

23/251

COMMUNIST

6^D

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

Review



NOVEMBER

1939

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

EDITOR: R. DIXON

Associate Editor: E. W. Campbell

Room 2, 193 Hay Street, Sydney.

Vol. VI. No. 11. Sydney: November, 1939 Sixpence

Contents

THE NEWS REVIEWED	E. W. Campbell	641
SOCIALISM BRINGS PEACE, PROGRESS AND PLENTY	J. B. Miles	648
THE CANARY (Story)	George Farwell	654
OUR PARTY IN THE CRISIS	L. Harry Gould	657
PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY	K. Ostrovitzanov	660
OUR NEW "DEMOCRAT" MENZIES	M. Porter	663
CROSS THE RUBICON	J. J. Leo	666
ON HISTORY	"Alpha"	668
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	670
ITALY: THREE YEARS OF WAR	671
WHO SHALL BOOZE? (Sketch)	"Gordon"	674
SOUTH AUSTRALIA	"Y. J."	676
THE MOVEMENT OF THE WORKING CLASS STANDARD OF LIVING IN AUSTRALIA	N. Kelly	679
LEGION OF YOUTH (Verse)	682
PAGES FROM THE PAST	J. N. Rawling	683
THE SOVIET UNION MADE PEACE POSSIBLE	L. Sharkey	689
PEEL'S SETTLEMENT AT SWAN RIVER	W. Watson	695
SOVIET'S FIRST ACT—DECREE ON PEACE	699

THE NEWS REVIEWED

● THE WRITING ON THE WALL ●

THE Upper Hunter (N.S.W.) by-election resulted in a political cataclysm for the reactionary U.A.P.-C.P. Coalition Government.

The Country Party retained the seat but only by a very narrow margin. It was indeed a Pyrrhic victory.

The Upper Hunter constituency is in the heart of a wealthy farming and grazing district, and has always been regarded as a "safe" Country Party seat.

In the 1935 election the successful Country Party candidate was not extended to win by a majority of 1,121 over Labor and Independent rivals.

In last month's by-election this was reduced to a bare 100 votes. Labor increased its strength by over 2000 votes.

It needs no Daniel to interpret the meaning of this writing on the wall. The days of the present government are numbered. It has been weighed in the balances and found wanting. When it goes to the polls it will be smashed. The people of New South Wales want a Labor Government. That is what the Upper Hunter result means.

For the past seven years the State has languished under the misrule of the U.A.P.-C.P. junta. This has been a period of seven fat years for the monopolists but seven exceedingly lean years for the people.

Milk monopolists, food monopo-

lists and rent racketeers have had a gloriously rapacious time plundering the community. While the cost of living has soared to stratosphere heights wages have been anchored to underground levels.

It has not simply been a case of the government casting a Nelsonian eye upon this course of events, it has actually intervened to smooth the path for the robbers.

Amongst other things it disposed of the State Brickworks for a mere song, giving the brickmaking combine a clear field in which to exploit the building public.

However, this particular combine over-reached itself in grabbing for super profits and brought upon itself a Royal Commission. As a sequel to this, if public pressure does not relax, many friends of the government will find themselves in court answering charges of breaches of the Monopolies Act.

If justice and not the law was to hold sway they would be joined in the dock by their governmental accomplices.

How, it might be asked, have the people of New South Wales tolerated this regime for so long.

One reason has been that Labor under Lang's leadership has not offered a sufficiently attractive alternative.

The lower middle classes, whose ballots constitute that "swinging

vote" which often decides election results, had lost faith in Stevens, Mair and Co., but were not prepared to support Labor under Lang. They could not be blamed for viewing the present government's policy as a continuation of that instituted by Lang when in office.

But given a new and invigorated Labor Party, united under a new leadership, and pursuing a progressive anti-trust policy and the situation is changed.

Already there was evidence of this in the Hurstville and Waverley by-elections where the candidates of the "new" A.L.P. received substantial support from the urban middle classes and went in with flying colors.

Upper Hunter gave the opportunity for testing the feelings in country constituencies, and it told the same story—the people are sick to death of the present government and more than ready for a change.

But it is not enough that we should passively register the course of events, it is not sufficient for us to merely interpret the desires of the masses, ours is the leading role in transforming the will of the people into action.

The people are already hostile to the monopolists. We must intensify our efforts to expose these vultures in all spheres of economic and political life. The ramifications of the monopolies and their political connections must be dragged into the open and kept constantly before the

eyes of the people.

At the same time we must teach the people how to organise and struggle against these concerns.

The people are already hostile to the present government. We must show them that the shortest route to its early downfall lies through united action and struggle to achieve their immediate demands.

The people are swinging in greater numbers to the support of the Labor Party. This swing has kept pace with the forward march to ascendancy of the progressive wing within that Party, it has become more marked since some degree of unity was achieved. The sooner complete unity is realised and the splitters put to final rout the better will Labor be fitted to wrest the reins of office from the present government.

A Labor Government will not be able to solve all of the problems of the people of N.S.W., it will at best be able to ease the burden for the masses, and that only in face of determined resistance by the monopolists who will become tenfold more truculent if they suffer a reverse at the polls.

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that they might make some attempt to prevent the people from delivering a verdict at the polls in the light of the way things are shaping.

If such should prove to be the case then the people will not be slow to accept the challenge.

THIS CAPITALISM

"... Imperialism is an immense accumulation of money capital in a few countries... Hence the extraordinary growth of a class, or rather of a category, of bondholders (rentiers), i.e., people who live by "clipping coupons," who take no part whatever in production, whose profession is idleness." (Lenin's Imperialism.)

A RECENT case in the N.S.W. Equity Court provided an illuminating insight into the mode of living of certain of our parasitical upper classes.

Mary Alice Hordern, widow of the late Anthony Shoubra Hordern, was claiming an increased annual allowance from the deceased's estate.

The late Anthony Shoubra undeniably belonged to the category referred to in the quotation from Lenin's Imperialism.

His fortune was inherited, he played no part in production, his profession was idleness.

Hear what the learned Judge said about him in his summing up.

"... he lived a somewhat nomadic life, during which period it would seem his main purposes were to indulge in the pastimes of yachting and to evade or mitigate the pressure of income tax legislation."

What a terrific strain he must have labored under. Our poor heart bleeds with compassion when we think of this noble pillar of capitalist society cruising the seven seas in a sweat of anguish, cudgelling his colossal brain to conjure up new means of defeating the taxation laws of his country.

And if he should grow tired of the sea he could always repair to the land—

"In addition to the yacht he usually kept two motor cars, one of which was always a Rolls Royce."

As for the poor widow her plight must bring quick tears of sympathy to the eyes of all working women.

"Mrs. Hordern, now 39," said the Judge, "was the daughter of a retired colonel and had not been trained to any profession or occupation."

"She would seem to be quite incapable of earning her own living (poor soul) or even supplementing her means of livelihood (isn't it terrible) by her own exertions."

We can just picture the Judge weeping into his wig as the sad story unfolds and instructing the Court that it should:

"Allow such maintenance as would allow the widow to live in a reasonable degree of comfort and without anxiety in the state of life to which she was accustomed..."

The Court's verdict was that Mrs. Hordern was entitled to have her annuity increased to £1000 and the trustees of the estate were directed to apply £3000 to the purchase and furnishing of a suitable home for her and her daughter.

Such is this system of capitalism. The people who play no useful part in production, whose profession is idleness, who are not capable of

earning a living, are rewarded with fine homes and a life of comfort free from all anxiety. While the workers who build the fine houses and produce the good things of life live in dark hovels and endure the discomforts of a life on the basic wage, a life which is never free from anxiety as to whether even this will not give way on the morrow to an even more insecure existence on the dole. —E. W. CAMPBELL.

SOVIET BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION

THE great October Socialist Revolution, having abolished the rule of the landlords and capitalists, opened up the road of free development for all nationalities of the Soviet Union. The Russian proletariat liberated the peoples who were subjected to oppression and colonial exploitation under Tsarism and created the conditions for their political, economic and cultural development. On the basis of the self-determination of the peoples, the U.S.S.R. has built up a commonwealth of peoples, who are building a joyous and happy life, a thing impossible under capitalism.

The Socialist development of the national Republics which in the past were colonies of Tsarist Russia would have been impossible without the all-round assistance of the working class of the industrially more developed regions of the country. In this work of promoting the economic and cultural development of the national Republics, no small part is played by the Soviet State budget. The State budget provides for active material assistance to the formerly

backward peoples of the U.S.S.R. in order to accelerate the development of Socialist industry, agriculture and culture in the national Republics.

The State budget approved by the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. provides for the further growth of all branches of national economy and culture in the Union and autonomous Republics. The aggregate total of the 1939 Republican and local budgets of the Union Republics was fixed by the Session at 38,721,843,000 rubles, which, according to preliminary data, represents an increase of 12.4 per cent. over the 1938 figures. The Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. endorsed the following total figures of the State budgets of the various Union Republics for 1939: Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—23,978,144,000 rubles, Ukrainian S.S.R.—6,542,001,000 rubles, Byelorussia S.S.R.—1,301,464,000 rubles, Azerbaidjan S.S.R.—992,967,000 rubles, Georgian S.S.R.—1,147,806,000 rubles, Armenian S.S.R.—439,670,000 rubles, Turkmen S.S.R.—495,583,-

000 rubles, Uzbek S.S.R.—1,441,517,000 rubles, Tadjik S.S.R.—482,680,000 rubles, Kazakh S.S.R.—1,513,770,000 rubles, Kirghiz S.S.R.—386,251,000 rubles. While the aggregate total of all the Republican and local budgets of the Union Republics for 1939 shows a 12.4 per cent. increase over 1938, the State budget of the Turkmen S.S.R. shows a 22.4 per cent. increase and the budget of the Kazakh S.S.R., an increase of 20.1 per cent.

The revenue of the Republican and local budgets is made up of income from the Socialist national economy under the jurisdiction of the Republican and local bodies, from the agricultural tax, from profits of Socialist industry, from State loans and other sources. Republics where revenue sources are comparatively small, receive a larger percentage of State revenue, derived in the given Republic, for their own budgets. This makes it possible to develop industry and culture in the formerly backward Republics at a more rapid pace. In 1937 18.8 per cent. of all State revenue derived in the R.S.F.S.R. was left in the R.S.F.S.R. budget, whereas in the case of the Turkmen S.S.R. its budget received 63.8 per cent. of all State revenue, the budget of the Kirghiz S.S.R. received 71.9 per cent., the budget of the Armenian S.S.R. received 86.4 per cent., and that of the Tadjik S.S.R. 100 per cent. of all State revenue.

The budgets of Union Republics grow more rapidly than the State budget of the U.S.S.R. as a whole.

Thus, for example, during the period from 1933 to 1939, the State budget of the U.S.S.R. as a whole increased 3.3 times, whereas the budget of the Byelorussia S.S.R. increased 3.9 times, the budget of the Ukrainian S.S.R. 3.8 times, the budget of the Uzbek S.S.R. 3.6 times, and the budgets of the Turkmen, Azerbaidjan, Georgian and Armenian Soviet Socialist Republics increased 3.4 times.

In addition to budget appropriations of the Union Republics, tremendous sums are allocated each year for the economic and cultural development of these Republics out of the State budget of the U.S.S.R. The 1939 budget of the Kazakh S.S.R., for instance, amounts to 1,513,770,000 rubles, whilst allocations from the State budget of the U.S.S.R. for the construction of the Balkhash copper smelting plant, situated on the territory of this Republic, alone amount to 509,000,000 rubles this year.

The State budget of the U.S.S.R. provides for a twenty-five fold increase in social and cultural expenditure in 1939 as compared with 1928-29 fiscal year. The budgets of the Union Republics show an even greater increase in expenditure on this item: the budget of the Kirghiz S.S.R. shows an increase of 34 times, the Kazakh S.S.R. 31 times, the Turkmen S.S.R. 29 times, and the budgets of the Azerbaidjan, Georgian and Armenian Soviet Socialist Republics show a twenty-six fold increase in budgetary expenditure on social and cultural undertakings.

These figures bear witness to the exceptional possibilities that the U.S.S.R. presents for the flourishing of culture, national in form and Socialist in content.

Prior to the revolution many of the non-Russian nationalities of Tsarist Russia did not have their own alphabet, nor schools, nor their own intellectual forces. The majority of the population in the non-Russian regions was illiterate. The Soviet Union has introduced and enforced universal elementary education, and in the Third Five-Year Plan period it will enforce universal secondary education in the cities and semi-secondary education in the national Republics and in the rural districts. The development of public education in the U.S.S.R. may be judged from the following facts: In 1914 only 400 children attended school in Tadjikistan, in 1939 the Tadjik Republic's schools are attended by 328,000 pupils in the Kirghiz S.S.R. the number of school pupils has increased from 7,000 in 1914 to 312,000 in 1939. The respective figures for the Kazakh S.S.R. are 105,000 and 1,118,000. In the Uzbek S.S.R. there were only 16,000 school pupils in 1914 as compared with 1,232,000 in 1939, and in the Turkmen S.S.R. the number of children attending schools has increased from 7,000 in 1914 to 233,000 this year.

Prior to the October Revolution there were no higher educational establishments on the territory of the present Byelorussian, Azerbaidjan, Armenian, Turkmen, Uzbek, Tad-

jik, Kazakh and Kirghiz Republics. In 1938 Byelorussia had 23 higher educational establishments, the Azerbaidjan S.S.R. had 14, the Armenian S.S.R. 8, the Turkmen S.S.R. 5, the Uzbek S.S.R. 29, the Tadjik S.S.R. 5, the Kazakh S.S.R. 21, and the Kirghizian S.S.R. had 4 higher educational establishments.

Public health services in the Union Republics have also developed tempestuously under Social rule. In 1914 there were only 13 doctors and hospital accommodation for 100 people in the whole of Tadjikistan, at present there are 440 doctors and hospitals accommodating 3,675 patients. In the Kirghiz S.S.R., instead of 15 doctors and 100 hospital beds in 1914, there are now 324 doctors and 3,243 hospital beds. The same is true of the other Union Republics. Thus, in the Turkmen S.S.R. there are now 544 doctors and 5,030 hospital beds as compared with only 56 doctors and 30 hospital beds in 1914. The number of doctors in the Armenian S.S.R. has grown from 57 in 1914 to 716 in 1939, and the number of hospital beds from 200 to 3,489.

The development of culture in the former backward Republics was vividly depicted at the recent Kirghiz art festival in Moscow. The members of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. had the opportunity of seeing the tremendous successes in the field of culture achieved by the people of Kirghizia, where prior to the revolution there was not a single theatre performing in the Kirghiz language.

This data shows the great progress

made by the peoples of the Soviet Union along the path leading from the gloomy reality of the past to the Socialist reconstruction of the country.

Only the Soviet Socialist system is capable of providing such conditions for the development of formerly backward peoples. For this system has destroyed the brutal laws of capitalism which plundered the weaker nations. The fascist aggressors, with the connivance of the democratic Powers, have made colonial slaves of the peoples of Abyssinia,

Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and Albania; they have deprived these nations of all their gains and are destroying their national culture. At the same time, in the land of Socialism, the formerly backward peoples have been given all necessary conditions for the development of their national economy and culture. The working people of the capitalist countries and the oppressed nations see their future in the Soviet Union, they are fighting for this future, and no long time will pass before it becomes a reality.



WOMEN STUDENTS in the Tadjikistan Soviet Republic.

