER, V. P. OLBERG, FRITZ DAVID (I. I. KRUGLYANSKY), E. S. HOLZMAN, R. V. PICKEL, I. I. REINGOLD, K. B. BERMAN-YURIN, M. LURYE, and N. LURYE have fully admitted themselves guilty on the charges made against them.

The accused I. N. SMIRNOV, acknowledging his participation in the united centre of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc, his personal connection with L. TROTSKY and his meetings with SEDOV while abroad in 1931, and also the fact that he maintained connection with TROTSKY right up to the time of his arrest in 1933, admitted that in 1931 instructions were conveyed to him by SEDOV and confirmed in 1932 by TROTSKY to organise terrorism against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and the

Soviet state and that these instructions served as the basis of the organisation of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc.

At the same time, the accused I. N. SMIRNOV categorically denies that he took part in the terroristic activities of the united Trotskyite-Zinovievite centre. However, the accused I. N. SMIRNOV is proved to have participated in the terroristic activities of the united centre by the evidence of the accused S. V. MRACHKOVSKY (Vol. XXIX, files 76-84), DREIZER (Vol. XXXI, file 63), A. N. SAFONOVA (Vol. XXXI, file 295), I. I. REINGOLD (Vol. XXXI, files 138, 284), G. E. ZINOVIEV (Vol. XII, file 35), L. B. KAMENEV (Vol. XV, file 28), G. E. YEVDOKIMOV (Vol. XXXVI, files 9, 10), R. V. PICKEL (Vol. XXXI, file 78).

On the basis of the above:

1. Grigori Evseyevich ZINOVIEV, born 1883, employee, convicted in 1935 in the Zinovievite Moscow centre case;

2. Lev Borisovich KAMENEV, born 1883, employee, convicted in 1935 in the same Moscow centre case;

3. Grigori Eremeyevich YEVDOKIMOV, born 1884, employee, convicted in 1935 in the same Moscow centre case;

4. Ivan Petrovich BAKAYEV, born 1887, employee, convicted in 1935 in the same Moscow centre case;

5. Sergei Vitalevich MRACHKOVSKY, born 1888, employee;

6. Vagarshak Arutyonovich TER-VAGANYAN, born 1893, employee;

7. Ivan Nikitich SMIRNOV, born 1880—are accused, the first six in the period of 1932 to 1936, and I. N. SMIRNOV since 1931;

(a) of having organised a number of terrorist groups which were making preparations to murder Comrades STALIN, VOROSHILOV, ZHDANOV, KAGANOVICH, KIROV, KOSIOR, ORJONIKIDZE, and POSTYSHEV;

(b) of having, on December 1, 1934, organised and carried out the foul murder of Comrade S. M. KIROV, through the Leningrad underground terrorist group of NIKOLAYEV-KOTOLYNOV and others:

i.e., of crimes covered by Arts. 58-8 and 51-11 of the Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R.

(8) Ephim Aleksandrovich DREIZER, born 1894, employee;

(9) Isaac Isaevich REINGOLD, born 1897, employee;

(10) Richard Vitoldovich PICKEL, born 1896, employee;

(11) Edward Solomonovich HOLZMAN, born 1882, employee;

(12) Fritz DAVID, alias KRUGLYANSKY, Ilya-David



Israilevich, born 1897, employee;

(13) Valentine Pavlovich OLBERG, born 1907, employee;

(14) Konon Borisovich BERMAN-YURIN (alias Alexander FOMICHI), born 1901, employee;

(15) Moses Ilyich LURYE (alias Alexander EMEL), born 1897, employee;

(16) Nathan Lazarevich LURYE, born 1901, employee—

Are accused in that, being members of the underground terrorist Trotskyite-Zinovievite organisation, they took part in the preparations to murder Comrades STALIN, VOROSHILOV, ZHDANOV, KAGANOVICH, KOSIOR, ORJONIKIDZE, and POSTYSHEV:

i.e., crimes covered by Arts. 19-58-8 and 58-11 of the Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R.

L. TROTSKY and his son L. L. SEDOV, both of whom are abroad, have been exposed by the materials in the present case as having directly prepared and personally guided the work of organising in the U.S.S.R. terroristic acts against the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and of the Soviet state, and in the event of their being discovered on the territory of the U.S.S.R. are subject to immediate arrest and trial by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R.

The cases of GERTIK, GREENBERG, J. GAVEN, KAREV, KUSMICHEV, CONSTANT, MATORIN, Paul OLBERG, RADIN, SAFONOVA, FAIVILOVICH, D. SCHMIDT, and ESTERMAN, in view of the fact that investigations are still proceeding, will be tried separately.

In view of what has been set forth above and in accordance with the decision of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. of August 11, 1936, all the above-mentioned persons are subject to trial by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. in open judiciary session.

The present indictment was drawn up in the city of Moscow on August 14, 1936.

A. VISHINSKY,  
State Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R.

## Important Announcement

COMMENCING with the January, 1937, issue, considerable improvement will be made in The Review. The present high standard of content will be raised by additional contributions from the history of Australia, trade union questions, and important documents.

The size and content will be increased by 40 per cent., the appearance and set-up will be improved. There will be no alteration in the price.

This forward step will increase the production cost, which must be met by increased circulation.

We are confident that this important announcement will induce the sellers to increase their orders for January. To avoid any disappointment, we urge agents to send in their orders before December 20.

We expect to reach the 4000 mark with the January number, and to surpass our original objective of 5000 by May 1, 1937.

### SALES CHART

	November	Increase on August Figures
AND DISTRICT .. .. .	1000	136
NSLAND .. .. .	618	133
NSLAND .. .. .	420	42
.. .. .	648	48
AND DISTRICT ...	145	—
ALIA .. .. .	120	
.. .. .	48	
.. .. .	6	
.. .. .	41	
.. .. .	3070	