SOCIALISM BRINGS PEACE, PROGRESS AND PLENTY

Lessons of the Russian Revolution

J. B. Miles

TWENTY-TWO years ago the workers and peasants of the great territory now known as the Soviet Union demonstrated that the power of the Tsarist court, the feudal landowners and the capitalists, the state power of these ruthless exploiters and the power of all their reactionary institutions could be smashed. Certain conditions existed which made this possible, the inability of the Tsar and his state forces to rule in the old way, the inability of the capitalist class to form a stable government and hold back the masses, the poverty, war weariness, suffering and discontent of the workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors, the ability of the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin, to give leadership to the millions who wanted peace, bread and freedom, to defeat all brands of misleaders.

But no special quality, absent in the people of other lands, was to be found in the make-up of the people of Revolutionary Russia. In suitable conditions and with such a party the power of the reactionary exploiters can be broken in other lands.

A new power arose, the power of the Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies. A new State power in the hands of the toiling people,

with the working class in the leading role, defeated the attempts to destroy the revolution from within the country and from without by the imperialists of all countries. The Bolsheviks did maintain power and proceeded to organise socialism. Given favorable conditions, which are maturing all over the world, and the essential leadership, with the advantage of the Russian experience, the toiling people of other lands can and will take power and proceed to organise a socialist society.

"The workers of Russia and the Bolshevik Party were the first in the world successfully to take advantage of the weakness of capitalism. They forced a breach in the imperialist front, overthrew the Tsar and set up Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies" (Short History Communist Party of the Soviet Union, page 180).

"The October Socialist Revolution smashed capitalism, deprived the bourgeoisie of the means of production and converted the mills, factories, land, railways and banks into the property of the whole people, into public property.

"It established the dictatorship of the proletariat and turned over the government of the vast country to the working class, thus making it

the ruling class.

"The October Revolution thereby ushered in a new era in the history of mankind—the era of proletarian revolutions." (History C.P.S.U., page 224.)

There are and have been other governments manned by parties claiming to be socialist. In Australia we are familiar with such governments. Whatever advantages these governments have had for the masses in contrast to capitalist party governments not one has succeeded to finally solve even one problem of the exploited masses, not one step has been taken to free the toilers from exploitation, from the robbery of employers, financiers and landowners. Numerous reformist governments have come and gone but exploitation, poverty and war continue.

Socialism raises the standard of living for the workers and the working farmers. There are no wealthy idlers of any class to draw tribute from the toiling people. Especially in the last five or six years in Soviet Russia there has taken place a continual increase in wage payments, reduction in prices and expansion of social services.

In this fruitful country, Australia, with plentiful and varied natural resources, with a people whose culture and technical level is much higher than that of the Russian masses in 1917, there is unemployment, the poverty of relief work and the poverty of families on the basic wage. With rising rents and profiteering in foodstuffs the standard of living declines. Australia is a capitalist

land, its industries belong to the rich few, to the bankers and monopoly directorates; huge areas of the best land belong to the pastoral companies and the city lots are private property.

Socialism means the release of the working people from tribute to the rich parasites. In socialist Russia there has been no unemployment for ten years. After overcoming the destruction of the imperialist war and the wars of intervention and restoring the economy of the country, the expansion of industry abolished unemployment for ever. Unemployment cannot exist in a socialist society, neither that of the wealthy parasite nor that of the unwanted worker. The products of labor belong not to a few but to the whole society. Production continually expands, it is not determined by private enterprise and profits but by social planning and the needs of the people. When the needs of the people in the socialist land can be more than met by a seven-hour day, not unemployment, but more leisure will follow.

Capitalism impoverishes the majority of farmers. In Australia the decline of export prices and the restriction of the home market through the poverty of the workers ruins thousands of farmers and large numbers are forced off the land.

The socialist scene is vastly different.

Having got rid of the landowner, having eliminated the kulak (farmer exploiter of labor), having taught the millions of poor and

middle peasants the advantages of collective farming, having developed industries to supply the farms with tractors and other machines, socialism has enabled all the farmers to become well-to-do and cultured citizens. This was fully demonstrated at the huge agricultural exhibition opened in Moscow on August 1. Members of a Bulgarian parliamentary group said of the exhibition: "Today we were enchanted by the exhibition. The latter confirms not only the tremendous successes of agriculture in the Soviet Union, but the triumph and might of Soviet industry."

In no capitalist country are the masses of women economically and politically the equals of men as they are in the socialist land. Especially in the fascist countries are women degraded to the level of mere slaves of men, poverty stricken housewives, rearing children for the armies of aggression, working for less wages than men, denied opportunities for entry into the trades and professions. Socialism emancipates women from political inequality, from wage inequality, opens the way to the trades and professions, to culture and social service for all women. Socialism cares for the mother and the child as no capitalist land does, except for the few.

In the capitalist world, youth in ever greater numbers get into dead-end occupations and from there to the dole or labor camps. Education does not extend or advance for the masses, the money is needed to prepare for or wage war.

Socialist society with its ever ex-

panding industry, sets out to train every young man and woman to be fully equipped for the chosen calling and to provide facilities for new spheres of endeavor. The best schools are filled by the people, there are no rich parasites as in the capitalist world to monopolise the best schools and cut the budgets of the schools for workers' children.

The Russian revolution solved the national question in the socialist territory. Instead of the Tsarist oppression of small nations there arose the mighty union of scores of nations enjoying equal rights, the more backward assisted by the socialist power to develop modern industry, abolish illiteracy and develop the national culture toward the common goal of socialism and communism.

Fascism stirs up national hatreds for its own predatory ends, conducts the most ferocious pogroms against the Jews and enslaves small nations. All the imperialist powers exploit subject peoples, they cannot solve the national question because the first need is democratic freedom for the nation whether it separates or remains associated with the hitherto oppressing nation. Imperialism raises new national problems in Palestine, the partition of Ireland, in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in China.

In Australia the aborigines are being destroyed because capitalism will not surrender the territory required to save the nomads and keep corrupting influences away, and it does not extend equality of opportunity and aid to those who are

more or less civilised. While demanding improved treatment for Australia's oppressed national minority it must be said that socialism would save these people from degradation and exploitation.

Socialism means peace between nations and prosperity for the people freed by socialism.

All this and much more has been accomplished without a monarchy, without landowners and without capitalists, without private bankers. In fact it is because such classes and their many lackeys and institutions were abolished that socialism has been realised and the two friendly classes of workers and collective farmers are on the high road to communism.

The socialist success did not come easily or merely in a struggle to advance production. Remnants of the compromising "Socialist" Parties and the deposed classes tried to hold up progress, to side-track the development. Their influence penetrated the Party and confronted the Party with the task of defeating their ideas and to defeat them practically in the advance to socialism.

"The Bolshevik Party wrested the masses from the influence of the petty-bourgeois parties (Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and Anarchists), by exposing the policy of these parties step by step and showing that it ran counter to the interests of the working people." (History, page 223.)

"The Bolsheviks defeated the attempts of the capitalists within the Party—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin, Trotsky, Pyatakov—to

deflect the Party from the path of socialist revolution." (History, page 224.)

Surrounded by hostile capitalist powers the Soviet Union found itself permeated by spies and wreckers, agents of foreign powers, some of whom were defeated opponents of the Bolsheviks who had sold themselves to the foreign enemy so as to carry on their work against socialism and the Party.

The struggle to prepare for the revolution is in part a struggle against all manner of class enemy influences, against provocation and spying. At the beginning of the revolution the enemy is not fully defeated, after he is defeated in the open he works underground and takes to wrecking and murder. But they could not succeed against the Party of Lenin-Stalin, against the people who experienced socialism and had no intention to permit the return of capitalism. Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites, all were exposed and prevented from rendering further service to the imperialists.

If the preparation of a party and the working class for a revolution demands a many-sided struggle against enemies inside and outside the labor movement, a vigilant and relentless struggle is required after the revolution. It is because the wise leadership of Stalin and the vigilance of the Party and State organs against these enemies has been successful that Socialism advances from triumph to triumph in the Soviet Union and the country of socialism exercises ever greater influ-

ence internationally.

"The surrounding capitalist world, striving to undermine and disrupt the might of the U.S.S.R., worked with redoubled energy to organise gangs of assassins, wreckers and spies within the U.S.S.R. This hostile activity of the capitalist encirclement became particularly marked with the advent of fascism to power in Germany and Japan. In the Trotskyites and Zinovievites, fascism found faithful servants who were ready to spy, sabotage, commit acts of terrorism and diversion, and to work for the defeat of the U.S.S.R. in order to restore capitalism.

"The Soviet Government punished these degenerates with an iron hand, dealing ruthlessly with these enemies of the people and traitors to the country." (History, page 330.)

The new Stalin Constitution, reflecting the actual social relations, defining the rights and duties of Soviet citizens, provides the people of the capitalist countries with a picture of real democracy for the millions, for the many nationalities inhabiting the territory of the Soviet Union.

Fascism destroys the organisations of the people, socialism encourages their development. All capitalist countries place new limitations on the liberties of the people. Democratic France suppresses the legal activity of the Communist Party and disbands a large number of democratic municipal councils. In Australia Emergency Regulations in

the hands of a capitalist party government, in a war situation seriously threaten the labor movement and all democratic liberties.

"The economic foundation of the U.S.S.R. is the socialist system of economy and the socialist ownership of the means of production. In the U.S.S.R. is realised the socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

"All citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, the right to education, the right to maintenance in old age and in case of sickness or disability.

"Women are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of life.

"The equality of the citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, is an indefeasible law.

"Freedom of conscience and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognised for all citizens.

"In order to strengthen socialist society, the Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, press, assembly and meeting, the right to unite in public organisations, inviolability of person, inviolability of domicile and privacy of correspondence, the right of asylum for foreign citizens persecuted for defending the interests of the working people or for their scientific activities, or for their struggle for national liberation.

"The new Constitution also imposes serious duties on all citizens of the U.S.S.R.: the duty of observ-

ing the laws, maintaining labor discipline, honestly performing public duties, respecting the rules of the socialist community, safeguarding and strengthening public, socialist property, and defending the socialist fatherland." (History, page 345.)

Peace has always been inscribed on the banner of Soviet Russia. The revolution began in a struggle for peace, to save the masses from further slaughter in the war of the imperialists. The new Soviet Government proposed peace to all the warring nations, exposing the secret treaties between the Tsarist Government and the allies for the division of spheres of exploitation.

But revolutionary socialism is not pacifist. The Red Army defended the revolution against the imperialists. Aware that every breathing space would be a period of preparation for new wars of intervention and that the second round of imperialist wars would seriously menace the security of the revolution, the Party, led by Stalin: set out to greatly strengthen the defence capacity of the socialist land. Modern heavy industry became the basis for the greatest army in the world, an army of defence of the gains of socialism, an army to cause the imperialist reaction to pause before cracking its skull against Soviet might.

The Soviet Union demonstrated its adherence to peace by its aid to the victims of aggression in Spain and China, by its efforts to organise a peace front of the powers against aggression, by its firm atti-

tude to all provocation, by its stinging rebuff to the Japanese marauders who sought to penetrate Soviet territory.

Today, when the imperialists have launched new imperialist wars, when Europe is threatened with a devastating war, the Soviet Union works for peace, for the defence of its territory, to narrow the sphere of conflict, to end the war. It works for the interests of the Soviet people and of the toiling people of the whole world.

Prevented from entering a pact to prevent the outbreak of war in Europe, the Soviet Union took advantage of the removal of tension with Germany and concluded a non-aggression pact. This pact upset the plans of the British and French reaction to provoke a war between Germany and the Soviet Union, it disrupted the "anti-Comintern Pact," which was no less anti-British and French than anti-Comintern.

Confronted with the dangerous situation on her borders due to the rapid collapse of Poland, the Soviet Union acted to safeguard socialism. This action also freed White Russians, Ukrainians and Jews from the menace of war, and in place of Nazi oppression, brought to them Soviet freedom.

The Baltic countries which Britain could not guarantee because they were "neutral" now have agreements with the Soviet Union, they are guaranteed and the defence of the Soviet Union is more secure. The Soviet power for peace is recognised also in the Balkans, where

a real peace front is extending. East Europe faces peace while West Europe faces war.

Socialism means peace. Capitalism breeds war.

But the issue of war or peace is not solely in the hands of the imperialists, their reformist and other lackeys, it is no longer a question of whether the people can be deluded and forced to accept war by a world of imperialist states. The Soviet Union and the states friendly

to her are a mighty force for peace to which all real socialists and democrats, all who oppose an insane slaughter in the interests of imperialist domination must turn and force their own governments to turn. A world war can yet be prevented if the friends of peace will aid the efforts of the Soviet Union by action in their own countries for an international conference to secure a peace with guarantees against further acts of aggression.

THE CANARY

George Farwell

THE canary was huddled up in a scrawny ball at the bottom of the cage. Even the warm sunshine couldn't make it sing.

Miss Birchington looked at it for a long time, helplessly.

"I don't know what to do for the poor little mite," she said at last. "He's lost all his dear little feathers, too."

Standing woodenly beside her, Miss Peck, her companion, said nothing.

"For goodness sake, haven't you a tongue in your head, woman?"

Miss Peck nodded.

"Oh, Miss Peck, I'm so worried. I don't know what to do. The poor little thing might be dying. You'd better go and ring up the vet at once."

"Yes, Miss Birchington." She turned, began to walk towards the house, then stopped. "Do you really think we should? I mean,

the expense. He'll probably charge you a guinea—at least."

"Well, good heavens, we can afford that, can't we?"

Miss Peck, remembering her reduced wages, did not answer.

"Really, I don't know what's come over you! Haven't you any feelings at all?"

Miss Peck, who for forty years hadn't stopped to think whether she had any feelings or not, went into the house. Before she could reach the telephone, it began to ring. She lifted the receiver. "Hullo . . . ? Yes . . . yes, Mr. Hawkins? Just a minute . . ."

Miss Birchington appeared in the hallway. "If that's the agent again, I don't want to speak to him."

"Oh, very well, Miss Birchington."

"He knows perfectly well what I want him to do. If those people won't pay a pound a week, they

must be turned out. Absolutely ridiculous! They've been getting those cottages for 17/6 all these years—and now they're grumbling. I can't afford to let them go for that any longer."

Miss Peck relayed her instructions to the agent, whilst Miss Birchington returned to the garden. She stood in front of the cage, thinking of that extra 2/6 a week. Twelve cottages; one pound ten extra a week. Why, that was almost £80 a year. She'd be able to manage that round-the-world trip now. And the doctor—always said she ought to travel.

So absorbed was she that she didn't hear the front gate open. But at last, hearing male footsteps on the gravel path, she turned.

"Mornin', ma'am!"

She looked hard at the man, not troubling to answer. It was not an encouraging expression; the eyes had a dull glitter like a crow's; the mouth was a thin line set at right angles to a sharp, thin, bird-like nose. Her hair, caught up at the back of her neck in a knot, gave her head the appearance of a door-knocker; an expensive door-knocker.

"I suppose, ma'am—you haven't —" He straightened his threadbare coat, felt nervously for his tie, then remembered he was collarless. His self-confidence, so painfully summoned at the gate, drained away. "Well, are there any jobs I can do?"

"Not today, thank you!" She gave the last two words an aggressive upward flick.

"Well—I was wondering—that

is, I'm up against it, ma'am . . ." "You've come to the wrong house."

Anger took the place of his vanished confidence. He was tempted to answer, "Yes, I can see that!" but restrained himself. A man grows used to getting knocked back after a time. But in a district like this—a swell suburb with big houses and gardens—well, they wouldn't miss a bob or two.

Miss Birchington, still keeping an anxious eye on the canary, fluttered her hands irritably. "It's no use pitching me a tale. Too many of you about. Anyway, I can't afford to give you anything." Through the open doorway he could see the gleam of silver on a sideboard and large, comfortable furniture. "Why don't you do some honest work instead of loafing about—begging?"

What could he say? The utter hopelessness of the situation was clear to him. Useless to tell this sharp, vinegarish woman of those futile, empty days tramping after jobs, reading and answering advertisements, queuing up for hours only to be told the job was filled. His legs felt weak and the sunlit garden grew suddenly blurred. Again that aching emptiness in his stomach. Stomach walls rubbing together, they said. Well, knowing the reason didn't make it any easier.

"If you're honest, the government will give you work," she said.

He began to speak, then, realising she wasn't listening, walked back along the path. The gravel was sharp under his soleless feet. Miss

Birchington didn't even hear the gate close. The canary had moved a little and was staring back at her, bleary-eyed.

"Poor little duckie! What are we going to do for you, my duckie?"

The man watched her for a moment from the other side of the fence, then walked rapidly along the street. It was no use, he realised, wasting any more time in that district.

Two hours later he reached home. What a contrast! The street was narrow, dirty, filled with stale and unidentifiable smells. No gardens here; not a patch of grass, not a tree. The blisters on his heels were rubbed raw. Blood made the thin socks stick to his shoes. In the kitchen he found his wife washing his other shirt.

"Well, Jim," she said, "any luck?"

"What d'you expect?"

"Poor Jim!"

In the next room, a baby began to cry. The woman went on washing.

"What's up with him, Bet?"

"Christ, do I have to tell you that again?"

He took a piece of newspaper out of his coat pocket. Inside were three thick, unbuttered slices of bread. "All I could get, Bet."

She took the bread without answering.

"Heard any more from that agent bloke?"

"Yes."

"Well?"

"We've got to quit." She had expected an outburst, but none

came. "He wants a pound a week."

"Bloody hot, ain't it?"

"I'd like him to see this place.

But not he. You'd never get him inside. Seventeen and sixpence was robbery."

"I'd give a lot to know who the owners are."

"He won't tell."

"What the hell are we going to do, Bet?"

"We won't get nothing cheaper."

"No, they're all on to the same racket now. Well, we've got to clear out, that's all."

She took the bread in to the child. The crying stopped. When she came back, she said: "Where did you go, Jim?"

"Out to Redstone. Thought I'd be right there. Lot of blasted tight-wads!"

"Oh, it's easy enough for them. They've never seen how we live. They don't want to see."

"Well, it's got me beat. D'you know, Bet, I struck one queer old tart out there. Nearly crying she was over a sick canary." In the other room the child was howling again.

"Did you give him all that bread, Bet?"

"Yes."

"What's the use of people like that? They ain't no good to the world. They do nothing—except sit on their blasted sugar. Now this one—she wasn't married. I saw that easy. No man—no kids—nothing. She's never been any use to anybody. I reckon the world wouldn't miss her."

The child was screaming now.

"One blooming canary! Christ!"

OUR PARTY IN THE CRISIS

L. Harry Gould

Party! Party! How can anyone reject it? Party, the mother of all victory! How can a poet slander such a word which bears the seed of all that's noblest? Speak out frankly like a man: Are you for or against us? Is your slogan slavery—or freedom? (Quoted in "An American Testament.")

THE past few months have brought about one gigantic transformation in world affairs: England has yielded her place of pre-eminence to Soviet Russia. The Socialist state has become the great arbiter of mankind's destinies. This is an indisputable fact! Everyone is looking towards the land where the workers rule. Some people, burdened with an uneasy conscience, seem to stare with an almost hypnotic fixity as they try to solve the "riddle of Russia." Trade and diplomatic bodies from Germany travelled to its capital city, British and French military missions were sent (supposedly) to secure an alliance with the formidable working-class Power, the ambassador from Japan dejectedly negotiates an armistice for Outer Mongolia, and representatives from Turkey are there to ask for aid against imperialist ambitions. "All roads lead to Moscow" is the new principle of international politics, while over 10 Downing Street the historian may already inscribe, "Sic transit gloria mundi" (thus passes the glory of the world).

The flux of one short month since the outbreak of the war has witnessed a like remarkable change in

the feelings and outlook of millions in western Europe, America and Australia, one which even the thousand-tongued voice of capitalist propaganda could do little to prevent. "The Red Army is instructing the peasants of West Ukraine and Polish White Russia to take over the big estates"—and the yelpings and lies of every bourgeois and bourgeois toady are shattered under the hammer-blow of that one irresistible fact. Not a single bomb was dropped in Poland by Soviet airmen, and tens of thousands of armed Polish troops surrendered without a shot. Countless similar events in the sweep of the Red Army to the Vistula were given fervent endorsement by the *class instinct* of the Australian workers, who more than ever before feel that the Red Army is essentially an army of peace, the guardian of working-class power, and the protector of small nations against fascist aggressors.

Our Party, as in every other country, came through this period of crisis with the proverbial flying colors! It proved itself indeed to be the "General Staff of the working class and the workers' allies." It was only our Party which was

able, with confidence and certainty, to forecast the tactical manoeuvres of the Soviet Union, point to the revolutionary integrity and explain the breathless audacity of Soviet policy. At the same time, the Communists of Australia in their day-to-day work fought still harder for unity of the people against the Nazi aggressor abroad and the reactionary at home, championed immediate economic demands, and finally, raised high the red banner of Socialism as the only final answer to the chaos of capitalism and capitalist war.

The strength of Communism may be gauged by the broadsides of calumny fired by the class enemy. There were two groups of enemies; one, the capitalist class itself which outdid all former efforts in slander and abuse in these first few weeks. The "men of Munich," who for years encouraged Hitler and incited him to attack in the East, every one of them a virtuoso of double-dealing, now dared to impute base motives to the Soviet government. The developments of four short weeks have constrained these gentlemen to make a laughably abject change of face. The following excerpt from the Sydney "Herald" of September 25 displays awesome respect for Soviet might, and a poorly concealed attempt still to trap the Soviet Union into nulling chestnuts out of the fire for them:

British and French reaction to Russia's part is undergoing a perceptible change from the first reaction—that the Red Army's invasion amounted to a stab in Poland's back. The tenor of conversations in many well-informed quarters is

now clearly less drastic, many inclining to the view expressed in Mr. Bernard Shaw's recent letter to the "Times." Mr. Shaw's view that M. Stalin said to Herr Hitler: "Thus far, and no farther," is finding support in M. Stalin's order that the Russian armies should advance to the borders of Rumania and Hungary.

The second category comprises such elements as Adela Pankhurst Walsh, the Labor Rightwing (Lang's previously pro-Nazi "Century" of September 22 will become an interesting relic of murderous, if impotent hate) and the trotskyists. Scattered through all these groups one noted the philistines ("bladders filled with hope and fear," as Lenin so aptly characterised them). There was, and remains, a spate of howls and lamentations from all the "revolutionaries - over - the - coffee - cup." Lenin branded them as persons filled with "philistine - Trotsky 'nose-picking' contemplations: Will there be a revolution or won't there be, who knows?" We can pass them by. They are an inevitable affliction.

If it were not for their malevolence and the harm they do to the labor movement, the trotskyists would be amusing. Their "policy" is quite simple, simple enough for any provocateur, namely, to "criticise" and attack whatever the Soviet government and the Communist Party do. Did Russia sign a pact with Germany? That is because Hitler and Stalin are one. The Red Army remained behind its own frontiers? It had no strength, the Soviet power was collapsing—didn't Trotsky himself prove it fifty times over this past ten years? But the Red

Army *did* march, and Hitler retreated precipitately? This substantiates the charge of "red imperialism." And so forth. What the trotskyists are saying about the establishment of Soviets in the occupied areas is not known at the moment to this writer; probably it is to fool or spite the people of Paraguay! Any reason is good enough.

The personnel of the Sydney grouplet of trotskyists should give the clue to such rage and insanity. One of them is a known police pimp, another a proven thief and labor spy, a third was thrown out of the Party years ago for penning sexy letters to a girl. There was one of them, not "officially" connected with them, but little different from the others in outlooks and actions, who seriously planned forming still another "international." He secluded himself in the country, brooded over the problems of life and revolution, and ended up about a year ago by cutting his throat. R.I.P. Trotskyism, however, must not be understood to be a movement of people who happen to suffer from some mental or moral deformity. Trotskyism is an *organised* agency of fascism, a special department of the police and intelligence service. But it *does happen* that its "best" recruits are the type described above with the further admixture of cranks, bohemians, hobohemians, half-baked intellectuals, anarchists and others from the ranks of the declassed, the outcast and the "lunatic fringe."

It is a great triumph for our Party to report that scarcely half-a-dozen wavered in the crisis, and who were dropped from the ranks. Only six out of about 2,000 in New South Wales! And within the first fortnight 50 new recruits were secured. All our members laugh at the calumny of the capitalists and the trotskyists. It's "old stuff." Didn't Trotsky and Bukharin say that Lenin betrayed the Revolution when he signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty, and also when he announced the N.E.P.? How often has Trotsky, to hide his own crimes, predicted collapse and screamed "betrayal" at the heads of the Soviet leaders? Let them rave, those enemies of Labor and democracy. The liberated people of eastern Poland, and the whole of the world's toilers will give answer!

Pride in our Party, and the unshakeable confidence we feel in the ultimate triumph of our class, must not weaken our vigilance or engender the least underestimation of the importance of our tasks. These are principally:

One, the continued "fight for theory," so that we can still more successfully wage the struggle on all fronts against fascist aggression and capitalist exploitation.

Two, increasing attention to the daily struggles of the workers and the middle strata, skillfully linking up economic demands with international events.

Three, the rapid training of hundreds of fresh propagandists, agitators and writers.

Four, the building up of our Party's membership, and its further training and steeling in struggle for socialism and peace.

PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN SHORT HISTORY OF THE C.P.S.U.

K. Ostrovitzanov

THE Short Course of the History of the C.P.S.U. (B) has been justly called a Bolshevik Encyclopaedia of basic knowledge in the sphere of Marxism-Leninism and the key to the study of social and economic subjects.

This also fully applies to economic questions to which enormous attention is paid in the book.

The "Short Course" contains real examples of the further development of Marxist-Leninist economic theory.

The propositions of Marx and Lenin regarding labor power as the chief productive force of human society are further developed.

Here people appear as the creators and makers of the instruments of labor. With the development of the means of production, man himself also changes, his experience grows in the struggle against surrounding nature, and his capabilities as the chief productive force become perfected.

In characterising production relations great attention is paid to questions of the ownership of the means of production.

Hitherto, in their scientific and pedagogical work, in characterising the production relations of the various social formations, economists paid absolutely insufficient attention to questions of ownership.

In the History of the C.P.S.U.

a comparative historical analysis of the forms of ownership of the means of production is made the basis of the characterisation of various social formations.

In such a comparative historical analysis the fact stands out particularly clearly that the private ownership of the means of production and labor power is the basis of the various forms of exploitation of man by man and, on the contrary, Socialist ownership of the means of production is the economic basis of the abolition of exploitation of man by man.

It is also necessary to stress the fact that in the "Short Course" the problem is raised of the part played in the development of human society by ideas and political institutions.

Changes in the sphere of production relations in pre-socialist formations take place spontaneously and independently of the will of the people, until such time as the productive forces outgrow the bounds of the old production relations.

But when the productive forces outgrow the bounds of the existing production relations, the old production relations and those who embody them—the ruling classes—become transformed into an obstacle to the further growth of the productive forces.

This obstacle can only be swept out of the way by revolutionary

means. And it is here where the tremendous role of the new social ideas and new political institutions which are called upon to eliminate the old production relations stand out particularly clearly.

On the basis of the conflict between the new productive forces and the old production relations, on the basis of the new economic requirements of society, new social ideas arise which organise and mobilise the masses for struggle. Revolution overthrows the old system of production relations and creates a new power and new political institutions which do away with the old order.

This raising of the question regarding the mobilising and organising power of ideas and political institutions is of very great significance for economists.

Hitherto, in studying the laws governing the development of various social and economic formations and the replacement of one formation by another, the roll of ideas and political institutions has not, as a rule, been shown. Yet political institutions and ideas, and the superstructure in general, exert tremendous influence over the economic life of society.

Therefore, it is impossible correctly to understand the laws governing the development of the production relations of various systems and the transition from one system to another, if one ignores the role of social ideas and political institutions.

A tremendous contribution is made to the theory of Marxism-Leninism by the characterisation of

the various social-economic formations given in the "Short Course."

This refers primarily to primitive society. Hitherto we have characterised primitive society as primitive communistic society. In the "History" it is characterised as the primitive communal system. This characterisation stresses the point that the basis of the primitive commune was the communal ownership of the means of production and the products of this production.

The essence of primitive communal relations both in the sphere of production and in the sphere of distribution is stated in the "History" in a very brief and concise fashion. Social ownership of the products of labor means collectivism not only in production but also in distribution and consumption.

Of great importance is the statement that in primitive society there existed personal ownership of certain instruments of production, which at the same time were weapons of defence against wild animals. This personal property, however, is not private property and its existence does not in any degree contradict the social ownership of the means of production. What is more, primitive people did not even have the concept of private ownership of the means of production.

The primitive-communal system was brought into being by the exceptionally low level of the productive forces, by the slavish dependence of man on the spontaneous forces of nature.

The transition from the primitive-

communal system to the slave-holding system was bound up with the growth of the productive forces, with the transition from stone to metal implements and from primitive hunting to agriculture.

The basis of the slave-holding system is "that the slave-owner owns the means of production—the slave, whom he can sell, purchase or kill as though he were an animal." In the "Short History" there is very well shown the connection between relations of production and the level of the productive forces in slave owning society.

Feudalism is also characterised primarily from the point of view of the forms of the ownership of the means of production and of the one who does the work—the peasant serf, whom the feudal lord may no longer kill, but whom he may "buy and sell." "The new productive forces demand that the laborer shall display some kind of initiative in production and an inclination for work, an interest in work. The feudal lord therefore discards the slave, as a laborer who has no interest in work and is entirely without initiative, and prefers to deal with the serf, who has his own husbandry, implements of production, and a certain interest in work essential for the cultivation of the land and for the payment in kind of part of his harvest to the feudal lord."

The basis of the characterisation of the capitalist system is capitalist private ownership of the means of production but not of those who do

the work—the wage laborers who are free of personal dependence, but are deprived of the means of production and are compelled to sell their labor-power to the capitalists.

Such a form of production relations corresponds to the new level of productive forces.

"The new productive forces," says the "Short Course," "requires that the workers in production shall be better educated and more intelligent than the downtrodden and ignorant serfs, that they be able to understand machinery and operate it properly. Therefore, the capitalists prefer to deal with wage workers who are free from the bonds of serfdom and who are educated enough to be able properly to operate machinery."

The "Short Course" further contains a very concise characterisation of the basic contradiction within capitalism, and shows that this contradiction finds expression in the periodic crises of overproduction and in the sharpening of the class struggle between exploiters and exploited, this constituting the main feature of the capitalist system, and in the last analysis leading to its downfall.

A review of the development of the productive forces and of the production relations of human society is completed by a characterisation of the socialist system as one based on the social ownership of the means of production, and that knows nothing of the exploitation of man by man.

OUR NEW "DEMOCRAT"— MENZIES By M. Porter

"We are resolutely determined that the rule of Parliament, which means the rule of the laws Parliament makes, shall continue in this country."
(Menzies, 30/6/39).

The Supply and Development Bill "proposes that the most dangerous surrender of the power of Parliament to the Executive that I have observed in my Parliamentary experience. The most vital feature about it is the complete absence of any concrete proposals which the House could examine, discuss and pass judgment upon." (McEwen, ex-Minister for the Interior).

"The Cabinet is a body constitutionally subordinate to Parliament and selected from the representatives to conduct the daily business of the nation, under the supervision, control and direction of Parliament. That supervision, control and direction cannot be abandoned or surrendered by the Parliament without a breach of the trust it undertakes to the people it represents."
(Sir Isaac Isaacs, ex-Governor-General).

MR. MENZIES claims to be and bluff, it is worthwhile to know the proud champion of Democracy. Speaking at Perth, he commended Hitler for "bringing Germany into a comparative state of solvency from bankruptcy." Interpreted, this means that what Menzies so admires about Hitler is that he has saved the big industrialists from bankruptcy by forcing the middle classes, farmers, and workers into worse than bankruptcy. He has forced them into slavery by military and industrial conscription, imposed with the help of . . . a thorough-going "National Register."

This technique of giving profits to the big industrialists at the expense of the entire nation is not peculiar to Germany and, as Menzies is a devout scholar of the Chamberlain school of compulsion

and bluff, it is worthwhile to know something of the background of National Registers both in England and Australia.

CHAMBERLAIN TEACHES MENZIES

Despite categorical pledges to Labor leaders during the last war that there would be "nothing in the nature of industrial conscription," the British War Cabinet set up a Department of National Service. The Director of National Service was none other than Menzies' political father—Mr. Neville Chamberlain. His task was to create machinery capable of controlling the whole manpower of the country. As in Australia, service was to have been voluntary—at first. Prime Minister Lloyd George afterwards said, "Cabinet . . . had approved in

principle the introduction of compulsory universal national service, and if voluntary enrolment failed, we were prepared to accord Mr. Chamberlain further powers."

These plans for industrial conscription, just like the plans of the War Census Act in Australia, failed to be fully implemented. The British Labor movement, weak as it was, resisted and, as in Australia, Cabinet had to fall back upon the less direct method of threatening with military conscription all who didn't submit to industrial conscription.

This indirect method of compulsion when not complemented with full powers for industrial conscription had the British ruling class worried. Even the mildest worker will in time rebel when he finds the government making his conditions worse and worse, whilst simultaneously making his employer's war profits bigger and bigger.

The lesson that Britain's wealthy rulers learnt from the Great War was that it is absolutely essential to hamstring the Labor movement before war begins, and cover the entire nation into position at the outbreak of hostilities. As Lloyd George put it: "The ideal would have been for the whole population to be conscripted at the very outbreak of the war, and every man posted forthwith in accordance with a wisely thought out plan to the job where he would be of most service to our war effort."

THE MEN BEHIND MENZIES

Since the U.A.P. government's

immense armament expenditure is calculated to enrich the heavy industrialists at the expense of the people, the National Register and industrial conscription become their paramount need; especially since these very industrialists are linked up internationally with the fascist dictators whom the Australian people detest.

McEwen, Minister for the Interior in the Lyons Cabinet, warned during the debate on the Supply and Development Bill that "if this particular provision is adopted, we shall hear something of further activity on the part of Broken Hill monopoly" to whom the bulk of Australia's "national" munition orders are being handed.

This is nothing new in Australian history. As McEwen says: "Under the old War Precautions Act, things were done which did not bear the light of day. I have very clearly in mind the fact that, under that Act the whole of the wheat production of this country was arbitrarily acquired from the farmers at a fixed price, which later transpired to be, during considerable periods, less than half what the farmers would have received had they been permitted to export their wheat freely and at world parity."

"I have in mind, too, that while the farming and pastoral industries were being treated in this fashion, under the same authority an arrangement was made for the acquisition, not only for the period of the war, but also for ten years after its termination, of the whole production of

the Broken Hill mines, at a price which proved to be most highly lucrative to those who have interests in those mines."

History is being repeated with Menzies' present wheat "stabilisation" plans coupled with his plans for the indirect financing of B.H.P., through armament expenditure, largely by levying the people with indirect taxes.

This is not all. B.H.P.-I.C.I. interests are due for even more plums than during the last war. Australia has meantime become "Britain's Arsenal of the East" and is to supply 6 in. shells, anti-aircraft guns, field guns, Vickers guns, Bren guns, rifles and ammunition, not only for Australia, but for South Africa and all British stations in the Far East. This presumably includes India, and definite provisions are already being completed for New Zealand.

The principle of State-owned munition factories was flagrantly ended as far back as 1937 with the establishment of the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation. Mr. Lyons, when he opened the factory, was publicly divesting the Federal Parliament of the sole right, which it should have, of controlling the production of such an important arm of Australia's defence as military planes.

And to whom has the government entrusted this national concern? To the I.C.I.-G.M.H.-B.H.P. monopoly, avowedly pro-fascist and outstanding war profiteers. Mr. L. J. Hartnett, the managing director, on his return from

a trip abroad three years ago, said: "Germany at present provides a wonderful example of the success of long-range policies." — "I am confident that the British Empire and the United Kingdom will not be too far behind in this new and necessary form of government, and that adjustments required to enable ourselves to exist nationally will be made." And *this* is the man at whose word Menzies has just now obediently promised even more profits by changing from the lowest-tender system of government contracts to firms which were "best equipped" to carry them out, i.e., the biggest firms — like B.H.P.-I.C.I.!

MENZIES—THE CONSTITUTIONAL GENIUS

But is Menzies true to the letter of democracy? No.

As Sir Isaac Isaacs—a greater constitutional lawyer than Menzies—reveals, Menzies' action whilst Attorney-General in forcing the Kembla wharves to load pig iron for Japan, was actually a delinquency by all accepted principles of International Law, i.e., it was illegal, although the wharves at no time acted illegally.

He made no promise about compulsory training or compulsory active service, and respecting industrial compulsion, he did not promise, as Lyons had done, that his government would *never* put it in force. He only states that the "National Registration and Supply and Development Act do not mean

any intention on the part of the government to use any of its powers" (note he doesn't attempt to deny that these powers are there to be used) "so as to set aside or impair the efficacy of awards or industrial agreements . . ." etc., though of course he reserves the right to impair the workers' conditions, as distinct from their awards, through the very arbitration system itself.

Most dangerous of all Menzies is undemocratic because of his deliberate technique, clearly seen in both the National Register and the Supply and Development Acts, of systematically ridding Cabinet of Parliament's legitimate control over it. Compare the three quotations at the head of this article. Apparently wealthy enemies are trying to introduce a "Parliamentary" brand of fascism to Australia, which is the more dangerous, because it is the more plausible, especially to the middle classes. Even Mr. Hartnett has since recanted and declared he is really in favor of "democracy." The Labor movement must checkmate this, and force Menzies to

come out into the open and expose himself to the Australian public as the reactionary he really is.

As Forde, deputy leader of the Labor Party, said in the debate on the National Register Bill: The unions "are naturally afraid of the dragnet clause in this and other bills. . . . The purpose of this clause is to enable the government to rule by regulation instead of by legislation. This practice is becoming more and more a feature of Commonwealth administration, and Ministers are increasingly extending the scope of various acts beyond what was intended by the Parliament when assented to. If the Labor Party is to hold its own politically and maintain the measure of democratic government we enjoy today, it must oppose in every way possible government by regulation. It is obvious that this procedure is being adopted by anti-Labor governments as a means of establishing, eventually, a political dictatorship in the name and through the medium of a democratically-elected Commonwealth Parliament."

CROSS THE RUBICON

J. J. Leo

AS we trace the threads of history we find that at Syracuse the death of Greece meant the life of Rome, and at Poltava Czarist Russia rose to eminence on the ruins

of Sweden. The Roman victory at Syracuse gave the Latin language to Italy, Spain and France, and Poltava and the subsequent acquisitions of Russia's rulers established that

vast territory which has become the cradle of a new social order.

Dear reader, if the scales that fell at Syracuse and Poltava affect the world so visibly today, so much more must the events of the last decade affect the present and the future. The failure of the Social Democrats of Germany in 1933 is more pregnant with tragedy than any other act of weakness or knavery of which history makes mention. If you ponder on the difference between the party that led the people of Russia in the crisis of November, 1917, and those that posed as the friends of the masses in Germany in 1933, well, you are swaying between a triumph and a tragedy. Socialism triumphant—capitalism decadent. Differing from each other as electric light differs from a slush lamp. Socialism, the child of yesterday but the giant of today, like the mighty Genie of the lamp, has created wonders where nothing stood. That other monster, fascism, released by the enemies and false friends of the masses, has created an inferno in Abyssinia, China and Spain; has despoiled the people of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland; has driven millions into the darkness of a relentless night, and thrusts more and more people into those hideous slums where health has died giving birth to disease.

Seneca says "Courage leads to Heaven; fear to death," and Sir Walter Scott says: "Treason seldom dwells with courage." The

fear of the Right-Wing and the treason of the pro-Fascist British Government are the compound responsible for this decade of violence. Historians stress what the change of wind meant at Lepanto and what the rain meant at Waterloo. The issues decided by the naval battle of Lepanto and the king-making battle of Waterloo pale into insignificance compared with the situation created by the fateful failure of the Social-Democrats of Germany. The murder and the betrayal of the Spanish people; the fate of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland; the holocaust in China and last of all, the fascist-like measures here in Australia, where Curtin and other Labor members behave very much the same as did the Social-Democrats of Germany.

Imagine a Democratic Germany, neighbor to Soviet Russia, and then to the westward, France, and to the south, the victorious Spanish Republic. A Democratic Germany would have meant all this. What a flooded Rubicon separates the world from liberty through that event, greater than the stream that confronted Julius Caesar. Over 2000 years ago the immortal Virgil wrote these lines:

*Annihilate time and space, ye
Gods,*

And make two lovers happy.

He must have had visions of our time, when a privileged minority are prepared to enthrone themselves in blood by any method and at any price.

ON HISTORY

By "Alpha"

MODERN historical writers are giving us some good books. Two of the modern books of a historical nature, are very good reading, treating history as a process.

Patrick Carleton in "Buried Empires" has an arresting paragraph which is herewith given:

"I am writing this book," says Mr. Carleton, "in characters descended from those which the Phoenicians seem to have adapted from the Egyptian hieroglyphs. When it is done, I shall send it through the post—a public service first organized by the Persians—and receive in return a document of a kind invented by the merchants of ancient Babylon, requesting a banking-house with whom my publishers have credit to pay me a certain sum in metal coins, such as were originally struck in Assyria in the VIII century B.C., and paper notes as used by the Chinese in Kublai Khan's day. Part of this money I shall assuredly spend on tobacco—a blessing we owe to the pre-Columbian peoples of America—but a larger part will go to provide me with a well-earned holiday at some spot reached by a train or boat driven by steam, whose propulsive powers were first discovered by a Hellenized Egyptian named Hero of Alexandria."

This is exceedingly clever and contains much useful information in a compact form.

Man is a tool using animal. Engels in his writings tells us that man progressed from the animal stage rapidly when the human thumb took form from the using of tools, this creating the shape of that organ, so useful in holding tools.

It is of importance that we know the facts of the history of mankind. Engels in his "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," has many things of interest to say on these matters—a book that all should read.

In "The Communist Manifesto" by Marx and Engels it is stated:

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

"Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman—in a word, oppressor and oppressed—stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight—a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

"In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold graduation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in

almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

"The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones."

P. Carleton in "Buried Empires" tells of an ancient planned city, which shows that the old-time peoples knew more than is imagined. Near Karachi, Mohenjodaro, has been discovered. It is remarked that:

"The city of Mohenjodaro in the III millennium B.C. was a planned city like Mannheim in Germany or Bournville in England. It was the creation of forethought, not of chance. Instead of meandering vaguely, intersecting where the spirit moved them, beginning in caprice and ending in confusion, as did the streets of ancient Ur and Kish, its avenues ran in bold parallels, east to west and north to south, as straight as the mason's cord could make them. . . . Another astonishing proof of the excellence of the ancient Indian municipal services is the presence, in the outer wall of some large houses, of a rubbishschute connecting with a brick ashbin in the street which would presumably be cleared regularly by the town dustman."

A readable book on history in ancient times is that of Stanley Casson: "The Discovery of Man." This author has much to say concerning old civilisations. He speaks of:

"Greek enterprise, that scattered over the shores of the Mediterranean from Syria to Spain the various colonies, factories and small stations for trade that ultimately Hellenized almost the entire inland sea, and further Greek exploits that led them to the confines of India, to the African coast and even to circumnavigate Britain and brave the coasts of the Baltic—all this enterprise brought in its train a mass of curious folk who were not immediately concerned with the problems of navigation and the craft of shipping. On each ship that sailed was some adventurer, some mere entrepreneur who, as passenger, could observe, record and remember. . . ."

Thus, those of days of old wrote their books on the knowledge of those times, Herodotus, Pliny and others.

Lucretius on "The Nature of Things" has left behind a book that is very practical and clear, a book that is quite fresh today. Lucretius lived from 95-52 B.C.

"What is man? What kinds of men are there? How and by what agencies are they formed and distributed over lands as we find them? How is human life propagated under parental sanction, maintained by social institutions and made tolerable by useful arts?"

These questions we should know the answers to. It is books like those mentioned that we should read as they are very enlightening—not forgetting the classical statements on the subject by Marx and Engels, found in their various writings.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

We here invite expression of views not exceeding 300 words.

From Rockhampton, Tom Healy writes on dialectical materialism:—

PLEASED to note the growing interest in dialectical materialism. The jibe of opponents of Communism that "dialectical materialism is for most Communists just a mouthful, the meaning of which they do not understand," will have little truth if this growing interest is catered for and sustained.

Marx began to publish his ideas in 1846. Darwin published his "Origin of Species" in 1859, simultaneously, one might say, thus showing these ideas represented exigencies, *i.e.*, needs growing out of the existing circumstances.

Marx's work showing the surplus value or unpaid portion of the workers' labor to be the foundation upon which is built the system of capitalism, "production for profit"—is good. But his work in establishing dialectical materialism as the proper method of finding out what is objectively true—is still better.

Since Marx established dialectical materialism, we have also had Engels' written thoughts on the subject and Joseph Dietzgen's work showing how we all get our understanding. Thirty years ago Lenin wrote his "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," a work devoted to the same subject. And then there are the works of Rudas, Adoratsky and other fine thinkers on this theme.

Already 1,073,000 copies of Lenin's book have been sold in that

part of the U.S.S.R. where the Russian language is spoken, and large numbers of it have been published in four other languages spoken in the Soviet Union—and sold.

J. Hyatt wants real and applied democratic centralism:—

IT is vital that the Central Committee in its capacity as the central leadership should use its full authority to insist on and obtain broad Party cohesion in achieving and maintaining Democratic Centralism as a live and vital force in our Party, its recognition as an imperative pre-requisite for efficient Party work.

The ever-constant dangers to the working-class movement—Trotskyism, bureaucracy and disruption, and the need for eternal vigilance to recognise and combat these evils—as outlined in Comrade Blake's admirable article (July "Review") is a very welcome indication of the Central Committee's realisation of the importance of this question.

However, to assume such articles are in themselves a sufficient remedy is absurd; all Party organs—from the C.C. down—must energetically and consistently strive to arouse in the whole membership a full consciousness of the need for establishing and maintaining real Party democracy, which is our surest weapon, and shield of defence against all the evils of which Comrade Blake writes.

ITALY: THREE YEARS OF WAR The People Give Their Blood and Their Money

From *State Operais* (official organ of C.P.I.) Note: Fascists own Statistics Used.

ITALY has been at war for three and a half years. First Abyssinia then Spain. Tens and hundreds of thousands of Italian soldiers have been forced into foreign lands, have been compelled to shed their blood in infamous wars against people who fight justly for their liberty and independence. By reason of these wars the expenditure of the Italian State has increased to giddy heights.

20,847,000,000	lire	in	1934-35
33,067,000,000	"	"	1935-36
40,932,000,000	"	"	1936-37

The Italian economy and finance have been exhausted by two wars. The workers and peasants and small traders have been overwhelmed with taxes and now Mussolini announces that this year the expenditure and the taxes will increase again by 19 milliards of lire for armaments and for war against France.

The Italian people do not want war against other peoples. The people are unable any longer to support the shocking burden of taxes and with increasing anxiety sees the approaching hell of economic and financial ruin. *Nothing is produced for the people.*

In order to conduct its policy of hunger and war in permanence, fascism has invented that tragic nonsense, autarchy; black bread, no coffee today, something else lacking tomorrow—the use of the most repugnant substitutes. The so-called autarchy in reality reduces to a minimum all industry destined for the satisfaction of the most elementary needs of the civil population. In the first eleven months of 1938, compared to the corresponding months of 1937, the production of woollen thread diminished by 13.6 p.c.; the production of woollen cloth diminished by 9.8 p.c.; public works have diminished by 11.7 p.c.

Raw material is lacking for civil industry, unemployment is increasing in many branches of industry, the small factories to which the big bureaucrats, accomplices of the financial sharks, refuse raw material, are closing.

The Cost of Living Increases

Whilst the political folly of permanent war and autarchy continually increase the cost of living, the official fascist statistics make it less than it is in reality. But let us look at them all the same. Taking Aug-

ust, 1934 as 100, the cost of living has increased to 110 in January, 1936; 116 in January, 1937; 132 in January, 1938; 135 in November, 1938. The masses cannot meet their daily expenses with wages cut by unemployment, taxes and the increasing cost of living.

But the Financial Sharks and

the Big Bureaucrats Grow Richer

These profit by the war, and accumulate millions to milliards out of the poverty and blood of the people. From the tens of milliards that Italian taxpayers must pay for armaments, the Mussolini-Ciano family again draws profits. They are big shareholders in the Terni War Industry Trust, which has 430 millions as capital and whose head is Arturo Ciano, uncle of the dreadful Galeazzo. In the three years of war, the Terni Trust of the Mussolini-Ciano family has realised enormous profits.

30,000,000 lire in 1935
30,000,000 " " 1936
34,000,000 " " 1937

And 1938 shows a further increase. The Mussolini-Ciano family draws money from the Italian State—money squeezed piece by piece from the worker, the peasant, the small trader and the clerk, and pays magnificent salaries to its members and to the financiers and corrupt bureaucrats that surround it. Galeazzo's other uncle, Admiral Alessandro Ciano, is also the head of the Italian Silurifician Trust. It is no wonder that Galeazzo, minister of Foreign Affairs, multiplies pro-

vocations to war that threaten to lead Italy to ruin but blossom with millions for the Mussolini-Ciano family, the financiers and the corrupt bureaucrats.

While all production of goods destined for the use of the people languishes and declines, in the war factories the production of cannons, tanks, explosives and instruments of death increases. In the first eleven months of 1939, compared to the corresponding months of 1937, the production of lead for war purposes increased by 22.1 p.c.; copper for war purposes, by 83.3 p.c.; cast iron for war purposes, by 10.3 p.c. From 6968 tons in 1936, the production of explosives jumped to 10,450 in 1937, to 11,000 in 1938. It is in order to produce these death weapons that the financiers and the bureaucrats deny to the people the bread they so sorely need.

And the Financiers Strangle

the Workers

They profit from the permanent war policy and from the autarchy, using their established monopolies to sell their products at prices ever more strangling.

Thanks to the policy of self-sufficiency, to the disgraceful complicity of the bureaucrats, the big shark Donegani, for example, the director of the Montecatini Trust, has more than doubled the price of the products he sells to the peasants. Taking 100 as the price of a kilo of copper sulphate in 1934, the price has jumped to 120 in 1935, 145 in

1936, 201 in 1937. It is in order to strangle the workers and peasants with their monopolies that the financial sharks and big bureaucrats must have the policy of so-called autarchy, the policy of cartels, the policy of permanent war.

The Workers Tighten Their

Belts

Fascism dare not publish the true figures of diminished wages, unemployment increased by the policy of autarchy, permanent war and cartelisation. However, let us look at the official statistics of the fascist government showing the reduction of food consumption in Milan, a big industrial city. Taking 100 as representing the quality of food-stuffs consumed in Milan in January 1934, this has been reduced to 78 in January 1937, 72 in January 1938, 70 in November 1938. The consumption of articles of first necessity, the consumption of the workers, there has therefore been reduced by 30 per cent. in a few years by war and autarchy.

The Workers Cannot Clothe

Themselves

The workers have nothing with which to buy clothes for themselves and their children. According to the official fascist statistics, the consumption of clothing at Milan has diminished from 100 in November, 1936, to 84 in November 1937; to 78 in November, 1938. This is the fault of war and autarchy which have increased the prices at a giddy speed and cut wages.

Unemployment and Bankruptcy
for the Poor People.

With war and autarchy, unemployment has increased amongst workers and tradesmen. The number employed in public works has diminished from 261,960 in 1935 to 241,989 in 1936; to 240,019 in 1937; to 200,000 in 1938. The war and autarchy policy not only strikes the workers and the peasants but also the small traders and the rest of the middle class. The number of bankruptcies of small traders etc. strangled by monopolies and laid low by taxes has increased from 42,894 in October 1937, to 62,469 in October 1938, from 43,095 in November 1937, to 62,469 in November 1938. Reduced to poverty and ruin, the lower middle class joins the unemployed.

The Poor People Go to the

Pawn Shops

Reduced to poverty by the fascist policy of war and autarchy, workers, peasants, artisans and small traders must take their last few belongings to the Mont de Pieté. According to the official statistics of the fascist government the pledges have increased from 2,422,224 in 1935, to 2,560,734 in 1936; to 2,566,031 in 1937, to 2,811,668 in 1938.

But the Sharks and Bureaucrats

Grow fatter.

Whilst workers, peasants, clerks and small traders these last few years have been able to buy less

bread and meat the sharks have been able to buy even more luxurious motor cars, jewels for their mistresses, delicious and costly meals. Taking 100 as the figure for the sale of fine pastry and cakes in the big cities in 1936, it has increased to 114 in 1937; to 115 in 1938. It is certainly not the proletariat or the working class generally that buy fine pastry and rich cakes.

But the Sharks and Big

Bureaucrats Buy Furs

Whilst the workers cannot buy clothes, the sale of luxury furs has increased from 100 in 1936, to 110 in 1937, to 127 in 1938.

The war makes rich only the financial sharks and the big bureaucrats and reduces all the people to poverty.

The Sharks Capital Gains

They are certainly not reduced to unemployment by war and autarchy. The capital of the big companies has increased from 44 milliards in 1936, to 47 milliards in 1937; to 53 milliards in 1938.

It has gained at the expense of the poverty and blood of the work-

ers. It has gained at the expense of the ruin of small traders, artisans, small manufacturers laid low by the autarchy and war policy, by taxes and monopolies.

But the Sharks and Big Bureaucrats

Increase Their Profits

Scandalously.

The Edison, Montecatine, Ilva, Terni, Fiat, Snia, Pirelli, Breda, Chatillon, and Erba companies, ten big trusts belonging to Mussoliniano, Volpi, Pirelli, Benni and Agnelli, have seen their declared profits increase (and those undeclared are much greater). From 354 millions in 1934, to 399 millions in 1935; to 426 millions in 1936; to 521 millions in 1937. And this year the profits are still greater. Big dividends for a few sharks, the Monte de Piete for the mass of the people—*Such is fascism.*

War, Poverty, Slavery and Death of Thousands of the People's Sons.—Down with War! Out of Spain! Down With Mussolini's Government—a Government of Hunger, Slavery and War. For a Regime of Liberty in Which the People May Control Their Destinies.

WHO SHALL BOOZE ?

"Gordon"

CHARACTERS: MR. and MRS. NIGEL SMYTHE-BROWNE

SCENE: ANY INTERIOR.

[Mr. Smythe-Browne enters, wearing a dressing-gown and slippers, and a general "morning-after-the-night-before" appearance. Closely followed by wife, also in dressing-gown.]

Mrs. S.-B. You're a naughty boy! You promised you wouldn't get up till lunch-time.

- Mr. S.-B. Don't pester, my dear, don't pester!
- Mrs. S.-B. But you only came in an hour ago! Where d'you think you're going, like that?
- Mr. S.-B. It is my misfortune, my dear, to have a . . . hup! . . . bushiness that requires . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. Good Heavens! Is that what's on your mind? Why, you must still be drunk!
- Mr. S.-B. [*Heavily*] I am . . . hup! . . . conscious of my resh . . . pons . . . abilities. Ergo . . . hup! . . . I must be drunk! Delightful, my dear, delightful!
- Mrs. S.-B. But Claude, you're forgetting Waffles! Hasn't he always attended to the business when you've been like this?
- Mr. S.-B. Waffles . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. And you told me yourself that he's the best manager in the world.
- Mr. S.-B. [*Louder*] Waffles . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. And that he knows more about the business than you do yourself.
- Mr. S.-B. [*Louder still*] Waffles . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. [*Putting her arm round him*] Now do go back to bed, there's a darling. Fancy worrying about the office when . . .
- Mr. S.-B. [*Shaking her off*] Waffles . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. Well, what about Waffles?
- Mr. S.-B. [*Triumphantly*] I . . . shack'd . . . him!
- Mrs. S.-B. You what?
- Mr. S.-B. I shack'd him.
- Mrs. S.-B. You sacked him? But whatever for?
- Mr. S.-B. [*With terrific aplomb*] He came in . . . hup! . . . drunk!
- Mrs. S.-B. Waffles! Drunk?
- Mr. S.-B. Waffle . . . sh . . . drunk,
- Mrs. S.-B. But I thought Waffles didn't drink. He couldn't afford to; he has four children.
- Mr. S.-B. Five, my dear, to be . . . hup! . . . preshish. And Waffles doesn't drink, in a way. He . . . jus' . . .
- Mrs. S.-B. Stupid! You sacked him because he got drunk once, and now you've got no one to . . .
- Mr. S.-B. Don't pester, my dear, don't pester! Get me my . . . hup! . . . pantsh.
- Mrs. S.-B. Waffles! Drunk! I can't believe it.
- Mr. S.-B. [*Unctuously*] Ye . . . esh, drunk. And shack'd. [*Sways*] We must have . . . dish . . . i . . . pline, my dear. Dishipline . . . [*Lurches*] and . . . hup . . . eff . . . ic . . . ien cy! [*Collapses*].

CURTAIN.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

By Y. J.

THE "West Coast" of South Australia, the area to the west of Spencer Gulf, is occupied, in the main, by thousands of wheat farmers. Ten years ago there were probably twice as many as now. What is happening there?

Going south from Port Augusta the first centre on the "coast" is Whyalla, which until recent years had practically no human connections with the rest of the "coast." It is situated on the sea and draws its lifeblood from the well nigh inexhaustible deposits of the highest grade iron ore in the world, found at Iron Knob, Iron Baron and elsewhere in the Middleback Ranges, some thirty miles in the semi-arid hinterland.

Whyalla is booming. The B.H.P., to which the Liberal government of Butler gave the rights over most of the iron deposits for the next fifty years, is building a blast furnace to exploit the ore on the spot. Coke will be brought from Newcastle in the ships which would otherwise come empty. Limestone will be brought from nearby inexhaustible deposits. Water will be provided from the Murray, three hundred miles distant, at the cost of nearly three million pounds to the South Australian people. The B.H.P. undoubtedly would like to get its workers on the same easy terms.

A growing number of Whyalla workers are known as "Whyalla

cockies." They do no farming, for without the waters of the Murray no farming is possible in the dry, dusty district. They are farmers and their sons who have been forced off their land elsewhere on the "coast." They provide the living link between the struggling wheat industry, the Cinderella of the Liberal and U.A.P. governments, and the booming monopoly B.H.P., the pampered favorite of these governments.

Among some trade unionists at Whyalla there is a tendency to be hostile towards these dispossessed farmers. They do not become good trade unionists overnight. They are used to working individually, slaving with their families from dawn to dark in the uneven struggle against weather, mallee, rent, interest, high freights, high costs of manure, bags, machinery, food and clothing. Hostility towards the ex-farmers because they do not immediately adjust themselves to their new conditions of work can only help the B.H.P. at a time when it is intensifying its efforts to weaken the unions. It can only help the B.H.P. to get the workers on cheaper terms.

The ex-farm workers can be won for active trade unionism. The ideas of co-operation are not unknown to them. In the areas from which many of them have come considerable united efforts have been made by the farmers in resisting evictions.

These areas lie mainly to the west and south-west of Whyalla, extending to the head of the Bight. They are marginal sandy mallee lands with a rainfall of from ten to fifteen inches a year, and an average of one good season in three or four. The land was bought from its owners at inflated values by the government, subdivided into small blocks of two or three thousand acres, and let to settlers at rentals of from £50 to £150 a year. Most areas were settled about the time of the Great War. Many of the settlers were city workers.

Investing their savings in makeshift homes, machinery, sheds, fences and horses the settlers and their families started the work of clearing the mallee and sowing wheat. Most cleared about 1,000 acres in the course of some years. The land takes about ten years to come to full productive capacity. Half the cleared land is cropped each year. On the average five to seven bushells per acre are harvested each year. Sometimes when drought or mice or grasshoppers or caterpillars have been at work less than one bushell is reaped—less than the seed sown.

With the fall of wheat prices, and last August it was 1/2 to 1/4 a bushell in these areas, the position of most of the settlers became hopeless.

The Gepp Commission estimated that in these areas the average cost of production was 4/6 a bushell (whereas the average for Australia was 3/6). Debts, therefore, grew. Rent, storekeeper, bag, manure and

machinery merchants could not be paid. In desperation farmers sometimes sowed crops without manure.

The State government relief schemes operating in these districts, the Debt Adjustment Board and the Farmers' Assistance Board have achieved nothing in real relief. The former has dealt with a few hundred of the thousands of applications for debt adjustment made to it, and already among the cases dealt with there are re-applications for adjustment of the already "adjusted" debts. The F.A.B. seems to be devised not to help the farmer, but to secure that the government shall get the best possible return from the farm. Farmers who got into difficulties applied to the F.A.B. for help. If accepted, and only those with a "reasonable chance" of pulling through are accepted, the F.A.B. takes control of the farm, sends its inspectors to tell the farmer what he must do on it, takes control of his products and in general, by means of frequent inspections, polices the farm. In return the farmer is guaranteed a miserable pittance. In reality he works for the F.A.B. If by some miracle his produce exceeds in value all his debts plus advances from the Board he gets the surplus. Very few farmers in these marginal areas have ever freed themselves from the Board, which usually ends its activities by declaring that it cannot carry the farmer any longer, and selling his farm and effects.

A farmer under the F.A.B. receives 10/- a week for himself, 10/- for his wife, 2/6 per child under 15,

slightly extra for infants, 3/3 for sons 14-16 years old, from 5/- to 10/- for sons over 16 years. Each son who works on the farm gets £5 a year for himself. £25 on the average is allowed for a family of four or five for clothing; £12, paid in quarterly instalments, is allowed as petty cash. Anything the farmer's family can make out of cows (up to six) and fowls are allowed to be kept. All other produce must be handed over to the Board, which sells it, collects, and distributes the proceeds among the creditors. By going under the F.A.B. the farmer incurs up to £25 a year for administrative charges alone. He loses £10 or so in cash discounts which he cannot collect since the Board pays his accounts. Every item of expenditure must be agreed to by the F.A.B. in advance, except such as can be met out of the petty cash allowance, and emergencies, such as medical expenses. These last are often queried, but veterinary expenses never. The horses belong to the F.A.B.!

To eke out his existence the farmer keeps a few sheep. The cultivated land will take up to one sheep every five acres, the scrub up to one every ten acres. From 150 to 200 is therefore the maximum possible except if hand feeding is carried out. Each sheep returns an average of about 7/- gross each year. Freight and selling charges take 20 per cent. of this amount, so

that only a small sum, if any, can be cleared each year.

Under these conditions most farmers get more and more hopelessly in debt, until the day comes when the F.A.B. sells him up. He then has to get work elsewhere, become unemployed, or make a fresh start. Those farmers who are game enough to make a fresh start are helped by their neighbors. Word goes round that the farmer wants to buy machinery, horses, etc., at his sale. Neighbors agree not to bid. The auctioneer, in the presence of the F.A.B. representative, receives bids from only the farmer (or his agent) who therefore gets what he wants at nominal prices. Attempts at scab bidding are few and far between, as they are dealt with in the best traditions of working-class picketing. The solidarity of the farmers is such that hundreds of these sales have been effectively picketed in this way.

Nevertheless, many farmers have gone under. In one Hundred near Streaky Bay there were 19 settlers in 1931; there are now 8. In another there were 8, now 2. In the Kimba district there have been 300 evictions since 1931.

Consequently the farmers in these areas are full of indignation against the Menzies and Playford governments which have done nothing for them.

(To be continued.)

The Movement of the Working Class Standard of Living in Australia

N. Kelly

THE question which I want to put and answer from the available statistical data is, "Are the workers in Australia any better off than they were 30 years ago?" "What is the trend of their standard of living?" and "What on the other hand is the relative position of the non-wage earning classes which receive income?"

There is no statistical information concerning the position of the small farmers, the small shop-keepers, etc., and covering the middle classes as a whole. The same may be said of the smaller capitalists and the larger monopolist groups, but we can get some indication of the trend in the distribution of income by comparing changes in the standard of living of the workers, defined below, with changes in national income per head of the occupied population which includes the unemployed.

This standard of living takes account only of adult male workers owing to the lack of information concerning other workers, but it may be supposed that changes in the position of women and juveniles would not depart very much from changes in the adult male standard.

The standard is used as follows: We take notice firstly of

changes in the average money wage rate received by all Australian workers. Suppose in 1940 it rises to 120 shillings from 100 shillings in 1930. Secondly, we take account of changes in employment. Suppose that in 1940 only 75 per cent. of the workers were employed, whereas all were employed in 1930. In this case the money wages actually earned per week are only three-quarters of 120 shillings or 90 shillings as compared with 100 shillings in 1930. Thirdly, we take account of changes in the prices of the things the workers buy. The money wage earned has fallen in 1940 by 10 per cent. as compared with 1930. But if prices have also fallen by 10 per cent. the standard of living would remain the same.

The figures for the standard thus defined are those of the Commonwealth statistician. In the Labor Reports of recent years he has discontinued publication of the figures for these last years. But these later figures have here been compiled by the methods used and explained by him and from the material which he uses, the nominal wage index, the C series price index, and the trade union figures of unemployment.

Our method leaves out of account increases or decreases in social ser-

vices, increases in direct taxation of the workers, and in indirect taxes on articles the workers buy—tobacco, etc., but which are not covered by the price index. Also new articles, wireless, etc., not used in 1911 are not included in the price data. Moreover, the average nominal wage which is another element in the calculation is overstated in later years because the weights given to different industries have not been changed since 1911. And the development of industry has been such that average wage in later years is overstated as compared with 1911. The picture here presented is on the whole thinly drawn and the position in the last ten years is overstated relatively to the position in earlier years.

The standard of living moved on the whole in an upward direction in Australia until the year 1911. And it is useful to compare subsequent years with this high-water mark.

Year	Index No.
1901	94.5
1906-10	95.9
1911	100.0
1912-22	92.6
1923-7	104.7
1928-32	96.0
1933-7	101.9

We see from these figures that in the period of eleven years 1912-22 the standard is 7.4 per cent. below 1911. From 1923-7 it is 4.7 per cent. above. From 1928-32 another five years it is 4 per cent. below. And in 1933-7 it is 1.9 per cent. above. If the gains and losses are compared, and the present perspectives of imperialist war or capitalist economic

crisis are kept in mind, it is apparent that the standard of living has been fluctuating in a downward direction when we fix in the background of the whole movement the high tide year of 1911 as the point of comparison. It must be remembered, too, that in recent years the figures overstate the standard, and so understate the downward movement.

If we make another form of comparison and take not 1911 but the four-year average of 1908-11, which includes in representative proportion very bad and good years, we get the following result:

Year	Index No.
1908-11	100.0
1912-16	92.9
1917-22	97.9
1923-7	108.2
1928-32	99.2
1933-7	105.3

Even here we see that the standard has been below 1908-11 in more subsequent periods than it has been above it.

It is useful to notice that between 1914 and 1919, the war years, the standard was 7.1 per cent. below 1908-11 and 11.1 per cent. below 1911. War, contrary to the illusions of some people, means an attack on working-class conditions.

It is quite evident that Karl Marx's thesis, that the development of capitalism means eventually an absolute worsening of the conditions of the working class, applies to Australia in the period of monopoly capitalism. While it is true that rates of wages have increased, unemployment has increased faster,

with the result that living standards have moved on the whole in a downward direction, and this movement is accelerated by war and preparation for war. At the same time the turning point for the workers is later in Australia than in England where it was about the year 1900, and then in France and Germany where it was a little later than in the case of England, because of the later development of capitalism on the mainland of Europe.

A rising standard of living in Australia was assisted by the loan money available for government development works and private capitalist enterprise, the accumulations coming from the profit won by the expansion of British imperialism in Africa, the Near East, China, etc. And there is no doubt that the levels reached by our standards in the upward movement were attained at the expense of the colonial peoples in part at least.

But although the standard of living has been declining in the last thirty years on the whole, the national income per head of the occupied population has increased continuously. In order to compare changes in the standard with changes in income per head we shall be forced to refer to the standard as having changed so much since 1914. It will in this case appear to have increased a lot since in that year it was abnormally low. The reason for doing this is that the national income figures are not available before 1914 except for 1902 and before. Because it is necessary to do

this, the contrast which we point out will be considerably understated. The relative increase in the standard will be overstated for later years since it was lower in 1914 than in 1902. Whereas relatively the increase in national income will be understated since income was 10 per cent. higher in 1914 than in 1901-3.

The figures of national income used are those of Colin Clark. And the following table shows the position of national income per head as compared with the working-class living standard.

Year	Index No. of national income per head of the occupied population including the unemployed.	Nos. of income per head of the population including the living standards.	Index No. of living standards.
1914	100	100	100
1915-22	101.5	(6 yrs.)	100.7
1923-7	130.9		115.0
1928-32	127.5		105.3
1933-7	140.3		118.8

For the national income between 1915-22 only six years are available. The figures are to be compared with each other by comparing both sets with 1914. From 1915-22 national income increased by 1.5 per cent. and the standard by 7 per cent. In 1923-7 income had increased over the previous period by 29.4 per cent. and living standards by 14.3 per cent. or at less than half the rate of the increase in national income. From 1928-32 income fell by 3.4 per cent. from the previous period and the standard by 9.7 per cent. or at over three times that rate. Between 1933-7 income rose by 12.8 per cent. and the standard by 6.5 per cent.

It must be re-emphasised that the

contrast is thinly drawn for the reasons outlined above. Also because income per head of the capitalist class and those who got the increase is higher and increases faster than national income per head, which here includes the workers and unemployed.

We see also from the above figures who paid for the depression.

The increase in national income since 1914 has been partly absorbed undoubtedly by the lower middle

class, the political padding of capitalism in the period of imperialism, partly also by the better paid workers. But the difference between skilled and unskilled rates is less here than in England. The main gainers, however, have been Australia's monopoly capitalists and this applies more than ever since and in the depression when the position of the middle classes did not improve and that of the small farmers has deteriorated greatly.

LEGION OF YOUTH

*We march,
True to our hearts' imperative command;
Our urgent voices shouting together,
Ringing over the chasm of death,
—But we fall only to death!
Not to fear—greedy for our surrender;
Fear that would thrust its cold bayonet
Into our quivering throats,
To gush our hot blood,
To break each quickened nerve,
Each bright brave dream.
Never will we fall.*

*We know that man bleeds in agony tonight,
And old people hungering fall in the streets,
Where frightened children whimper and kiss the lifeless shapeless forms
of mothers.*

*In the fold of your arm, hold your young close;
Look long into the burning eyes of your mate,
Lest he be blown into the desolate black and red of changing worlds;
And lovers, remember your shining flesh, trembling thighs,
The teeming embryos of future life,
Remember when you are scattered when armies charge. . . .
—But the fire of our purpose is bright on our cheek,
Warm in our voice—
We will not fall!*

We love the deep task of our choice.

—J. J.

PAGES FROM THE PAST

J. N. Rawling

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

Period III.—Democracy and Unionism, 1856—1890 (Continued)

AUSTRALIA A REFUGE

Louisa Lawson, mother of Henry, contributed the following verses to the *Republican*.

Australia for ever!
Beloved home-giver,
Bright haven of rest the wide oceans between,
How many in sorrow,
Take heart for the morrow,
When nearing thy borders thy beauty is seen.

The weary world-ranger,
The poor and the stranger,
Find all that they need on thy bountiful shore.
And gratefully feeling,
Hope's placid annealing,
They bless thee resolving to wander no more.

Australia forever,
Fond hearts leap and quiver
With pride and delight at the sound of thy praise.
And true to each other,
As brother to brother,
They beat or they bleed thy proud banner to raise.
—LOUISA LAWSON (in the "Republican," April 4, 1888)

BOSSSES' CLOWN

On the other hand, our friends the enemy—those on the other side of possible barricades—knew how to hate in those days. And so did their versifiers, their clowns, ready to pour ridicule upon or to raise hatred against reformers, rebels and labor leaders. Such a one, sad to relate, was Henry Kendall. In the follow-

some good, and has, as you say, exposed the charlatan, Joseph Symes. I am writing in this next "Radical" a reply to his personal abuse of myself in last week's "Liberator" (or as it should be called, "Liberty-hater"); it will help on his exposure a little further. Of course, I look upon the affair as an outside spectator, for I do not belong to the A.S.A., having left it about three years ago rather than endure Symes' despotic rule, and find myself always voting in the minority, while the victorious majority always assisted him in his scramble for the loaves and fishes. To belong to such a fossilised body, I look upon as a sheer waste of valuable time; and if Symes does not stop his slanders, I shall shortly rattle out such a volley of exposures that must even open the eyes of such infatuated dupes as Wallwork and Barnes.

I am always glad to hear from you, and take a great interest in your writings. If you are not an Anarchist, you are too humanitarian for an Archist, and there is scarcely

a sentiment of yours that I can dissent from. We are both fighting the common enemy, and I hope ere long we shall both be championing the common cause. If you see difficulties in Anarchism, I should like to see you express them in "Honesty" (or elsewhere) and we may there discuss the problems in all their bearings, for the benefit of both ourselves and our readers.

I have taken the liberty of sending you two dozen copies of "Honesty" for this month, and will be obliged if you will try to dispose of them at the meetings of the Australian Socialist League. We have appointed R. Bear² as a Sydney agent, but he has little (if any) sympathy for the paper, and I thought you might feel more disposed to introduce it. The price is 8d. per dozen, post free.

Let me hear from you now and then if you can afford time, as I am always anxious to know how Sydney friends are getting on.

With heartiest greetings,

Fraternally,

David A. Andrade.

Notes: 1.—A.S.A., i.e., the Australian Secularist Association, of which Joseph Symes was leader; 2.—Radical, organ of the Australian Socialist League; 3.—Liberator, organ of the A.S.A.; 4.—Honesty, an Anarchist organ; 5.—R. Bear, a well-known Sydney bookseller, who styled himself Sir Robert Bear.

POST MORTEM ON THE 1890 STRIKE

The causes and history of the 1890 Strike will be told on another occasion. There follows an interesting summing-up of the lessons of the Strike, as seen by the Sydney Defence Committee and published by it in its Report.

... Already the Defence Committee has indicated that it regards the lessons inculcated by defeat, of more value to the Unions than the victory to their opponents.

What then have we learnt? First

of all the necessity for a critical inspection of weapons. In its inception Trades-unionism was merely an instrument for improving the lot of the worker within the lines of modern competition. The overthrow of

that system was no part of its business. As time has gone on, however, the commercial structure itself, within which the wheels of Unionism revolve, has been considerably modified. Monopoly has grown apace. Rings, trusts and combines have menaced Society on its purchasing side, and now Unions of employers have come into the field to cope with it in its capacity of worker and wage-earner. Still keeping in view the primary aim of Trades-unions—to get as much wealth for the worker as present conditions will admit of—we have then in the first place to consider the extent to which recent developments have left a margin within which our weapons are likely to prove effectual and in the second place the extent to which the weapons themselves demand improvement.

Now, in a mere report, we must not wander into the mazes of political economy. All that it is here possible to do is to remind the Trades-unionists of Australia that they have been travelling these many years in a kind of *cul de sac* or blind alley, one end of which is blocked by the conditions of modern commerce and firmly cemented by the laws of the land. That is a barrier which no strike can ever break through and when we find ourselves abreast of it we shall know that Trades-unionism has fulfilled its mission, that it has carried us faithfully to the very end of the track. But we are not there yet; and in the meantime there is ample work on the old lines but slightly varied for one and all of our organisations. A

working day of not more than eight hours, an improvement in the wages of the more underpaid of workers, the retention of those advantages gained by so many hard struggles in the past and threatened now by the united action of employers—these and many other objects come well within the original scope of Trades-unionism, and for their achievement, in the light of the late strike, too much stress cannot be placed upon the necessity for low entrance fees to individual Unions, and of some central power to control the machinery of Unionism throughout the whole of Australia. It is impossible for independent local organisations to conduct a general strike with success. Some form of federation is imperative.

A still more important lesson, learnt in the hour of defeat is this: That whilst we must go on ever increasing our capacity for fighting as we have fought before, the time has come when Trades-unionists must use the Parliamentary machinery that has in the past used them. We are still some distance—it is impossible to say just how far—from the blind end of our industrial lane. Until we reach that end we shall still stand in need of the strike and the boycott. But the trumpet notes, at the sound of which the barrier itself will fall, are essentially political. Once the worker determines—as he has determined—that the very basis of modern industry is antagonistic to his welfare—once he questions the right of any man to interpose a partition between himself and the fruits of his

labour—he must set about the work of reform where it seems that reform can alone be obtained—and that is in Parliament. The rule that Trades-unionism must steer clear of politics was a golden rule when there was so much work to be done within our present industrial environment. But that time, as we have said before, is drawing to an end, and ere we can radically improve the lot of the worker we must secure a substantial representation in Parliament. Then, and only then, can we begin to restore to the people the land of which they have been plundered, to absorb the monopolies which society at large has helped to create, and to ensure to every man, by the opportunity of fairly remunerated labour, a share in those things that make life worth living, and, above all, a reasonable chance of developing within him the qualities of a perfect manhood.

The Parliamentary weapon is ready to our hand. West Sydney proved that. Too much stress cannot be laid upon its importance. Isolated labour representatives are useless—often worse than useless. The next general election must yield us

(To be Continued.)

the balance of power; future contests must give us an absolute majority in Parliament. Strait is the gate and sure only, but sure indeed, if we hold on our course, ignoring the touts of existing parties, knowing neither freetrade nor protection, and oblivious of sectarian difference. Self-seekers must go. Jealousies must share the fate of the prickly pear, least of all to be suffered in the home-paddock. "Politics" is a game we must decline to play. For us Parliamentary life will be a real and perhaps a bitter warfare, at all events a life into which no man must enter who does not love the Cause before himself, who does not believe that the only statesmanship worthy the name is that which enriches a country's toiling citizens.

This, then, is over and above all others the greatest lesson of the strike—that our organisations must become a means of education and constitutional power. Already it is half learnt. We have come out of the conflict a United Labour Party, destined amid all the hypocrisy of political life to brighten the lot of our children—if not our own lot.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Soviet Union has made Peace possible

L. Sharkey

THE treaties concluded by the Soviet Union with the Baltic States are models of the non-imperialist, non-aggressive attitude of the Soviets towards other States and peoples.

The Baltic coasts of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are vital to the defences of the Soviet Union, particularly Leningrad, the second greatest city of the Soviet Republics, from attack by the imperialists.

None of the great imperialist powers would have concerned themselves for one moment with the independence or rights of these tiny states had they found themselves in a similar position to the Soviet Union.

The land on which the new Soviet bases are to be situated, even when islands off the coast, are not annexed, but leased, from the Baltic States for the duration of the treaties, "at reasonable rentals."

The treaties are also greatly to the advantage of the Baltic States. The treaties prevent the Baltic States becoming a cockpit for war against the U.S.S.R.

The new relation of the Soviet Union to these tiny and poverty-stricken countries means economic advantages for them in the way of increased trade and business agreements, as well as with the Soviet gar-

risons. The new bases greatly strengthen the defences of the Soviet Union. These bases prevent a hostile fleet from penetrating the Baltic and the Gulf of Finland to a position where Leningrad could be bombarded. Further than this, the Red Navy now has elbow room in which to develop; free from interference by the fleets of the capitalist states.

Our capitalist press represents the treaties between the Soviets and the Baltic States as solely a blow at the Nazis. It is perfectly true the treaties bar the way to aggression from that direction, but the Soviet moves by no means have only Hitler in mind. It must never be forgotten by the workers that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned the danger of attack does not come solely from the Nazis. The Chamberlain and Daladier governments, as their whole records show, are just as mortal enemies of the Soviet Power as ever Hitler was, and they are possibly more dangerous, having greater resources. Certain groups of the British and French imperialists would perhaps desire nothing better than to transform the present war into a war of all the imperialist states against the Soviet Union. The Baltic treaties, as well as the one the Soviets are negotiating with the

Turks at the time of writing, have as much in mind the eventuality of a British-French imperialist attack as a Nazi one, or the alternative combined offensive of the imperialists. The fact of the mortal enmity of the government of Chamberlain to Soviet Russia and the need for the latter to take that fact into consideration at all times is overlooked by all manner of Liberals and well-meaning people when they speculate on reasons for Soviet actions. They forget that Chamberlain and Daladier are likewise anti-Soviet and, as the history of the past few years has proved, prefer war to co-operation with the Soviet Government for peace.

The Baltic Pacts are supplemented by the position of the Red Army in Poland. The new territories place the Red Army in a particularly strong defensive or offensive position.

With a Soviet-Turkish treaty guarding the Black Sea, the defensive position of the Socialist Fatherland has been enormously strengthened by the military and diplomatic moves of the Soviet Government over the past several weeks. The first round of the war has been won in the main by the Workers' State; placing new tremendous obstacles in the way of attack upon its frontiers.

These activities, whilst withdrawing the Baltic from the area of hostilities, also by virtue of the new powerful position of the Red Army in Western Ukraine, have thrown a protecting shield over Rumania and the Balkans. A successful pact with Turkey still further limits the

possibilities of aggression in the Balkans.

These moves of the Soviet government decisively change the nature of the problem of the restoration of peace to what it was at the start of hostilities. The danger to the Soviet Union becoming involved has been greatly lessened and the Soviet Union is already protecting a large and vital area of Europe. The Soviet-German Pact, which is but a recognition of the fact "that the Soviet Union is too big a nut for fascist jaws to crack" (Dimitrov) by Hitler and Von Ribbentrop, has removed the tension and war danger between those countries and gives the promise of peace in the east of Europe. This pact destroyed the Anti-Comintern Pact and isolated Japan as well as Spain and helped to force Mussolini into a neutral position.

It is because he has to face all these hard and unpleasant realities that Hitler has been forced to talk of a Peace Conference with the Western Powers and offers to restore a Polish State. It is because of this change in the situation that the question of peace no longer rests on Hitler's word. This position has been established by the assertion of the might and power of the Soviet country, which is working indefatigably for the re-establishment of peaceful relations; to save the lives of millions of youthful soldiers; of civilians in London, Berlin and Paris and of their countries being laid waste.

The working class and the peace lovers of every country, who love

peace and hate war, must hasten to the support of the proposals for peace. The use of Hitler's criminal reputation and murderous actions to block the road to peace on the part of the British and French capitalists and their press must be rebuffed.

If most of the remaining small states of Europe are shielded from aggression by the Soviet Union and Hitler is compelled by the strength of the Red Army to acquiesce in this, it is plain enough that a common stand by the Soviet Union and the Western powers would constitute an effectual restraint compelling Hitler to respect peace and international law.

There is yet another great and powerful ally of peace: the German people. The German people, due to censorship and Goebbels's lies were not aware of their danger until they actually had been precipitated into the war by Hitler. The German people now understand Hitler's war aims and where they lead. The German people, if peace were restored, would not allow itself to be tricked by Hitler and his gangsters a second time.

At the time of writing, the capitalist press is waging a big campaign against peace. It spices this campaign with provocations against the U.S.S.R., trying to present the U.S.S.R. as "accomplice" of Hitler and spreading lies of Red Army "invasion" of first, the Baltic States, then Rumania, and when these were exposed, "300,000 Red Army soldiers had invaded Sinkiang," a Chinese province. In addition, the Red Army was alleged to be threat-

ening India. All of these provocations are being spread to foster the war spirit. The possibility of peace in Europe brought about by the might of the Soviet Union raises the question of the real aims of the British and French ruling classes.

They are obviously no longer fighting for small nations, indeed, continuance of the war involves aggression against Belgium, Holland, Switzerland and Denmark, in all probability. In France, 900 Municipal Councils have been dissolved, 72 democratically elected members of the French Parliament and one of the biggest newspapers, the "L'Humanite," have been placed outside the law. In face of this example of dictatorship, it is hard to believe that M. Daladier is fighting to restore democracy in the German Reich.

Now comes the terrific announcement that a twelve-hour day has been instituted for French labor. The attack on the Communist Party, as always, but precedes savage onslaughts by the capitalists upon the workers and their economic and political organisations.

The attack upon the French Communists, on the flimsiest and lying pretences, was the necessary condition to the total enslavement of French labor.

In face of all this, in face of the fact that the Soviet Union is the guarantor of most of Europe; in face of Daladier's open flouting of French democracy; what are we fighting for? Is it for open imperialist aims, questions of European supremacy and of world domi-

nation?

Let us glance at some past imperialist history, in the not too distant past at that.

At the end of the world war in 1918, the French imperialists, led by the "Tiger," Clemenceau, strove to hamstring Germany for all time.

To do this they aimed to annex the main sources of Germany's might, the chief bases of the great industrial and military centres.

The French took over the Alsace and Lorraine, which contain enormous supplies of coal and iron; the Saar Valley, likewise a base of German industry, producing iron and coal, was separated from Germany and placed under the control of the League of Nations, which, by and large, meant French imperialism, at the time.

The Rhineland, the great source of military strength of Germany, was occupied by the French, but owing to the opposition of the British and other powers, the French imperialists were unable to continue in occupation. The Rhineland, instead, was demilitarised, that is, the Germans were not allowed to fortify nor to garrison it.

It was only a couple of years ago that the German troops once more marched back into the Rhineland.

Finally, in 1923, the French imperialists, fearing a German Socialist Revolution during the economic and financial crisis in Germany in that year, marched their troops into the very heart of German industry, the chief source of the might of modern Germany, the Ruhr.

Again, the British, having by no

means that childlike faith in their "noble ally," the French rulers, that the daily press preaches, forced the French out of the Ruhr again. The French imperialists in control of the mighty iron and coal industries of Germany seemed likely to prove an even more dangerous adversary for British capitalism than even capitalist Germany.

So the French "tiger" had to draw its claws out of the body of its intended victim.

Is the "resolution" of the French bourgeoisie to continue the present war to, this time, achieve the prizes that slipped out of their fingers on the last occasion, largely because of the policy of their "loyal ally," Britania, who did not want to allow France to become too big for her boots?

Have these two now agreed on the final elimination of Germany along the lines of dismembering the country, removing her power for all time by the seizure of the Ruhr, the Saar and the Rhineland and other key points?

Germany has no colonies that they might seize, nor is the German fleet the menace to the British fleet that it once was.

Are Chamberlain and Daladier fighting to maintain and make more secure their own domination of the capitalist world?

In the event of their success, they would be faced with the undying hatred of the Germans, who would revolt against their domination, but not only this. Once freed from the immediate threat from German imperialism, their own struggle,

long veiled, for the domination of Europe, would break into the open. Such a victory and "peace" on such terms would simply be the preparation for yet new wars.

As Bernard Shaw said, the continuance of the present war policy will "ruin our people."

Some workers take the "Leftist" view that war is a good thing for the workers, a golden opportunity to emancipate labor. It is, of course, true that a Proletarian revolution can be brought about by the impact of war on the masses, as in Russia in 1917, although this revolution had been long maturing and was bursting forth at the outbreak of war in 1914.

But revolution did not succeed in Germany, Austria, Italy, France nor Britain, as a result of the last war. There were other conditions, particularly a strong revolutionary Communist Party, required for success.

War does not necessarily lead directly to revolution. To postulate another imperialist war as a precondition of revolution is to place oneself in the position of the Tsar, the Kaiser, Hitler and the other blood-stained monsters who wade through seas of blood to their goals.

The working class is for the avoidance of a second imperialist world war; for its immediate liquidation; for the restoration of peace. Peace is the really revolutionary slogan in the present conditions.

Within the German Reich there are mighty forces making for the overthrow of Hitler's dictatorship

and for the restoration of German democracy. Hitler cannot solve the economic problems of Germany. Hitler, the Communists have foretold over the years, would plunge into a desperate war as a way of escape from the wrath of the German people. Now he has taken that plunge. Were peace restored, the Germans, who have been tricked into the war, would be more fiercely opposed to Hitler's policy than ever. The anti-fascist peace forces in Germany would grow more rapidly than before. It would be much more difficult, practically impossible, for Hitler to again lead the German people into war. Peace would be disastrous for the Hitler dictatorship. The Communists, before the war, pointed out that peace is a revolutionary slogan against fascism, that peace is fatal to fascism. Economic crisis would also undermine Hitler's power.

It is far better for the German people to deal with Hitler themselves, rather than when the armies of imperialism are destroying the powers of resistance of the country, when the French and British imperialists are occupying Berlin, and on the spot as the barrier to the German peoples' movement for freedom.

The working class in the countries opposed to Hitler have nothing to lose through peace. To the contrary, Labor can save human civilisation only by the means of restoring peace to the world.



CRACK TROOPS of the Red Army of the U.S.S.R. embarking on a big transport plane for practice in parachuting behind enemy lines to disorganise communications. (Photo taken during recent manoeuvres.)

PEEL'S SETTLEMENT AT SWAN RIVER IN 1830

W. Watson

THOMAS PEEL was one of a group of English capitalists influenced by Captain James Stirling's report of conditions at Swan River. Accompanying Stirling was Fraser, a botanist; and these two were responsible for a glowing report of the district.

They were here in March, at the end of the dry season, when the country could not have looked at its best, yet they were so impressed that Stirling said it was "equal to the plains of Lombardy," and, "the land out of all that I have seen in all quarters of the world that possesses the greatest attractions."

This was in January 1827, and next year Stirling was in England, where he got busy to persuade the Admiralty to make a settlement.

The Admiralty would have nothing to do with the scheme at first, but in the meantime Peel's company had been formed, and the proposed new colony had become the topic of the day. Egged on by the example of fortunes being made by increase in land values at Sydney, and the lack of profitable means to invest capital in England at the time, people thought it would be necessary only to tickle the soil in Stirling's paradise where untold wealth awaited the venturesome.

By November, 1828, Peel's syndicate had presented to the govern-

ment a plan to settle 10,000 persons in the new colony, and to complete the undertaking in four years.

They estimated the cost at £30 per head, and asked for repayment in land at 1/6 per acre for each indentured servant so taken out, and an acre of land for each 1/6 invested in stock and goods.

Had these plans succeeded, the syndicate would have had 4,000,000 acres of land "equal to the Plains of Lombardy," but the government knew by the cost of exporting convicts that £15 per head would be nearer the mark, and cut down the proposed grant to 1,000,000 acres.

This offer to Peel's syndicate became the basis on which land was supplied to the earliest settlers. For every 1/6 spent on taking out indentured servants, or on settlers' passages, and on stock taken to the new colony, one acre of land was given, but it was necessary to improve the land to the extent of a further 1/6 per acre before the freehold title would be granted. Peel's partners would not agree to the new terms; 1,000,000 acres of "Lombardy" at 1/6 the acre was not enough; they wanted 4,000,000 or nothing.

It is most likely, however, that the first raptures of expectancy having died down, Peel's friends were glad of an excuse to pull out.

Mr. Peel was of different mettle. He had an amount of £50,000 ready to invest, and he dreamed of becoming one of the founders of "new majesties of mighty states." Penn and Delaware were to be his models.

In the meantime strings had been pulled at the Admiralty. It changed its mind and sent Lieutenant Fremantle on board H.M.S. Challenger to claim Swan River as British territory; he arrived on April 27, 1829.

Mr. Peel, still keen on his Empire building, agreed to take out 300 indentured servants, men, women and children, with stoves and stock of all kinds.

On a map in London, he marked out 500,000 acres extending from the junction of the Swan and the Canning Rivers westward, and he agreed to arrive on the scene of his choice by the end of November, 1829, or to forfeit his right to the block.

He arrived at Fremantle in December, to find that nearly all his land had been handed out to other settlers. On board the "Gilmore," that brought Peel from England, were 182 passengers, three horses, four cows, three calves, and some pigs and poultry, comprising about half his company, and with these he moved down to a place nine miles south of Fremantle that he named Clarence.

He was unfitted to control a venture the size he had embarked on, and misfortune set upon him from the beginning.

Writing about him in 1836, close enough to the actual happenings to

be accepted, Lieutenant Bunbury says:

"On arrival, he established a township at Clarence, nine miles south of Fremantle.

"He lived for some time with naval officers at Garden Island, and was afraid to go among his people, who grumbled, and threatened him; while some were sent to prison for breach of contract. Many were starved to death, or died of disease brought on by lack of food, and even of water. Indeed the condition of the people on Peel's Estate became so bad that the governments stepped in, cancelled their indentures, and let them go where they pleased . . ."

"He began to build a house for himself" and intended "to cultivate immense acres, drained and watered by canals."

He had spent all his capital in England, because the more he invested the more land he would get, and he had no ready cash for emergencies. It is said that he borrowed money from fellow-passengers at Cape Town.

The "Rockingham" arrived in May with 175 passengers, who constituted the balance of Peel's indentured servants. The conditions described by Bunbury must have already set in, and to add to the misery and confusion, a storm arose during the night that wrecked the "Rockingham."

The passengers were saved, but most of the stores and stock were lost.

Tremendous hardships were undergone by the people off the "Rockingham," who now joined the

already stricken settlers who had landed in January.

Ultimately, in June, 1830, the government stepped in and cancelled the indentures of all but a few, who remained with Peel.

They built boats with the tools brought from England, and made their voyage to Perth, where some worked for other settlers, and others went to Sydney and to Hobart.

Those who went to Sydney carried the story that eventually reached Wakefield, who made use of it in advancing his new theories, and provided Marx with the information that he gives in his chapter on "The Modern Theory of Colonization" in "Capital": "Poor Mr. Peel was left without a servant to make his bed or fetch him water from the river."

There is no accessible story of Mr. Peel's affairs, if there is one at all. It is said that 37 died between January 12, the day on which he landed at Clarence, and June, when the government stepped in.

A letter written by a Mr. Fox Brown describes the ruin at Clarence: "Its sole edifices crumbled, buried and neglected tombs, its only inhabitants corpses, the victims of disease, starvation and despair; the beach strewn with wrecks; the hills and borders of the river studded with deserted buildings, bearing witness to the consequences of this rash attempt at colonization: to the folly, the absolute madness of such a mode of setting about it, and speaking of the brave men, delicate women and helpless children perish-

ing by hundreds on the desert coast for want of food, of shelter and even of water, surrounded by hordes of angry savages. . . ."

"It was impossible to estimate the vast amount of property buried for safety, or the multitude of stock whose skeletons whiten the ground."

Irwin, in his book, "The State and Position of Western Australia," says that he did not know of anyone dying of starvation, and he adds that "with the exception of the Peel Estate, most of the settlers were on, or near, the Swan, or the Canning Rivers, and could have come down in a day had they wanted to altogether." Irwin's remarks look like diplomatic evasion of facts, and he himself says that he doesn't think it desirable to say too much about Mr. Peel's affairs.

The experiment lasted less than six months, and much happened in that time. Some of the indentured men were transported for breach of contract; that meant they were sent to Tasmania as convicts; so the government must have known of their condition when they were tried. Their condition was the cause of their discontent and they would be sure to mention it at their trial.

In so small a community, what was happening 20 miles from the seat of government must have been known to almost everyone, but Mr. Peel was one of the great people of the colony, and the government left the people to perish rather than to take immediate action. According to the agreement Peel was liable to prosecution because he had not carried out his part of the agreement,

and the servants could have claimed their freedom, as many others did.

It must be noted that the survivors made boats by which to go to Perth, or Fremantle, by water; that suggests that they took property with them, and that they were supplied with food while they made preparations to leave.

Peel blamed his failure on his servants who, he said, left him to take up land for themselves, but no person that had not fulfilled agreements could take up land; the agreements were enforceable by law and, as has been said, this was done at Clarence when Peel had broken his side of the agreement, but the law was only enforced on the worker. In July, 1830, J. Morgan, the colonial storekeeper, wrote to the Under-Secretary to say that Peel was a ruined man unless someone was sent out to manage his affairs; he was incapable, and no one with him

could do so."

Scott's "Short History of Australia" says of him: "Finally, conscious of failure, he surrendered his grant at a ruinous loss, and returned to England," but Bunbury, writing of him in 1836, says that he lived at Peeltown, or Mandurup, in a "long, low thatched cottage of wattle and daub, whitewashed and kept clean."

"There he lives with his wife and two young daughters and his son Tommy, his mother and his wife's mother." "No servants but two natives, who wash dishes, look after horses and assist generally."

"The old woman cooks, and never appears at table. Often as I have been there, I have never her face, the fare is not sumptuous, but depends, as usual in the bush, on native sources."

He died 30 years later in indigent circumstances.

SOVIET'S FIRST ACT Decree on Peace

One of the first tasks which the Soviet Government set itself on coming to power on November 7, 1917, was to extricate the country from the imperialist war into which it had been dragged by the former ruling class.

The first legislative measure of the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets was the Decree on Peace which was adopted on November 8, 1917, on the report of Lenin.

In the light of the present world situation and the tremendously enhanced role of the Soviet Union this historic document should prove of great interest to our readers.

THE question of peace is a burning and painful question of the day. Much has been said and written on the subject, and all of you, no doubt, have discussed it quite a lot. Permit me, therefore, to proceed to read a declaration which the government you elect should publish.

DECREE ON PEACE

The workers' and peasants' government created by the revolution of November 6-7 (October 24-25) and backed by the Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies calls upon all the belligerent nations and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just, democratic peace.

By a just or democratic peace, for which the overwhelming majority of the working and toiling classes of all the belligerent countries, exhausted, tormented and racked by the war, are craving—a peace that has been most definitely and insistently demanded by the Russian workers and peasants ever since the

overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—the government means an immediate peace without annexations (i.e., the seizure of foreign lands, or the forcible incorporation of foreign nations) and without indemnities.

The government of Russia calls upon all the belligerent nations to conclude such a peace immediately, and expresses its readiness to take the most resolute measures without the least delay, pending the final ratification of the terms of this peace by authoritative assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations.

In accordance with the sense of justice of the democracy in general, and of the toiling classes in particular, the government conceives the annexation, or seizure, of foreign lands to mean the incorporation into a large or powerful state of a small or feeble nation without the precisely, clearly and voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time such forcible incorporation took place,



irrespective also of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to, or forcibly retained as part of, the given state, and irrespective, finally, of whether this nation is in Europe or in distant, overseas countries.

If any nation whatsoever is forcibly retained as part of a given state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether expressed in the press, at public meetings, in the decisions of parties, or in protests and revolts against national oppression—it is not permitted the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation and without the least pressure being brought to bear, such incorporation is annexation, i.e., seizure and coercion.

The government considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war for the purpose of dividing up among the strong and rich nations the feeble nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the conditions indicated, which are equally just for all nationalities without exception.

At the same time the government declares that it does not regard the above-mentioned terms of peace as an ultimatum; in other words, it is prepared to consider any other terms of peace, but only insists that they be advanced by any of the belligerent nations as speedily as possible,

and that in the proposals of peace there should be absolute clarity and the complete absence of all ambiguity and secrecy.

The government abolishes secret diplomacy, and, for its part, announces its firm intention to conduct all negotiations quite openly under the eyes of the whole people. It will immediately proceed to the full publication of the secret treaties endorsed or concluded by the government of landlords and capitalists from February to November 7 (October 25), 1917. The government proclaims the absolute and immediate annulment of everything contained in these secret treaties that is aimed, as is mostly the case, at securing advantages and privileges for the Russian landlords and capitalists and at the retention, or extension, of the annexations made by the Great-Russians.

Appealing to the governments and peoples of all countries immediately to begin open negotiations for peace, the government, for its part, announces its readiness to conduct these negotiations both in writing, by telegraph, and by negotiations between representatives of the various countries, or at a conference of such representatives. In order to facilitate such negotiations, the government is appointing its authoritative representatives to neutral countries.

The government proposes an immediate armistice to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, and, for its part, considers it desirable that this armistice should be concluded for a period

of not less than three months, i.e., a period long enough to permit the completion of negotiations for peace with the participation of the representatives of all peoples or nations involved in or compelled to take part in the war, without exception, and the summoning of authoritative assemblies of the representatives of the peoples of all countries for the final ratification of the terms of peace.

While addressing this proposal for peace to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, the provisional workers' and peasants' government of Russia appeals in particular to the class-conscious workers of the three foremost nations of mankind and the largest states participating in the present war, namely, Great Britain, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have made the greatest contributions to the cause of progress and Socialism; they have furnished the great examples of the Chartist movement in England, a number of revolutions of historic importance by the French proletariat, and finally, the heroic struggle against the anti-Socialist law in Germany and the example shown to the workers of the whole world in the prolonged, persistent and disciplined work of creating mass proletarian organisations in Germany. All these examples of proletarian heroism and historical creative work are a pledge that the workers of the countries mentioned will understand the duty that now lies upon them of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences.

For these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely energetic action, can help us to bring about the success of the cause of peace, and at the same time the cause of the emancipation of the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation.

The workers' and peasants' government created by the revolution of November 6-7 (October 24-25) and backed by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies must start immediate negotiations for peace. Our appeal must be addressed both to the government and to the peoples. We cannot ignore the governments, for that would delay the possibility of concluding peace, and the people's government dare not do that; but we have no right not to appeal to the peoples at the same time. Everywhere there are differences between the governments and the peoples, and we must therefore help the peoples to interfere in the questions of war and peace. We will, of course, insist upon the whole of our programme for a peace without annexations and indemnities. We shall not retreat from it; but we must deprive our enemies of the opportunity of saying that their conditions are different from ours and that therefore it is useless to start negotiations with us. No, we must deprive them of that advantageous position and not advance our terms in the form of an ultimatum. Therefore, the point is included that we will consider all terms of peace and all proposals. We shall consider

them, but that does not necessarily mean that we shall accept them. We shall submit them to the judgment of the Constituent Assembly, which will have the power to decide what concessions can and what cannot be made. We are combatting the duplicity of governments which pay lip-service to peace and justice, but in fact wage usurpatory and predatory wars. No government will say all it thinks. We, however, are opposed to secret diplomacy and will act openly under the eyes of the whole people. We do not, and never did, close our eyes to difficulties. War cannot be ended by refusal, it cannot be ended by one side only. We are proposing an armistice for three months, but shall not reject a shorter period, so that the exhausted army may breathe freely, if even for a little while, and, moreover, in all the civilised countries national assemblies must be summoned for the discussion of the terms.

In proposing an immediate armistice, we appeal to the class-conscious workers of the countries that have done so much for the development of the proletarian movement. We appeal to the workers of England, where there was the Chartist movement, to the workers of France, who have in repeated insurrections displayed the strength of their class-consciousness, and to the workers of Germany, who waged the fight against the Anti-Socialist Law and have created powerful organisations.

In the manifesto of March 27 (14) we called for the overthrow of the bankers, but, far from over-

throwing our own bankers, we entered into an alliance with them. Now we have overthrown the government of the bankers.

That government and the bourgeoisie will make every effort to unite their forces and drown the workers' and peasants' revolution in blood. But the three years of war have been a good lesson to the masses: The Soviet movement in other countries and the revolt in the German navy, which was crushed by the junkers of Wilhelm the hangman. Finally, we must remember that we are not living in the wilds of Africa, but in Europe, where news can spread quickly.

The workers' movement will triumph and will pave the way to peace and Socialism.

(*Pravda*, No. 171, November 10 (October 28), 1917 and *Izvestia of the Central Executive Committee*, No. 208, November 9 (October 27), 1917.

REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT ON PEACE, NOVEMBER 8 (October 26), 1917

I shall not touch on the general character of the declaration. The government which your congress sets up may introduce amendments to unessential points.

I shall declare my decided opposition to lending our demand for peace the form of an ultimatum. An ultimatum may prove fatal to our whole cause. We cannot demand that because of some insignificant departure from our demands the imperialist governments should have the opportunity to say that it was impossible to enter into

negotiations for peace owing to our irreconcilability.

We shall distribute our appeal everywhere, it will be made known to everybody. It will be impossible to conceal the terms proposed by our workers' and peasants' government.

It will be impossible to hush up our workers' and peasants' revolution, which has overthrown the government of bankers and landlords.

The governments might not reply to an ultimatum; they would be obliged to reply to the text we have proposed. Let it be known to all what their governments have in mind. We do not want any secrets. We want a government to be always under the control of the public opinion of its country.

What will the peasant of some remote province say if, owing to our insistence on ultimatums, he will not know what another government wants? He will say, "Comrades, why did you preclude the possibility of any terms of peace being proposed? I would have discussed them, I would have examined them, and would then have instructed my representatives in the Constituent Assembly how to act. I am prepared to fight by revolutionary means for just terms if the governments do not agree, but there might be such terms for certain countries that I would be prepared to recommend those governments to go on fighting themselves. The complete realisation of our ideas depends solely on the overthrow of the whole capitalist system." This is what the peasant might say to us, and he would ac-

cuse us of being superfluously uncompromising over trifles, when the chief thing for us is to expose all the vileness, all the rascality of the bourgeois and of its crowned and uncrowned hangmen placed at the head of the governments.

We dare not and must not afford the governments the opportunity to take refuge behind our uncompromisingness and to conceal from the peoples why they are being sent to the shambles. This is a drop, but we dare not and must not reject this drop, which will wear away the stone of bourgeois usurpation. An ultimatum would make the position of our opponents easier. But we shall make all the terms known to the people. We shall confront all the governments with our terms, and let them make answer to their peoples. We shall submit all peace proposals to the Constituent Assembly for decision.

There is still another point, comrades, to which you must direct the most careful attention. The secret treaties must be published. The clauses regarding annexations and indemnities must be annulled. There are various clauses, comrades—the predatory governments, you know, not only made agreements among themselves as to the plunder, but among such agreements they also included economic agreements and various other clauses regarding friendly relations.

We shall not bind ourselves by treaties. We shall not allow ourselves to be enmeshed by treaties. We reject all clauses dealing with plunder and violence, but we shall

welcome all clauses containing provisions for friendly relations and economic agreements; those we cannot reject. We propose an armistice for three months; we choose a lengthy period because the peoples are exhausted, the peoples yearn for a respite from this bloody shambles which has lasted over three years. We must realise that the people must be given the opportunity to discuss the terms of peace and to express their will with the help of parliament, and this requires time. We therefore demand a lengthy armistice so that the army in the trenches may enjoy a respite from this nightmare of constant slaughter; but we shall not reject proposals for a shorter armistice; we shall examine them, and it is incumbent on us to accept them, even if we are offered an armistice of a month or a month and a half. Our proposal for an armistice, too, must not be in the form of an ultimatum, for we will not give our enemies the opportunity to conceal the whole truth from the peoples, using our irreconcilability as a pretext. It must not be in the form of an ultimatum, for it is criminal for a government not to desire an armistice. If, however, we do not put our proposal for an armistice in the form of an ultimatum, we shall thereby compel the governments to appear as criminals in the eyes of the people, and the peoples will show such criminals scant ceremony. The objection is raised that by not issuing ultimatums we display our impotence, but it is time to cast aside all bourgeois cant when speaking of the strength

of the people. According to the bourgeois conception, strength means that the masses go blindly to the slaughter in obedience to the behest of the imperialist governments. The bourgeoisie admits a state to be strong only when it can, by the whole might of the government apparatus, throw the masses wherever the bourgeois rulers want. Our idea of strength is a different one. In our opinion a state is strong by virtue of the consciousness of the masses. It is strong when the masses know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously. We need not fear to tell the truth about fatigue, for what state is now not fatigued, what nation does not talk about it openly? Take Italy, where owing to this fatigue, there was a lengthy revolutionary movement demanding the termination of the slaughter. Are not mass demonstrations of workers taking place in Germany, at which the demand for the termination of the war is raised? Was it not fatigue that provoked the mutiny in the German navy that was so ruthlessly suppressed by that hangman, Wilhelm, and his hirelings? If such things are possible in so disciplined a country as Germany, where they are beginning to talk about fatigue and about putting an end to the war, we need not fear to say the same openly, because it is the truth, equally true both of our country and of all the belligerent and even non-belligerent countries.

(*Pravda*, No. 171, November 10 (October 28), 1917.

WANTED

One thousand new readers of the
"Communist Review"
by February, 1940

In January, 1937, the "Communist Review" was first published in its new and improved form.

In six months the circulation was doubled. Since then, however, there has been no further increase.

Plans which the Editors have for further improvements and new features cannot be introduced until this situation is remedied.

If we can obtain one thousand new readers by the end of this year, January, 1940 will see a still brighter and better "Communist Review."

We estimate that the sales should increase in the various States as follows:

N.S.W.	400	W.A.	60
Q'ld.	250	S.A.	30
Vic.	250	Tas.	12

Sellers and readers alike can help us to achieve our objective by introducing the "Review" to new people.

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

OBTAINABLE BY SUBSCRIBING TO
SOVIET PERIODICALS IN ENGLISH

Moscow News

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

Twenty-four pages.

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

Single copy 2d.

Sovietland

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

U.S.S.R. In Construction

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

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

International Literature

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

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

Combined annual subscription rates:

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

Orders to be placed with:

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



11. DEC 1939

6^D

COMMUNIST

Review

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



DECEMBER

1939